

Orange County Public Schools

Windermere High



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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Windermere High

5523 WINTER GARDEN VINELAND RD, Windermere, FL 34786

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

Demographics

Principal: Andrew Leftakis

Start Date for this Principal: 6/20/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	26%
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: B (60%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Windermere High

5523 WINTER GARDEN VINELAND RD, Windermere, FL 34786

<https://windermerehs.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)
High School 9-12	No	26%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

Year Grade	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	B	B	B

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.

OCPS Mission: 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.

OCPS Vision: 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
Guthrie, Douglas	Principal	
Linehan, John	Assistant Principal	
Robb, Sheri	Assistant Principal	
Granberry, Keyonata	School Counselor	
Hernando, Roxana	Other	
Plumlee, Taylor	Assistant Principal	
Newcomer, Amanda	Instructional Coach	
Stokes, Daniel	Instructional Coach	
Adkins, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Murchison, Nancy	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/20/2016, Andrew Leftakis

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.*

6

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.*

27

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

216

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	26%
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: B (60%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1069	1121	1059	929	4178
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	146	165	180	551
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	49	52	47	172
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	143	150	162	500
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	167	127	140	480
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	122	133	107	490
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	111	104	152	494

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	207	195	214	727

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/28/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	984	917	762	701	3364
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	166	215	177	681
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	75	69	64	293
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	284	311	196	137	928
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217	219	106	37	579

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198	230	166	102	696

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	3	4	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	8	19

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	984	917	762	701	3364
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	166	215	177	681
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	75	69	64	293
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	284	311	196	137	928
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217	219	106	37	579

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	198	230	166	102	696

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	3	4	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	8	19

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	70%	55%	56%	0%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	53%	51%	0%	46%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	40%	42%	0%	34%	41%
Math Achievement	56%	43%	51%	0%	34%	49%
Math Learning Gains	52%	49%	48%	0%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	46%	45%	0%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	74%	70%	68%	0%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	73%	73%	0%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	67%	52%	15%	55%	12%
	2018	65%	50%	15%	53%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	65%	50%	15%	53%	12%
	2018	61%	49%	12%	53%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	67%	6%	67%	6%
2018	74%	62%	12%	65%	9%
Compare		-1%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	76%	69%	7%	70%	6%
2018	71%	65%	6%	68%	3%
Compare		5%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	46%	63%	-17%	61%	-15%
2018	39%	61%	-22%	62%	-23%
Compare		7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	53%	7%	57%	3%
2018	64%	65%	-1%	56%	8%
Compare		-4%			

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	18	25	25	14	30	34	32	36			
ELL	41	52	49	46	53	49	60	57			
ASN	81	69	33	75	58		90	85			
BLK	59	55	38	30	31	43	63	74			
HSP	60	54	45	52	52	41	70	74			
MUL	92	74		71	67		85	67			
WHT	74	61	47	60	54	46	75	83			
FRL	54	49	33	42	44	42	62	71			
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	20	31	30	29	42	43	41	53			
ELL	35	50	46	48	48	37	58	65			
ASN	81	60	33	74	52		90	90			
BLK	69	61	37	52	49	50	67	51			
HSP	55	55	48	49	46	37	67	69			
MUL	68	48		50	29		60	100			
WHT	72	60	52	62	47	39	85	81			
FRL	54	51	44	46	44	40	67	60			

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

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	61
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	549
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
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	70
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	49
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	58
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	76
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	65
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	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.

In the 2018-2019 school year, math lowest quartile was our area that performed the lowest among our own data and as compared to the district data. There was a positive trend in this area, as we made progress in closing the gap between our school's performance and the district performance in

this area. We performed 22 points lower than the district in 2018, and only 17 points lower in 2019. During that year, we had an under-performing teacher who was moved out of the Algebra I content area for the 2019-2020 school year. During the 19-20 school year, the data from our Performance Measurement Assessments (PMA) show that we decreased by 1% in Algebra I when compared to the 18-19 school year and showed a decrease of 8% in geometry.

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

The data component which showed the greatest decline during the 2018-2019 school year was Geometry. The Geometry EOC results dropped by 4 points compared to the 2017-2018 school year. This is due to a change in the middle school math course progression. However, there is a positive trend in this area, as well. In 2017-2018 our performance was 1 point less than the district. In 2018-2019, we outperformed the district average by 7 points.

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.

Based on the 2018 and 2019 EOC data for Algebra I and Geometry, the learning gains of students in the lowest 25%, in math, was the area with the greatest gap when compared to the state average. However, there is a positive trend in this area, as we have made progress in closing the gap between our school's performance and the district performance in this area. We performed 22 points lower than the district in 2017-2018, and only 17 points lower in 2018-2019. At the time, we had an under performing teacher who was moved out of Algebra I for the 2019-2020 school year.

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

During the 2018-2019 school year, math learning gains showed the most improvement. This was due in part to our School Improvement Plan (SIP) focus on increasing the use of data in our math professional learning communities. We worked to build teacher capacity, in the use of math data, to allow for informed decision making within their professional learning communities in order to effectively deliver rigorous, standards-based instruction with a focus on close reading strategies to improve student achievement. Common formative assessment data from quarterly progress monitoring assessments (PMAs) was monitored and discussed with the evaluating administrator during professional learning community time. The administrator pulled the PMA data for each department after the assessment and led a data chat to address areas of success and areas of growth. Included in this process was a plan for remediation for specifically identified standards of need. The administrator also created individualized student remediation plans based on the PMA data. The math teachers used these remediation plans to conduct student data chats to provide students an opportunity to understand their individual student data and their individual progress in achieving mastery of the content and growth in the content area. This year we have a tutor on campus for level 1 support and create individualized student data plans based on PMA scores. We will also utilize virtual tutoring to reach our students at home.

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

980 students (23%) had a course failure in math or English. Although this is a 5% decrease from the previous year, it still supports a need to continue implementing more structures in math and English.

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

1. Social and Emotional Learning
2. Positive school climate and culture

- 3. Achievement of Students with Disabilities
- 4. Algebra I and Geometry interventions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In order to increase student achievement for students with disabilities and the lowest quartile, we will build up our system of how we analyze data, analyze instructional practices, and make necessary adjustments that improve student outcomes. We would like to increase our Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) federal index for students with disabilities from 27% to 33% in the coming year.

Measurable Outcome: To improve math proficiency for our lowest quartile and increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Douglas Guthrie (douglas.guthrie@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Build up our system of how we analyze data, analyze instructional practices, and make necessary adjustments that improve student outcomes

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The ESSA subgroup for students with disabilities was 27%, while all other subgroups performed between 53% and 76%. Therefore, we have chosen to focus on our students with disabilities to increase their achievement levels in ELA and math for the coming year. After teachers develop their instructional goals, they should evaluate and make ongoing adjustments to student's instructional programs. Once instruction and other supports are designed and implemented, teachers have the skills to manage and engage in ongoing data collection using curriculum-based measures, information classroom assessments, observations of students academic performance and behavior, self-assessment of classroom instruction, and discussions with key stakeholders (i.e., students, other professionals, administrators, parents). Teachers study their practice to improve student learning, validate reasoned hypotheses about salient instructional features and enhance instructional decision making. Effective teachers will retain, reused, and extend practices that improve student learning and adjust or discard those that do not.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and administrators will collaborate during common planning to create lesson plans that utilize student-focused pedagogy to improve student outcomes.
2. Teacher, support facilitator, staffing specialist, and 504/IEP coordinator collaboration on student needs and progress.
3. Staff members will collaborate in order to support student learning toward measurable outcomes and to design and implement educational programs for all students. Support will be provided by instructional coaches, and leadership team members.
4. Staff members will utilize systems to analyze data to make adjustments in order to improve student outcomes for all students.
5. Build up our system of how we analyze data, analyze instructional practices, and make necessary adjustments that improve student outcomes.

Person Responsible: Sheri Robb (sheri.robb@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 subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: Math achievement, achievement for students with disabilities, and increased supports for mental health and wellness.

Measurable Outcome: Improvement in Early Warning Systems indicator data, improvement in Cognia survey results, number of referrals to SAFE, increased math achievement, and a decrease in learning gaps for Students with Disabilities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Taylor Plumblee (taylor.plumblee@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.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-wide collaboration to create understanding of how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies across all content areas and extra-curricular activities.
2. Administration and SAFE Team collaborate to produce and support meaningful Professional Development opportunities, for teachers and staff, on identifying and implementing Social and Emotional Learning strategies.
3. SAFE Team and Guidance collaborate directly with teachers in order to support Social and Emotional Learning Strategies daily.
4. SAFE Team and Guidance to work with Inter Club Council in order to create student-driven activities that support mental health and wellness, to tie students into the school and community.
5. Monitor data related to SEL strategies each quarter and share with staff.
6. Virtual opportunities will be provided for LaunchEd student support. This includes a virtual club rush, virtual tutoring, and virtual options for activities that take place on campus.

Person Responsible: Jessica Adkins (jessica.adkins@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will be looking at individual students within math and English, that have not shown adequate progress, in order to uncover causes and develop plans for intervention. We will use data from PMA, attendance, suspensions, and teacher grade distributions to assist in finding ways to better support these students and build a path to content mastery.

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.

This year, Windermere High School will continue to build and improve positive school culture and environment through a school-wide emphasis on Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) and focus on mental health and wellness of our students and staff.

Administration will work closely with the school SAFE Team, guidance, and district resources, in order to provide continuous, relevant professional development that employs SEL strategies daily. Utilizing these strategies is key to student growth and achievement in order to ensure that students have a promising future. Providing a robust SEL education increases student skill levels, improves academic performance, social behaviors, attitudes and levels of distress. To start this process, we have added an additional SAFE Coordinator, to support in these efforts. Professional Development will establish clear guidelines on how school-employed mental health professionals, administrators, teachers, classified staff, and interns respond to the challenge of youth who are suicidal. The SAFE Team will work with administration to highlight best practices of SEL at our school, and share these with staff and the community. Events will also be held for teachers to decrease stress and keep morale high.

Leadership team members will have a group of students to check in with each month, in order to identify any emotional needs students may have. Guided questions will be provided, so that they have a guideline for meetings. Administration will review meeting notes as a team. All staff members can reach out for specific instructions if additional help is needed. For students that may need support outside of these meetings, we will establish a system for students to contact a Mental Health Counselor (or other appropriate personnel) at any time, to put specific actions and plans in place for that student.

We will also engage student clubs and athletics to promote positive culture and environment outside of the classroom, across the school, and into the community. Clubs and athletics will attend the events of one another to show support and encourage students break any possible barriers between different clubs, sports, or social circles. Clubs and athletics will work together to create student-centered events that link SEL to the school culture and make connections to valuable skills outside of our campus. SAFE will also

work with Inter Club Council to advocate for diverse student voices and to help address individual and school-wide concerns. We will also involve SAFE in the School Advisory Committee (SAC) and the Parent Teacher Student Organization (PTSO) meetings, so that parents and the community understand the importance of their involvement on campus and can provide any additional supports where needed.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00