

Orange County Public Schools

West Oaks Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

West Oaks Elementary

905 DORSCHER RD, Orlando, FL 32818

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

Demographics

Principal: Elaine Lundberg

Start Date for this Principal: 6/30/2013

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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	TS&I
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

West Oaks Elementary

905 DORSCHER RD, Orlando, FL 32818

<https://westoaks.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	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	99%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

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 that 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
Thompson, Cherie	Principal	Principal, Cherie Thompson: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, provides clear direction by establishing measurable goals and establishes a positive school culture. Mrs. Thompson ensures that the school-based teams are implementing research-based instructional strategies focused on the work of improving academic achievement. Mrs. Thompson monitors the use of common assessments and ensures data is analyzed, interpreted, and used to drive classroom instruction. Mrs. Thompson establishes instructional teams who collaborate regularly, provides professional development opportunities addressing school improvement focus areas and provides support through the use of instructional coaches and modeling. Ms. Thompson also allows for opportunities for students, parents, staff, and the community to provide input regarding the function of the school and engages families in a variety of learning and relationship-building activities throughout the school year.
Barnes, April	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach and Science Coach, Ms. April Barnes Ms. Barnes, the instructional coach works collaboratively with the school-based problem-solving teams to develop and implement training, coach and support teachers, and participate in collaborative planning. Ms. Barnes also serves as the science coach to facilitate the management and interpretation of data necessary to develop, implement and evaluate science instruction across the grade levels. Ms. Barnes also coordinates our mentee and mentor program for teachers with less than three years of experience or those new to our school.
Karimi, Aki	Other	Staffing Specialist, Aki Karimi: The staffing specialists, Ms. Karimi, facilitates and provides training to school staff regarding ESE procedures, least restrictive environment, and other items related to students with disabilities. Ms. Karimi serves as a liaison and expert on school board, state and federal laws related to special education services. Assists in the development and implementation of student IEPs to ensure accuracy and appropriate services and accommodations are provided. Participates in student data collection integrates core instructional activities/materials into tier 3 instruction and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.
Murray, Regina	Instructional Coach	Math Coaches, Regina Murray (Grades K-1): Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes the existing literature on scientifically-based curriculum and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of students' need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children to be considered at risk; assists in the design and

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
Tyler, Thomas	Instructional Coach	Math Coach, Thomas Tyler (Grades 3-5): Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes the existing literature on scientifically-based curriculum and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of students' need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, Instructional evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children to be considered at risk; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
Lundberg, Elaine	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Elaine Lundberg: Develops documents necessary to manage and display data; provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding data analysis, management and implementation to drive instruction. Provides guidance on the K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of tier 1, 2 and 3 intervention plans. Monitors, provides actional feedback, and ensures accountability of the MAO initiatives and Culturally Responsive School Plan. This section is:
Garcia, Susan	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach and Science Coach, Ms. Susan Garcia Ms. Garcia, the instructional coach works collaboratively with the school-based problem-solving teams to develop and implement training, coach and support teachers, and participate in collaborative planning. Ms. Garcia also serves as the reading coach to facilitate the management and interpretation of data necessary to develop, implement and evaluate reading and writing instruction across the grade levels. Ms. Garcia also coordinates our mentee and mentor program for teachers with less than three years of experience or those new to our school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 6/30/2013, Elaine Lundberg

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.*

0

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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	TS&I
* 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	36	84	89	89	108	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	1	11	14	8	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	1	24	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	11	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	1	3	35	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	0	1	1	0	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

Wednesday 7/15/2020

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	60	82	87	114	96	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	16	9	9	15	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	9	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	4	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	59	45	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	1	1	1	20	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	60	82	87	114	96	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	16	9	9	15	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	9	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	4	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	59	45	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	1	1	1	20	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	45%	57%	57%	44%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	58%	58%	55%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	52%	53%	47%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	47%	63%	63%	43%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	61%	62%	56%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	48%	51%	59%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	59%	56%	53%	35%	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	44%	55%	-11%	58%	-14%
	2018	33%	55%	-22%	57%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	57%	-21%	58%	-22%
	2018	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	40%	61%	-21%	62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	63%	-26%	64%	-27%
	2018	51%	62%	-11%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
	2018	32%	59%	-27%	61%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	57%	54%	3%	53%	4%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
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	13	48	63	11	31	35					
ELL	39	43	56	39	58	64	56				
BLK	43	52	68	46	48	48	57				
HSP	52	50		45	50						
FRL	41	50	61	45	48	50	62				
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	7	31	31	4	27	40					
ELL	40	70	63	40	56	54	29				
BLK	45	58	47	45	46	42	45				
HSP	48	83		38	67						
FRL	46	61	50	44	50	47	46				
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		19	18	11	38	38					

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
ELL	28	46	45	40	53	52	6				
BLK	46	58	49	43	56	65	34				
HSP	15	23		25	46						
FRL	44	55	47	43	56	59	35				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
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	

Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
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	49
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
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.

Based on 2019 Florida State Assessment (FSA) data, the data component that shows the lowest performance is the students with disabilities subgroup with only 13% of students with disabilities performing on grade level in ELA and 11% performing on grade level in math as assessed by the Florida State Assessment. Trends that were observed within this subgroup show that there is a gap that remains between scores of our fully mainstreamed students and the general education population. Analyzing data and making the necessary adjustment to address the learning gaps and access to grade-level standards while building a culture of collaboration between ESE and non-ESE teachers will continue to be important for the upcoming school year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the 2017-2018 school year, would be included in our grade-level data, specifically fourth grade. Our fourth grade-level team performing at 51% in both reading and math for the 2017-2018 school year declined to 36% in ELA and 37% in math during the 2018-2019 school year. One of the factors that may have contributed to this decline is that the cohort of students needed a more targeted and systematic intervention plan to address many academic concerns. Another contributing factor may be the level of teacher experience particularly in the knowledge of the Florida Standards and the district's instructional framework model.

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.

Our math achievement data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The math achievement at our school is 47% while the state average is 63%, which is a difference of 16%. This gap increases to a 27% deficit among our fourth grade in the grade-level data analysis. Knowledge and comfort level of the Florida math standards by our teachers is a contributing factor to this gap. Also, closer monitoring of student achievement through common assessments and collaborative data analysis is needed for us to clearly identify the specific math needs of our students and support them through the MTSS process and appropriate use of interventions. The trend with our FSA and i-Ready data is that we need to continue to focus on math content as our scores fall below state and district average on assessments.

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

Our science achievement level is the data component that showed the most improvement with a 14% increase during the 2018-2019 school year. We contribute the use of standard-aligned curriculum as a foundation for instruction, the increased use of technology and hands-on learning opportunities, and consistent analysis of student common assessments to drive instruction as important factors leading to our success. Another contributing factor is the quality of collaboration and communication among our fifth-grade team, science coach, and administration during common planning and data analysis. Finally, the implementation of adjustments to improve student outcomes and to clear any misconceptions through the use of specific instructional practices and interventions was also a large contributor to the success in this area.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

One area of concern, as identified through the EWS data, would be the total of students scoring a level 1 on the statewide state assessments. The second concern would be the number of students whose attendance falls below 90%.

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

1. Increasing the proficiency of our students with disabilities.
2. Increase reading and math achievement levels across all grade levels.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Our Area of Focus is to the commitment and consistency of small group instruction in all classrooms. Small group instruction is used to reinforce or reteach standards or skills, in a reduced student-teacher ratio, to make a significant impact on student learning. Increasing small-group instruction shows several benefits, which include increased targeted differentiated instructional time, build confidence through improved student collaboration, immediate feedback, and opportunity for the teacher to intervene with scaffolding and support for a struggling student. While we make incremental improvements in learning gains, we continue to perform below our goal in the percentage of students meeting grade-level achievement expectations in the areas of reading and math. We continue to perform below district and state average in students achieving at or above grade level on FSA assessment. In response to ESSA outcomes, small group instruction will also support our students with disabilities allowing for additional individualized instruction and support.

Measurable Outcome:

By May, as assessed by FSA, Statewide Science Assessment, and i-Ready progress monitoring at the school level the number of students meeting grade-level proficiency will increase by 5% in each subject area ELA, Math, and Science across grades 3-5.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cherie Thompson (cherie.thompson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning to support data-based instructional decisions related to small group instruction in reading, math, and science. Our leadership team will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations with actionable feedback, and progress monitoring data. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by common assessment and i-Ready data, student needs, and staff areas of opportunity for growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

To establish a consistent practice of small-group learning experiences within all classrooms, it is critical to purposefully plan for differentiated small group instruction based on student common assessment data. The leadership team will provide continuous professional development opportunities and open classroom opportunities will be scheduled for feedback and growth. Open classroom opportunities and sharing common assessment data during Professional Learning Communities will allow for shared responsibility and accountability for small group instruction. Through purposeful planning, regular common assessment analysis, open classroom experiences, and continual professional development our school can implement effective and regular small group instructional learning that will support the social and emotional needs while improving the academic achievement of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Ongoing professional development opportunities will be provided to address needs based on student achievement, classroom walkthrough, and evaluation data trends to support our area of focus. These professional development opportunities may include how to create text-based questions, increase writing to process opportunities, and strategies for student collaboration during small group instruction.

Person Responsible

April Barnes (april.barnes@ocps.net)

Plan collaboratively and deliberately to address choosing appropriate text, creation of text-dependent questions, implementation of close read strategies, culturally responsive instruction, and student collaboration appropriate for differentiated small group instruction.

Person Responsible Cherie Thompson (cherie.thompson@ocps.net)

Instructional coaches and leadership team members will follow the professional learning cycle to provide differentiated support to teachers as needed.

Person Responsible Elaine Lundberg (elaine.lundberg@ocps.net)

Monitor student common assessment data every 3-4 weeks with Professional Learning Communities to ensure that small group instruction is meaningful and addresses the needs of students.

Person Responsible Thomas Tyler (thomas.tyler@ocps.net)

Continuous and planned open classroom observational opportunities will allow for the collection of data on the implementation of small group instruction, trend feedback for teachers, and inform our coaching cycle as well as the professional development plan.

Person Responsible Cherie Thompson (cherie.thompson@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to the subject material.

By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:

- Better identifying and addressing the social and emotional needs of our students with disabilities.
- Promote a climate and culture of inclusion and acceptance to support our students with disabilities
- Build a school-wide culture of teamwork to increase collaboration and achievement
- Positive behaviors (such as kindness, sharing, and empathy) to improve student perspective on school and reduce depression and stress among students to increase student achievement among all students

Measurable Outcome:

Through ongoing and monitored professional development and practice, teachers will increase intentional SEL instruction and embedded SEL strategies in the classroom. By May, as assessed by FSA, Statewide Science Assessment, and i-Ready, progress monitoring at the school level, the number of students meeting grade-level proficiency will increase by 5% in each subject area ELA, Math, and Science across grades 3-5. By May, as assessed by Early Warning Signs indicator, we have a 5% decrease in suspensions across grade levels. By May, improve Cognia survey overall results by 5% in all indicators. In response to ESSA outcomes, we will increase the number of students with disabilities meeting grade-level proficiency to 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cherie Thompson (cherie.thompson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model, our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning at your school with adults and students

Person Responsible

Elaine Lundberg (elaine.lundberg@ocps.net)

Implement daily strategies including morning meetings, positive affirmations, and team-building activities for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture.

Person Responsible Thomas Tyler (thomas.tyler@ocps.net)

Use cycles of professional learning through weekly PLCs, monthly staff development opportunities, open classroom practices, and differentiated support through the coaching cycle that integrates academics and social and emotional learning.

Person Responsible April Barnes (april.barnes@ocps.net)

Monitor with feedback from open classroom opportunities, weekly walk-throughs, and student engagement. Measure success through common assessments, observation data, and suspension rates. Finally, modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts.

Person Responsible Cherie Thompson (cherie.thompson@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will address the issue of daily attendance through regular monitoring, constant communication, and building positive relationships with families. Leadership continues to support our teachers and staff in building a positive, engaging, and nurturing school environment for our students and families to increase attendance rates. Each leadership member will monitor attendance weekly to identify trends that may show a student or group of students is at danger of disengaging from school and ensure that students with attendance issues are quickly identified as early as possible to provide interventions. Team members will review the student and family situations that may explain patterns of poor attendance, tardiness, and move forward with the necessary support systems through our social worker or mental health counselor.

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.

Our focus on creating a positive school culture and environment is thorough, coordinated, and embedded in daily academic structures. Students, parents, and community involvement (including after-school programming) are included in the creation, implementation, and recognition of school improvement and goals.

Parental and community involvement is essential to positive school culture. Monthly SAC and PTA meetings are held to inform parents, staff members, and community members on school data, schoolwide improvement plan goals, and on other school initiatives providing all stakeholders the ability to provide input and feedback. In addition, meaningful school activities and events that promote positive interactions and build stronger relationships between the school and the families are scheduled monthly. At these events, schoolwide improvement goals are communicated to parents. Parents experience ways to support their children through positive interactions with teachers and staff.

A positive school culture includes celebrations and recognition for achievement. West Oaks celebrates students for many achievements throughout the school year including academic success, goal achievement, attendance, and display of positive behaviors. We also celebrate families through our Parent of the Month celebrations - where teachers are able to recognize families for their contributions to our school or to their child's academic growth. Teachers and staff members are consistently recognized for their efforts and commitment to our students and families at staff meetings, on morning announcements, and through social media. Community members and partners are celebrated at events and on social media for their contributions to the success of the school.

Our school will participate in professional development opportunities and dedicate time for Social-Emotional Learning, team-building, and class building to promote positive student relationships and increase student engagement. Teachers are scheduled for Day 5 of the Kagan Cooperative Learning Series - strategies to promote a positive classroom culture and effective accountable collaboration. Select teachers and leadership team members participate in the district's professional learning community with a focus on SEL initiatives and strategies to bring back to the staff for implementation. The implementation of strategies is monitored weekly through the use of classroom walks and teacher observations.

The climate and culture are monitored through the use of surveys, feedback at SAC/PTA meetings. We also encourage transparency and honesty for the purpose of adjustment and growth.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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