

Orange County Public Schools

Whispering Oak Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Whispering Oak Elementary

15300 STONEYBROOK WEST PKWY, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://whisperingoakes.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Lee Montgomery

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (74%) 2014-15: A (87%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Whispering Oak Elementary

15300 STONEYBROOK WEST PKWY, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://whisperingoakes.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	21%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and community

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Montgomery, Lee	Principal	
Moore, Cathy	Instructional Coach	
Henry-Louis, Marie	Instructional Coach	
Dickerson, Dana	Instructional Coach	
Conley, Joyce	Assistant Principal	
Stribling, Joy	Assistant Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	183	191	174	154	157	172	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1031
Attendance below 90 percent	6	12	5	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

75

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/5/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	11	4	13	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	16	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	11	4	13	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	16	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	85%	57%	57%	84%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	74%	58%	58%	77%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	52%	53%	66%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	85%	63%	63%	85%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	79%	61%	62%	83%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	48%	51%	74%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	56%	53%	79%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	183 (0)	191 (0)	174 (0)	154 (0)	157 (0)	172 (0)	1031 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	6 (14)	12 (11)	5 (4)	7 (13)	15 (5)	0 (10)	45 (57)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	4 (3)	0 (4)	0 (1)	1 (1)	0 (1)	5 (10)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (14)	16 (16)	18 (5)	49 (35)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	55%	31%	58%	28%
	2018	79%	55%	24%	57%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	87%	57%	30%	58%	29%
	2018	76%	54%	22%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	78%	54%	24%	56%	22%
	2018	92%	55%	37%	55%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	85%	62%	23%	62%	23%
	2018	83%	61%	22%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	63%	20%	64%	19%
	2018	74%	62%	12%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	83%	57%	26%	60%	23%
	2018	91%	59%	32%	61%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	74%	54%	20%	53%	21%
	2018	86%	53%	33%	55%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	49	70	64	43	55	52	45				
ELL	66	83	80	70	78	62	71				
ASN	90	90		90	90		83				
BLK	76	75	63	68	64	63	61				
HSP	86	76	75	83	75	52	68				
MUL	86	70		86	90						
WHT	86	70	53	87	81	58	84				
FRL	72	68	56	68	66	44	61				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	49	53	52	49	47	41	58				
ELL	57	53		53	42	20					
ASN	95	71		92	81		100				
BLK	68	62	67	63	62	46	80				
HSP	78	73	70	80	66	33	76				
MUL	94	90		76	70						

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
WHT	87	66	70	90	71	63	90				
FRL	71	59	56	65	56	45	77				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	53	59	54	51	61	50	38				
ELL	69	63		66	72						
ASN	90	79		95	96		93				
BLK	78	71	80	75	76		55				
HSP	77	73	57	83	87	83	74				
MUL	95	75		76	56		100				
WHT	86	79	68	86	82	71	80				
FRL	72	67	55	77	79	72	64				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	595
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	73
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	89
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	67
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	74
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	83
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	74
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	63
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest performance was a 7% decline in the learning gains of our lowest 25% in English Language Arts. In response to the ESSA outcomes regarding students with low economic status, Students With Disabilities and African American, the trend appears to require a more concentrated focus applied in the area of English Language Arts. Specifically with our learning gains in the lowest 25%. After the mid-year iReady diagnostic, our ESE subgroup showed only 28% of students on grade level. This caused administration and the ESE teachers to collaborate and implement an ESE model that would allow for more time in the classroom to support teachers and students. There was a lack of focus on common language and in class accommodations being consistent. Overall, there was not enough emphasis on consistent data collection and movement in intervention groups with our Tier 3 students.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Science showed the greatest decline from the previous year. Moving from a high of 87% to a modest of 77%. The decline in score was due to not providing adequate opportunities for a more hands on focus in science in addition to lack of close reading strategies in this content area.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

None. Our data is above district and state averages.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Overall math gains increased by 9%. We had a more concentrated focus on hands on math instruction and practice that helped lead to this increase.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Looking at our Early Warning Systems data, the number of 4th grade students is disproportionate to the attendance rate, course failures, and students with 2 or more indicators. Fifteen students had an attendance rate below 90% and 16 students scored a level one in Reading or Math. In first grade, 12 students had attendance below 90%, and 4 students had course failures in reading or math.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Lower socioeconomic students who are in the lowest 25 percent
2. ELL students in Reading
3. SWD in reading and math
4. African American students who are in the lowest 25 percent

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increasing Learning Gains in ELA for the Lowest Quartile
Rationale	On the 2018-19 Florida Standards Assessment, overall academic proficiency in English Language Arts was 85%. This is a one point increase from the previous year. Although we achieved 85% in ELA, our ELA lowest 25% decreased by seven points from 71% to 64%. In looking at our ESSA data of the lowest 25%, we need to narrow achievement gap between white students and black students as well as white students and low socio-economic students, who fall into the lowest quartile. Specifically there was a 17 point decrease with our white students, four point decrease with our African American students, and our students with low socioeconomic status stayed the same.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Learning Gains of our lowest 25% will increase from 64% to 70% in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	As a result of continued participation in year three of the District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) we will support students' use of close reading strategies to engage in diverse and complex texts, participate in rigorous discussions and respond to text dependent questions. All students will be able to use these strategies across all content areas to improve comprehension, organize their thinking, and write in response to complex texts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Student's use of conative skills necessary for understanding and interacting with others allows students to strategically extend learning by enhancing procedural skills and deepening knowledge.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will participate in ongoing professional development to support the Deliberate Practice content to organize students based on collected data. 2. Teachers will effectively organize students to practice and deepen knowledge. 3. ESE teachers will strategically target our lowest 25% during FBS blocks. 4. We allocated monies to hire two additional ESE teachers that will support our students during FBS. 5. Instructional coaches will monitor subgroup data to identify student intervention needs and create student groups to receive targeted support from our specified intervention teachers. 6. Administration and instructional coaches will conduct informal classroom observations on a regular basis to monitor implementation of DPLC strategies.
Person Responsible	Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Narrowing the Achievement Gaps in ELA
Rationale	In looking at our ESSA data, in our white, black, and low socioeconomic subgroups there was a decrease in the number of learning gains for those who fell in the bottom 25% in ELA. Specifically, there was a decrease of 17 points in white students, a 4 point decrease in black students, and no change in points with our low socio-economic subgroup. There are also required shifts needed regarding culturally-informed instruction to support the shift in student demographics.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our Black subgroup will increase learning gains from 63% to 70% and our low socio-economic subgroup will increase learning gains from 56 to 63%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementing and utilizing the rules of the Energy Bus, we will empower instruction and the environment by building positive relationships with students. Empowering the paradigms for instruction and engaging in open classroom practices will impact student achievement, close achievement gaps, and improve social emotional learning for all students. In order to narrow the achievement gap and increase student learning gains, students will use close reading strategies to engage in diverse and complex texts. Teachers will effectively organize students to practice and deepen knowledge. As a result, students will be able to interact in small groups and utilize the effective conative skills necessary for collaboration to practice and deepen knowledge. This will also allow students to interact with their peers and engage in positive learning experiences. Students will also be supported in their Social Emotional learning through interactions with other students and the support of the teacher.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In order to support our students, our teachers also need to create a positive and supporting learning and working environment as well as support their social emotional learning. Students use of conative skills necessary for understanding and interacting with others allows students to strategically extend learning by enhancing procedural skills and deepening knowledge. Students will interact in strategic small groups that support social emotional learning. Interacting with their peers based on levels of social needs and abilities will increase their academic proficiency as well as their social skills. This will result in increasing learning gains in our SWD, black, and low socio-economic students.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will participate in monthly Professional Development on the Rules of the Energy Bus, including book study 2. Quarterly monitoring of iReady data by subgroups will be monitored 3 Regular classroom observations during strategic activities will be done to provide trends and support in Organizing Students to Practice and Deepen Knowledge 4. Coaching support will be provided to teachers as a result of trend data
Person Responsible	Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).