

Orange County Public Schools

Tildenville Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Tildenville Elementary

1221 BRICK RD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

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

Demographics

Principal: Agathe Alvarez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Tildenville Elementary

1221 BRICK RD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	66%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	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
Alvarez, Agathe	Principal	instructional leader facilitates data driven decision making parent communication leader student scheduling purchasing coordinator
Clemonshager, Julie	Instructional Media	Media Specialist Dual Language Coordinator Digital device facilitator support K & 1 school calendar & mornign announcements webiste coordinator textbooks
Pankonin, Christine	Instructional Coach	Coaching support support 3rd & 4th curriculum support field trips student contests - oration, bee, etc NEHS, Safety Patrols mentor program coordinator teacher recertification title IX coordinator
Dolfi, Bryan	Other	Testing Coordinator MTSS Coach Skyward Captain support 5th grade PD facilitator and in-service points records tutoring coordinator
Trampe, Regan	Other	Staffing Specialist ELL Compliance Specialist 504 compliance SAC support 2nd & specials

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/29/2014, Agathe Alvarez

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 7/29/2020

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	110	87	93	90	81	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	546
Attendance below 90 percent	9	8	3	8	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	13	7	17	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	22	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	4	5	0	12	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	
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	110	87	93	90	81	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	546	
Attendance below 90 percent	9	8	3	8	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	13	7	17	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	21	22	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	

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	4	5	0	12	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
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	66%	57%	57%	57%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	58%	58%	61%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	52%	53%	39%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	71%	63%	63%	66%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	61%	62%	62%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	48%	51%	40%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	56%	53%	47%	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	67%	55%	12%	58%	9%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	57%	1%	58%	0%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
	2018	65%	55%	10%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
	2018	60%	61%	-1%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	63%	0%	64%	-1%
	2018	74%	62%	12%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	81%	57%	24%	60%	21%
	2018	79%	59%	20%	61%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	73%	54%	19%	53%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	56%	53%	3%	55%	1%
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	21	50	56	46	53	47					
ELL	37	50	64	74	71	69	63				
BLK	62	68	83	55	68	50	58				
HSP	64	60	58	78	67	52	72				
WHT	71	64	64	72	68	40	83				
FRL	56	57	67	62	64	53	59				
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	8	16	7	22	50	54					
ELL	46	55	39	70	59	42	40				
BLK	53	52		58	64		45				
HSP	63	64	40	76	74	44	59				
WHT	69	63		76	73		67				
FRL	62	63	39	70	70	54	52				
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	18	33	27	19	36	20					
ELL	41	50	35	66	51	36	16				
BLK	47	59		47	54	25	15				
HSP	54	57	39	66	61	47	41				
WHT	69	68		75	67		71				
FRL	47	54	38	58	56	31	39				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	518
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
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 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	63
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	65
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	66
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	60
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 the data from the 2018-2019 FSA, the data component that showed the lowest performance was the lowest 25% learning gains in math. In math, 48% of our students in the lowest 25% made gains which is down from the previous year's score of 56%. Data in this category from the past three years shows this is a trend. The contributing factor was limited time spent in small group instruction to provide differentiated instruction to meet specific student needs.

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

Based on the data from the 2018-2019 FSA, the data component that showed the greatest decline again was the lowest 25% learning gains in math. In math, 48% of our students in the lowest 25% made gains which is down from the previous year's score of 56%. Data in this category from the past three years shows this is a trend. The contributing factor was limited time spent in small group instruction to provide differentiated instruction to meet specific student needs. This was also an area of concern within the 2019-2020 iReady progress monitoring data.

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 data from the 2018-2019 FSA, the data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state was the lowest 25% learning gains in math. In math, 48% of our students in the lowest 25% made gains which is 3% lower from the state's 51%. The contributing factor was limited time spent in small group instruction to provide differentiated instruction to meet specific student needs. This was also an area of concern within the 2019-2020 iReady progress monitoring data.

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

Based on the data from the 2018-2019 FSA, the data component that showed the most improvement was the lowest 25% learning gains in reading. In reading, we improved from 41% in 2018 to 67% in 2019, a 26% increase of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains. The contributing factor was a strengthening of teacher knowledge of the MTSS process and then an increased focus on small group reading instruction to provide differentiated instruction to meet specific student needs. This was also the trend within the 2019-2020 iReady progress monitoring data.

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

Based on the EWS data, the two potential areas of concern are course failure in ELA or Math and Level 1 on statewide assessment.

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

1. Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains
2. Course Failure in ELA or Math
3. Level 1 on statewide assessment
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains showed the lowest performance and the greatest decline from the prior year. Focusing on increasing the learning gains of the Lowest 25% will lead to an increase in learning gains, overall Math proficiency, and help reduce the achievement gap evident within this population of students.
Measurable Outcome:	We plan to improve from 48% to 53% for Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains on the Florida Standards Assessment, which is an 5% increase. In addition, we plan to focus on maintaining 71% in Math overall proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Agathe Alvarez (agathe.alvarez@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The leadership team will strengthen teachers' understanding of the MTSS process as it relates to math instruction. Teachers will effectively implement Tier I differentiated, small group mathematics instruction for students performing in the Lowest 25%. We will use the i-Ready diagnostic assessments to identify deficiencies and monitor student progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was selected because of the improvements made in the area of Reading after applying this same process. Teaching is focused precisely on what the students need to learn next to move forward. Ongoing observation of students, combined with systematic progress monitoring assessments enables teachers to draw together groups of students who fit a particular instructional profile and address their specific needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development in applying the MTSS process in the area of math instruction. The professional development opportunities will be scheduled monthly during Wednesday afternoons and will be continuous throughout the year.

Person Responsible Bryan Dolfi (bryan.dolfi@ocps.net)

Teachers will meet in weekly PLC groups to review data which will inform and drive small group instruction.

Person Responsible Christine Pankonin (christine.pankonin@ocps.net)

Teachers will effectively implement differentiated, small group mathematics instruction.

Person Responsible Agathe Alvarez (agathe.alvarez@ocps.net)

Monitoring of small group mathematics instruction will take place weekly by Admin Team using classroom walkthrough observation tool (Google Form). Feedback will be provided to teachers.

Person Responsible Agathe Alvarez (agathe.alvarez@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: Improvement in Early Warning Systems indicator data Panorama survey data Cognia survey data Anticipated impact of a culture and climate on student achievement
Measurable Outcome: Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	There will be a decrease of the number of course failures in ELA or Math from 56 to below 50 and a decrease in the number of level 1 student scores on statewide assessments from 57 to below 50. Agathe Alvarez (agathe.alvarez@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

Faculty and staff will develop an understanding of the connections between social and emotional learning and instructional strategies. We will integrate SEL strategies within daily instruction by first participating in cycles of professional learning focusing on academics and social and emotional learning.

Person Responsible Agathe Alvarez (agathe.alvarez@ocps.net)

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

Person Responsible Agathe Alvarez (agathe.alvarez@ocps.net)

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.

Person Responsible Agathe Alvarez (agathe.alvarez@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 any remaining schoolwide improvement priorities as determined through continuous review, discussion, and adjustments as needed throughout the year. This can include any area of focus as determined by review of schoolwide data and observation.

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, all schools engage in ongoing, districtwide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the 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 from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons 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.