Windermere Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Windermere Elementary

11125 PARK AVE, Windermere, FL 34786

https://windermerees.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Janet Bittick

Start Date for this Principal: 1/18/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	12%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (70%)
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	

> * 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

Windermere Elementary

11125 PARK AVE, Windermere, FL 34786

https://windermerees.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	9%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Greer, Diana	Principal	Responsible for ensuring high academic achievement for all students. Monitors curriculum and instruction and assesses all instructional personnel. Coordinates school site strategic planning, and communication of the school improvement plan with the School Advisory Committee. Coordinates and supports staff development on campus to support strategic goals.
Diederich, Amy	Dean	Responsible for implementation of school-wide Positive Behavior Intervention Support. Monitors MTSS behavior data and assist classroom teachers with strategies to reshape behavior. Supports self-contained EBD units with curriculum and mainstream opportunities and assists media specialist with overseeing digital curriculum on campus.
Matthews, Bridgette	Behavior Specialist	Provides resources and materials for teachers to use for targeted intervention skills and works with targeted students throughout the day. Assists teachers in collecting progress monitoring data. As the school's MTSS Coach, she is responsible for tracking tiered interventions on campus. Serves as the school's testing coordinator.
Ennis, Elizabeth	Staffing Specialist	Responsible for monitoring compliance of all IEP and Section 504 plans and ELL students on campus. Coordinates meetings with SLP and school psychologist to review data and provide recommendations for instructional support. Closely monitors ESE students' progress and the accommodations to support learning gains. Closely monitors the progress of ELL students.
Layman, Angela	School Counselor	Responsible for providing character education and health lessons to all students on campus. Member of the Threat Assessment Team and responsible for recording and submitting data on behalf of the school. Supports the Dean with the school-wide behavior plan and expectations. Serves as the mental health designee and provides small group social skills and counseling to students as needed. Supports teachers with the implementation of Social and Emotional Learning strategies in the classroom.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 1/18/2012, Janet Bittick

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
39

Total number of students enrolled at the school
600

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
1

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	69	79	114	108	117	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	599
Attendance below 90 percent	2	4	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 7/23/2021

2020-21 - 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	2	99	102	116	126	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	592
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	3	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	2	99	102	116	126	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	592
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	3	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				82%	57%	57%	84%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	58%	58%	72%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	52%	53%	55%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				87%	63%	63%	86%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				80%	61%	62%	75%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				74%	48%	51%	55%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				85%	56%	53%	84%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	79%	55%	24%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	84%	57%	27%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2021					
	2019	79%	54%	25%	56%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	85%	62%	23%	62%	23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
	2019	85%	63%	22%	64%	21%	
Cohort Comparison		-85%					
05	2021						
	2019	87%	57%	30%	60%	27%	
Cohort Comparison		-85%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2021						
	2019	84%	54%	30%	53%	31%	
Cohort Comparison							

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment used for all grade levels.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40%	56%	73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44%	43%	81%
	Students With Disabilities	43%	25%	57%
	English Language Learners	0%	50%	33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38%	59%	75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	56%	75%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	43%	57%
	English Language Learners	13%	38%	44%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28%	54%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	62%	62%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	44%	44%
	English Language Learners	0%	44%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15%	46%	65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8%	23%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	33%	67%
	English Language Learners	11%	22%	50%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41%	55%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	46%	46%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	21%	40%
	English Language Learners	36%	36%	40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8%	13%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	0%	31%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	14%	27%
	English Language Learners	7%	14%	27%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35%	57%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	36%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	27%	27%
	English Language Learners	25%	38%	63%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14%	35%	73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	15%	43%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	14%	40%
	English Language Learners	37%	38%	50%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30%	43%	46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	23%	37%
	Students With Disabilities	19%	27%	21%
	English Language Learners	0%	17%	15%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22%	38%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	23%	35%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	13%	43%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	17%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	82%	86%	90%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50%	68%	82%
	Students With Disabilities	61%	76%	65%
	English Language Learners	50%	43%	57%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	55	41		64	53	40	65				
ELL	84			76							
ASN	81	80		87	60						
BLK	58			58							
HSP	88	88		80	63		88				
WHT	86	63	58	88	76	55	79				
FRL	65	56		61	58		50				

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	53	45	46	68	60	69	50				
ELL	57	53	40	83	84		73				
ASN	83	83		92	92		70				
BLK	53	27		43	64						
HSP	73	64	54	85	82		83				
WHT	86	67	70	89	79	75	88				
FRL	63	55	53	53	61	54	67				

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	44	59	54	46	52	46	46				
ELL	83	71	64	83	76	71					
ASN	93	68		90	68		92				
BLK	60	67		45	62						
HSP	72	63	47	79	69	60	67				
MUL	80			80							
WHT	87	75	59	90	80	57	90				
FRL	60	63	56	60	64	55	73				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	581

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	80
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	82
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Based on data from i-Ready Diagnostic Assessments from 2020-21, the data component that showed the lowest performance was reading proficiency, which was at 67% for the school, but 58% for grades 3-5.
Though this was our lowest data component on the diagnostic, this was an increase from the previous year's data that showed 51% proficiency for the school and 49% proficiency for grades 3-5. The increase shows that students on campus benefited from targeted in-person small group support during the ELA block.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data component that showed the greatest need for improvement would be reading proficiency. There was a decline from the previous year with our 5th-grade reading proficiency score on the i-Ready Diagnostic. This showed a decline from 48% proficiency the previous year to 46% proficiency this year.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors to the decline in reading proficiency included providing differentiated instruction during the ELA block not just to meet the needs of the lowest 25%, but to ensure that high-performing

students are provided enrichment to support an increase in proficiency for all levels. Leveled support and varied resources were not used during the intervention/enrichment block to provide Tiered instruction.

Actions needed to address this area of improvement include specific structure during the ELA block so that small group instruction is provided to all levels of students, not just students in the lowest 25%. Collaboration with teachers and resource staff to review available resources that can be used to provide Tiered instruction during the intervention/enrichment block. Systematic structure in all grade levels for progress monitoring of proficiency in reading for all students every marking period.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data component that showed the most improvement was math proficiency based on i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment results. We had 69% proficiency for the school and 62% proficiency for grades 3-5. The previous year we were at 46% for the school and 41% for grades 3-5. Our SWD showed an increase of 43% from BOY to EOY i-Ready Math Diagnostic noting that our focus on BPIE indicator 24 to planning and implementing UDL across all instruction is showing positive results.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Factors contributing to the math improvement included a systematic approach to teaching the math block with the first five minutes of instruction to include number talks and mental math opportunities in all grades. Differentiated activities and practice during the math block including guided practice and math rotations were incorporated into the block. Weekly fluency drills to contribute to the mastery of facts were also embedded in plans. Collaboration between teachers and ESE support staff to support BPIE for all students during the math block.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Strategies that will need to be implemented to accelerate learning in math include:
1. Continue use of incorporating math talks and academic conversations at the beginning of the math block to promote mental math and sharing of problem-solving skills.
2. Use of math centers and guided practice to differentiate the learning.
3. Use of the Minority Achievement Office framework during the math intervention/enrichment block to front-load standards and skills.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will be provided professional development by Curriculum Associates on how to use the i-Ready grouping profiles to differentiate instruction and access resources to front-load prerequisite skills.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Teacher planning time will be provided during the first semester and 2nd semester after i-Ready BOY and EOY diagnostic assessments so that instructional focus calendars can be revised to meet the needs of the students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reading proficiency showed the greatest need for improvement according to the i-Ready End of the Year (EOY) Reading Diagnostic Assessment with a school-wide proficiency score of 67%. Focusing on differentiated small group instruction during the ELA block and leveled resources during the intervention/enrichment block will lead to proficiency gains for all students. Focus on differentiated instruction with targeted resources will help reduce the achievement gap in reading for our ELL students.
Measurable Outcome:	We plan to improve our reading proficiency from 67% to 72% on the EOY i-Ready Reading Diagnostic Assessment.
Monitoring:	We will monitor for the desired outcome by conducting classroom observations during the ELA block to ensure small group structure, conduct lesson plan checks for specific planning of reading for all levels, collaborate with teachers during common planning weekly to ensure access and use of targeted reading materials during the intervention/enrichment block, monitor reading proficiency data monthly and provide feedback to teachers during data meetings. I-Ready progress monitoring data will also be used to measure progress toward reading proficiency for all students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will effectively implement differentiated, small group reading instruction based on multiple sources of data during the ELA block and track student progress toward proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was selected because differentiated teaching is focused precisely on what each student needs to make gains in proficiency. Using data to differentiate instruction will ensure that high-achieving readers and students with reading deficits make gains toward proficiency. Collaboration during common planning to plan for targeted groupings during the ELA block and intervention/enrichment block combined with systematic progress monitoring enables teachers to create instructional groupis based on student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School teams use distributive leadership strategies to support the use of effective school-wide reading strategies and alignment of tiered resources through vertical PLCs and ELA grade level expert collaborative planning.

Person Responsible	Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

2. Professional development through Curriculum Associates on using i-Ready profile groupings and Teacher Tool Box to differentiate small group instruction in reading.

Person Responsible	Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

3. Professional development on collaborative structures and student engagement focused on supporting literacy conversations while integrating components to support students' Social and Emotional learning.

Person Responsible	Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

4. Teachers will analyze student performance on common assessments and discuss proficiency data during monthly data meetings. Specific tracking of subgroup data toward proficiency will be monitored, focusing on ELL students.

Person Responsible   Bridgette Matthews (bridgette.matthews@ocps.net)

5. Teachers will participate in a half-day planning session during the first semester and third marking period after the i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment is administered to review data, make changes to instructional calendars and refine targeted reading instruction and Tiered support.

Person Responsible   Bridgette Matthews (bridgette.matthews@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to the subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following needs: Support all students in ELA so that proficiency gains can be made. Create culturally responsive environments so that all students feel valued and connected. Reduce the achievement gap for ELL students.
Measurable Outcome:	Focusing on Social and Emotional Learning will promote meaningful connections between home and school. There should be an improvement in Early Warning System Indicator data in terms of attendance and grade-level achievement. Cognia survey data should show positive results in terms of students feeling safe and positive about their school environment. The use of distributive leadership to support school-wide social-emotional learning will enhance collaboration and build academic expertise with all students. The integration of the Caring School Community framework will strengthen home-school connections and engage all stakeholders.
Monitoring:	We will monitor for the desired outcome by conducting classroom observations to ensure that the morning meeting, closing meeting, and weekly lessons from the Caring School Community are implemented with fidelity in all classrooms. Lesson plan checks will be conducted to ensure specific planning of once a week of Caring School Community social and emotional learning lessons are included by all teachers. Monthly tracking of attendance should show an improvement in attendance in all grade levels due to the implementation of the Caring School Community program.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school will implement The Caring School community program as the framework for school-wide Social and Emotional learning. The program builds caring relationships among students and adults and directly teaches social skills that students need in school and in life. All teachers were provided training as part of the Caring School Community Program and follow-up training opportunities, safe practice, and impact data will be reviewed throughout the year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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 the school-wide implementation of the Caring School Community program and collaboration with our stakeholders, we will have an opportunity to strengthen the individual and team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvements and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary.
Action Steps to Implement	

1. Provide Caring School Community materials and overview training to all instructional staff before the end of the first marking period.

Person Responsible Angela Layman (angela.layman@ocps.net)

2. Establish a common language to support a culture and emotional learning on campus with adults and students.

Person Responsible Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

3. Collaborate and communicate with all stakeholders the common language to support social-emotional learning on campus through parent organization meetings and monthly family home projects.

Person Responsible Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

4. The Dean will work on promoting a positive school culture through the implementation of the school-wide positive behavior plan. Work with the MTSS coach to support tiered interventions in behavior for all students.

Person Responsible Amy Diederich (amy.diederich@ocps.net)

5. Use cycles of professional learning to integrate academic and social-emotional learning through the morning and closing circles, class meetings, and engagement structures.

Person Responsible Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

6. Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts. Classroom observations will be conducted weekly to monitor morning and closing circles and monthly checks of lessons plan to include Caring School Community lessons.

Person Responsible Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

1. Provide Caring School Community materials and overview training to all instructional staff prior to the end of the first marking period.

Person Responsible Angela Layman (angela.layman@ocps.net)

2. Establish a common language to support a culture and emotional learning on campus with adults and students.

Person Responsible Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

3. Collaborate and communicate with all stakeholders the common language to support social-emotional learning on campus through parent organization meetings and monthly family home projects.

Person Responsible Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

4. The Dean will work on promoting a positive school culture through the implementation of the school-wide positive behavior plan. Work with the MTSS coach to support tiered interventions in behavior for all students.

Person Responsible Amy Diederich (amy.diederich@ocps.net)

5. Use cycles of professional learning to integrate academic and social-emotional learning through the morning and closing circles, class meetings, and engagement structures.

Person Responsible   Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

6. Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts. Classroom observations will be conducted weekly to monitor morning and closing circles and monthly checks of lessons plan to include Caring School Community lessons.

Person Responsible   Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

In reviewing our discipline data with the data across the state we were low in the suspension data and incidents related to property and drugs. Our data was high in incidents categorized as violent with a 0.6 incident ratio reported per 100 students. This data is related to the processing of threat assessments with primary students using threatening language toward peers and adults when frustrated. Action steps that have been put into place already include positive behavior classroom and school-wide chats from the Dean on the appropriate way to deal with frustration. Classroom guidance lessons conducted by Guidance Counselor on appropriate ways to deal with anger and anxiety. The continued implementation of the Positive Behavior Intervention Support school-wide to promote positive behavior on campus. The implementation of the Caring School Community Framework will offer specific strategies and skills to support students' acquisition of social and emotional skills. The structure of morning and closing meetings will support positive classroom relationships that will help decrease the number of incidents related to violent threats made by students.

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, 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 staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine the next steps, while incorporating the Caring School Community framework. The development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The School Principal will guide teachers and staff through the setting of norms and development of a shared vision for school culture prior to the first day of school.
The SEL Team will participate in district-wide professional learning and use the distributive leadership model to collaborate on strategies with the SEL School-based team.
The School-based SEL team will collaborate and plan with grade-level teams to strengthen team dynamics and build expertise during planning.
Classroom teachers will implement the Caring School Community program and embed social and emotional learning for students throughout the learning day.
Students will learn social and emotional skills and strategies to support learning and develop CASEL core competencies.
The School Principal will coordinate the school's professional development based on the school's needs and framework from the Caring School Community program.
The Guidance Counselor will work on the development of a common language, connecting families with resources, and help bridge the community and school.
The School Principal will share and collaborate with the School Advisory Council and Parent Organizations on the implementation of the Caring School Community program and strengthening communication with our school families.