

Orange County Public Schools

Magnolia School

A word cloud graphic featuring various educational and improvement-related terms. The words are arranged in a circular pattern around a central logo. The largest words are "students", "school improvement", "learning", "success", and "leadership". Other visible words include "teaching", "relationships", "areas of focus", "instruction", "growth", "vision", "collaboration", "supportive environment", "resources", "achievement", "ambitious", "analysis", "college and career", "Florida", "mission", "family and community involvement", "needs assessment", and "strategic planning". The colors used for the text are primarily blue and yellow.



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Magnolia School

1900 MATTERHORNE DR, Orlando, FL 32818

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

Demographics

Principal: Timothy Shuler

Start Date for this Principal: 3/13/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 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	CS&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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Magnolia School

1900 MATTERHORNE DR, Orlando, FL 32818

<https://magnolia.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)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2011-12
Grade	F

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.

Mission:

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:

To be the top producer of successful students in the Nation

We envision all students at Magnolia School achieving their maximum individual, social, and academic potential.

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
Green, Latonia	Principal	
Thomson, Arlene	Assistant Principal	
Lee, Wendy	Assistant Principal	
Treffinger, Michelle	Other	Behavior Analyst
Adkins, Joshua	Other	
Garcia, Arlene	Instructional Coach	
Rodenberry, Lisa	Other	
Hogan, Andrea	Other	
Lee, Alia	Other	
Hughes, Cynthia	Attendance/Social Work	
Stockard, James	Other	
Dunn, Jessica	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 3/13/2019, Timothy Shuler

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.*

40

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.*

40

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 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	CS&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	3	3	10	3	9	15	43
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	1	5	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	2	10

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	2	2	3	0	1	5	13

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/8/2020

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	6	11	2	9	15	7	26	76
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	2	2	14	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	2	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	8	0	8	23

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	1	2	0	0	2	0	6	11

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	2	9	15	7	26	76
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	2	2	14	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	2	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	8	0	8	23

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	1	2	0	0	2	0	6	11

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0%	62%	61%	0%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	60%	59%	0%	62%	57%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	55%	54%	0%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	61%	62%	0%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	60%	59%	0%	59%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	52%	0%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	56%	56%	0%	55%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	74%	78%	0%	81%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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

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					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	29	48		25	70		36				
BLK	31	50		38							
HSP	20			14							
FRL	40	53		32							
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
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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	230
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	78%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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 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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	17
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

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	31
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

When comparing FSAA ELA data for high school students (grades 9 & 10) with the FSAA ELA data for middle school students, the ELA data for high school students were lower. Of the 13 middle school students who completed the FSAA ELA, 84% (11) scored Level 2 or higher, while 62.5% (15 of 24) high school students scored Level 2 or higher. The for FSAA mathematics for both groups of students were less skewed. Of the 13 students who were assessed, 69.2% (9 of 13) of middle school students received Level 2 or higher for FSAA Math, while 64.9% (22 of 34) of the high school students completing math assessments received Level 2 or higher. The data of the beginning of the year (BOY) and the middle of the year (MOY) for these two subjects areas during the 2019 - 2020 school year also showed that ELA results trended below that of BOY/MOY math data. Sixty three percent of students showed growth in ELA compared to 76% of students who showed growth in math. The data component that showed the lowest performance was that of FSAA ELA. Increasing the monitoring of instruction could have been more pervasive.

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

FSAA ELA data at the high school level have shown the greatest decline from the prior year (a 9% decrease over the prior year - 71.4% to 62.5%). Frequently reviewing lesson plans, providing actionable feedback on instructional delivery, and helping teachers to utilize academic data to drive ELA instruction could have been embedded in pedagogy.

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.

According to the ESSA data, the component that had the greatest gap was the student achievement data for the Hispanic subgroup. Seventeen percent of the student achievement data of our Hispanic students is below the 41% of the Federal Index threshold. This is the first year that the academic data for our Hispanic subgroup was below 32%. More focused and frequent support aligned with evidence-based strategies for instructing ELL students would have been beneficial for these students. Three other subgroups fell below the ESSA Federal Index threshold. These were: economically disadvantaged students (Federal Index = 31%), students with disabilities (Federal Index = 35%), and Black/African American students (Federal Index = 40%). More targeted, research-based instructional techniques for teaching economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and Black/African American students would have produced more favorable achievement results for these students.

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

The FSAA mathematics data component showed the most improvement. Thirty eight percent (5 of 13) of our middle school students, and 23% (8 of 34) of our high school students scored Level 3. Thirty one percent of middle school students, and 43% of high school students scored Level 2 on FSAA Mathematics. While following the district Scope and Sequence, there was a greater focus on academic concepts that were realistically achievable by our students. There were also collaboration and professional development concerning teacher concept knowledge as well as effective delivery of specific concepts deemed most appropriate for students.

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

Based on the data analysis, the area of concern is the suspension data. When the 2019-20 suspension data is compared to that of 2018-19, the percentage of students who were suspended in 2019-20 school year has increased. Based on district's new procedures for documenting threatening behaviors in 2019-2020 school year, the percentage of students violating the student code of conduct showed an increase. Student behaviors that were previously documented through the behavior manifestation process, were now documented through the discipline process for 2019-2020.

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

1. Increase learning gains/academic achievement in academic content areas - Reading and Math.
2. Reduce the percentage of students who are suspended from school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Area of Focus:
 Effective instructional practice that focuses on standards-aligned instruction leads to improvement in student achievement. While student data demonstrates that students are making learning gains, there is still room for improvement in Reading and Math as it relates to grade level expectations.
 Rationale:
 Continued focus and monitoring of the strategies implemented in 2019-2020 will lead to embedded instructional practice that should result in goal attainment for the 2020-2021 school year.
 In addition, focusing on standards-based instruction regarding our subgroups will insure teachers maintain rigor for all students.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of 2020-2021, it is expected that there will be a 10% increase over the 2018-2019's results in Reading and Math for students taking the FSAA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
 Wendy Lee (wendy.lee@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Collaborative lesson planning will be done weekly with curriculum resource teacher (CRT) and the instructional coach. The execution of the lessons will be monitored by the assistant principal for instruction, the CRT and the instructional coach in daily classroom walkthroughs using the classroom walkthrough protocol. Teachers will receive frequent actionable feedback on their planning and lesson delivery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Collaborative lesson planning allows teams of teachers and instructional coaches to share and utilize effective instructional strategies that benefit larger groups of students.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will collaborate with their teams and with instructional coaches to share effective strategies for instructional delivery.

Person Responsible Wendy Lee (wendy.lee@ocps.net)

Teachers will be provided with resources and trainings during collaborative planning regarding how to incorporate technology in their instructional delivery.

Person Responsible Joshua Adkins (joshua.adkins@ocps.net)

During PLCs, teachers will focus on common strategies for implementation that are aligned to standards. Resource teachers will conduct peer observations and provide actionable feedback and coaching during sessions to frequently monitor instruction in the classrooms for appropriate demonstration of evidence-based PLC practices.

Person Responsible Arlene Garcia (arlene.garciarivera@ocps.net)

In response to ESSA subgroups, teachers will be supported through professional development that targets evidence-based strategies pertinent to improving the achievement of Hispanic students.

Person Responsible Arlene Garcia (arleene.garciarivera@ocps.net)

Within the weekly PLC meetings, teachers will frequently utilize effective differentiation strategies built into their lesson plans to reach all students with disabilities.

Person Responsible Joshua Adkins (joshua.adkins@ocps.net)

School leaders will provide actionable feedback, focused and frequent support to teachers, to help them deliver effective lessons. School leaders will maintain running records regarding feedback provided to teachers and their evidence of instructional proficiency.

Person Responsible Latonia Green (latonia.green@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Culture and Environment help shape our students' social and emotional intelligence. Inappropriate social and emotional awareness may result in maladaptive behaviors which often result in students committing infractions that are counterproductive to school's norms and violate our student code of conduct. Infractions of the student code of conduct result in suspensions where students are removed from the learning environment. When they are absent from the learning environment, it impacts their ability to learn which can lower student achievement. In 2018-2019 school year, 10% of students had one or more suspensions. In 2019-2020, 20% of students had one or more suspensions. This increase can be attributed to the way student behaviors were documented. Threatening behaviors for our significantly impaired student population were now being documented through the discipline procedures, as opposed to through the IEP process.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of 2020-2021, it is expected that there will be a 50% decrease in the number of students receiving suspensions over that of the 2019-2020 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Dunn (jessica.dunn@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our school will implement social emotional learning by adopting the district's CASEL program. Students will be taught to understand their self-awareness, and self-management. They will also learn about emotional intelligence and how these two impact appropriate behavior that will ultimately reduce maladaptive behaviors and improve student achievement. They will also learn social skills as these relate to the impact of threats. These will be focused on direct instruction in social skills, as it pertains to threatening behaviors. The behavior analyst will confer with the behavior specialists weekly to review behavioral data and make adjustments as needed for effective strategy implementation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing the district's CASEL program for teaching social emotional learning will allow us to benefit from evidence-based methods that result in positive outcomes for students.

Action Steps to Implement

Behavior specialists will teach replacement behaviors by teaching students to recognize their own emotions, verbalize their emotions, and manage their emotions.

Person Responsible Jessica Dunn (jessica.dunn@ocps.net)

Behavior specialists will teach students to communicate feelings effectively by replacing their verbal threats with expressions of feelings, and teach them to ask for help working through those feelings.

Person Responsible Jessica Dunn (jessica.dunn@ocps.net)

The behavior analyst will frequently monitor instruction of the CASEL initiative, and provide feedback to the behavior specialists.

Person Responsible Jessica Dunn (jessica.dunn@ocps.net)

The behavior analyst will maintain running records regarding feedback provided from the behavior specialists and their evidence of instructional proficiency as demonstrated in improved student behaviors.

Person Responsible Jessica Dunn (jessica.dunn@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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 culture and climate, our school engages in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, our school uses social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, our school uses the district's CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning, and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators which includes our mental health designee, attends this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. This core team works with the broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning our school's stakeholders, based on our school and community needs. Our school leadership team collaborates with stakeholders through the School Advisory Council to reflect on implementation and determination of next steps. Our school utilizes staff such as our school social worker to bridge the community and school culture.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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