

Orange County Public Schools

Whispering Oak Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
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: 1/20/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
2019-20 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%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	22%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 1/20/2016, Lee Montgomery

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	56	167	188	192	184	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	934
Attendance below 90 percent	70	10	11	8	16	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/27/2020

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	
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	

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	
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	

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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						
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	74

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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 (SWD) and African American subgroups, 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 SWD subgroup showed only 28% of students on grade level. Overall, there was not enough emphasis on consistent data collection and movement in intervention groups with our Tier III 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?

Looking at our Early Warning Systems data, the number of 4th grade students show concerns in multiple areas compared to all other grade levels. This cohort leads in attendance rate below 90 percent and suspensions. Sixteen students had an attendance rate below 90% and three students with suspensions. Our 5th grade cohort data revealed eight students in ELA and nine students in math earned a Level 1 on the 2018-2019 FSA.

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

1. 5th grade level ones on FSA
2. SWD in reading and math
3. 4th grade cohort EWS
4. African American students who are in the lowest 25 percent in both reading and math
5. Focus on increasing science scores

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and 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 informed practices needed regarding culturally-informed instruction to support the shift in student demographics. We will work to create socially emotional instructional practices and utilize culturally appropriate curriculum.
Measurable Outcome:	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:	Cathy Moore (cathy.moore@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementing and utilizing the tools of Social Emotional Learning (SEL), 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. 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. 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 Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will participate in Professional Development on Social Emotional Learning

Person Responsible Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

2. Quarterly monitoring of iReady data by subgroups will be monitored

Person Responsible Marie Henry-Louis (marie.henry-louis@ocps.net)

- 3 Regular classroom observations during strategic activities will be done to help indicate trends and support needed in Organizing Students to Practice and Deepen Knowledge

Person Responsible Joyce Conley (joyce.conley@ocps.net)

4. Coaching support will be provided to teachers as a result of trend data

Person Responsible Cathy Moore (cathy.moore@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 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 the achievement gap between white 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 socio-economic status stayed the same.

Measurable Outcome: 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 implementing literacy strategies to engage in diverse and complex 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: Students use of conative skills necessary fro understanding and interacting with others, allows students to strategically extend learning by enhancing procedural skills and deepening knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will participate in ongoing professional development to support Deliberate Practice content to organize students based on collected data.

Person Responsible Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

2. Teachers will effectively organize students to practice and deepen knowledge

Person Responsible Joy Stribling (joy.stribling@ocps.net)

3. ESE teachers will strategically target our lowest 25% during FBS blocks

Person Responsible Dana Dickerson (dana.dickerson2@ocps.net)

4. We allocated monies to hire two additional ESE teachers who will support our students during FBS.

Person Responsible Dana Dickerson (dana.dickerson2@ocps.net)

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

Person Responsible Marie Henry-Louis (marie.henry-louis@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Leadership team will meet to review data and assess needs based on diagnostics. We will provide professional development, coaching, and collaborative planning to address instructional practices designed to create rigorous standards based instruction.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

In order to establish a positive school climate and culture, we will engage in ongoing district wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, we will use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and connotative strategies to support student success.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.