

Orange County Public Schools

Whispering Oak Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Whispering Oak Elementary

15300 STONEYBROOK WEST PKWY, Winter Garden, FL 34787

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

Demographics

Principal: Lee Montgomery

Start Date for this Principal: 1/22/2015

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
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 (75%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (78%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Whispering Oak Elementary

15300 STONEYBROOK WEST PKWY, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://whisperingoakes.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 PK-5	No	16%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

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
Montgomery, Lee	Principal	School based budgeting, personnel management, classroom observation, school cultural architect
Conley, Joyce	Assistant Principal	Classroom observations, student discipline, scheduling, supporting instruction, data analysis, drive instruction.
Dickerson, Dana	Instructional Coach	MTSS coach. oversees intervention, supports the 504 process, support facilitation.
Henry-Louis, Marie	ELL Compliance Specialist	Reading coach, ELL monitor, coaches reading strategies, models reading lessons, assists teachers with supporting ELL students.
Moore, Cathy	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Testing coordinator, instructional coach, supports common planning.
Chotai, Nimisha	Other	Media Specialist, technology representative, social media contact, supports uses of educational technologies.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 1/22/2015, Lee Montgomery

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

69

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,082

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

0

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

0

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	29	152	168	200	197	177	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	923
Attendance below 90 percent	7	7	10	6	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	2	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	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

Monday 7/12/2021

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	56	167	188	192	184	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	934
Attendance below 90 percent	70	10	11	8	16	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	56	167	188	192	184	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	934
Attendance below 90 percent	70	10	11	8	16	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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				85%	57%	57%	84%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				74%	58%	58%	68%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	52%	53%	71%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				85%	63%	63%	85%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				79%	61%	62%	70%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	48%	51%	54%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				77%	56%	53%	87%	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	86%	55%	31%	58%	28%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	87%	57%	30%	58%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2021					
	2019	78%	54%	24%	56%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	85%	62%	23%	62%	23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	83%	63%	20%	64%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
05	2021					
	2019	83%	57%	26%	60%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	74%	54%	20%	53%	21%
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 data grades K-5.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21%	64%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	56%	76%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	50%	82%
	English Language Learners	13%	50%	62%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20%	47%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	41%	65%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	14%	57%
	English Language Learners	0%	25%	38%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29%	55%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	51%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	18%	52%	60%
	English Language Learners	12%	39%	41%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16%	42%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	33%	59%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	32%	40%
	English Language Learners	18%	21%	50%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29%	53%	60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	47%	59%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	52%	71%
	English Language Learners	0%	52%	40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7%	26%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	24%	45%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	33%	43%
	English Language Learners	0%	22%	39%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33%	49%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	47%	52%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	14%	43%
	English Language Learners	20%	50%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12%	33%	59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	34%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	21%	31%
	English Language Learners	11%	30%	65%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26%	38%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	33%	30%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	38%	100%
	English Language Learners	7%	19%	33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19%	36%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	26%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	17%	100%
	English Language Learners	7%	13%	41%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	87%	82%	75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	70%	65%	47%
	Students With Disabilities	64%	50%	19%
	English Language Learners	67%	67%	53%

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	54	60	50	54	80	75	14				
ELL	65	75		63	67		43				
ASN	81	60		76	50		64				
BLK	76			73							
HSP	78	62		71	73		71				
MUL	89			79							
WHT	86	73	62	85	77	74	75				
FRL	74	58		62	62		53				
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	49	70	64	43	55	52	45				
ELL	66	83	80	70	78	62	71				

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
ASN	90	90		90	90		83				
BLK	76	75	63	68	64	63	61				
HSP	86	76	75	83	75	52	68				
MUL	86	70		86	90						
WHT	86	70	53	87	81	58	84				
FRL	72	68	56	68	66	44	61				
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	49	53	52	49	47	41	58				
ELL	57	53		53	42	20					
ASN	95	71		92	81		100				
BLK	68	62	67	63	62	46	80				
HSP	78	73	70	80	66	33	76				
MUL	94	90		76	70						
WHT	87	66	70	90	71	63	90				
FRL	71	59	56	65	56	45	77				

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	71
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	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	564
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
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	63
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	64
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	75
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	71
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	84
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	76
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	59
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?

Our school progress monitoring data shows that our students are under performing in math, with the exception of 5th grade. In ELA, 20% of our students are performing two grade levels or more below. In math the data reflects that 16% of our students are performing two or more grade levels below in grades 3-5. When comparing the fall and spring data in science, the PMA data indicates a 12% decrease in the number of students performing on grade level. All subject data shows that our ELL, SWD, and ED subgroups are performing below grade level in all content areas. .

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

Our 2019 subgroup data and 2021 progress monitoring data shows the following subgroups: ELL, ED, SWD, are performing below grade level in reading, math, and science.

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

Teachers need additional support in the use of engagement strategies as well as small group and data-informed instruction.

Actions needed to address these areas are as follows: restructuring intervention delivery model, providing additional teacher and student support in areas of need, professional development aligned to instructional practice based on student data and teacher observation data.

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

The ELA achievement showed the most improvement in all grade levels. Although there was an increase in proficiency, this is still an area of focus. Processes will be implemented to elicit a positive outcome for an improvement in student data which include the following: MTSS tier III support, data chats, formal and coaching observations, and ongoing data meetings.

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

The action steps implemented to enhance student achievement was the targeted intervention support provided by members of the leadership team. We will continue to focus on these processes and adjust them as student data dictates.

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

We will provide school-wide staff development on small group instruction in reading, and math, Instructional coaches will attend PLC meetings to offer support in effective standards-based lesson planning. We will restructure our intervention delivery to meet the needs of all students.

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.

We will provide school-wide staff development in the areas of small group reading, math centers, social-emotional learning, and culturally responsive school training.

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

We will use i-Ready diagnostic assessments and common assessments to identify deficiencies, create differentiated instructional groupings, and monitor student progress. We will have an increased focus on growth of every student in every grade level by closely monitoring the subgroup data. We will focus on providing standards-based instruction, implementing standards-based learning centers, and providing small group differentiated instruction to support all of our learners.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to the subject material.

By strengthening our school’s culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

We will improve the subgroup performances of our Economically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, and English Language Learners by focusing on whole child practices that increase cooperative techniques, classroom and school-wide community building, focus on values such as fairness, helpfulness, caring, and responsibility, and encourage students to care about each other and their learning.

The rationale for choosing cooperative learning and community building is to bring students together in an atmosphere of support to systematically focus on academic and social growth. By focusing on student emotional needs utilizing the CASEL framework, academics will be improved as students gain confidence and better sense of safe self.

We will utilize Panorama survey data in the following areas to gauge our progress:

Measurable Outcome:

Student Survey - School Climate, Sense of Belonging
 Teachers and Staff - School Climate, School Leadership, Professional Learning About SEL
 Family Members - Barriers to Engagement, School Climate

This area will be monitored using data outcomes from the following:

Monitoring:

Classroom Walkthrough trend data
 Evaluative instructional and leadership practice observational data
 Qualitative data from students, staff, and families

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide SEL curriculum, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school supports for families.

Evidence-based Strategy:

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 the Culture and Climate continuum, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations, and implementation surveys. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, staff needs, and family needs.

Rationale for Evidence-

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with families, staff, 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 integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change.

based

Strategy: Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum

Ensure the school team receives training on the implementation of a school-wide SEL curriculum.

Create a train the trainer model to support all necessary stakeholders in the implementation of the SEL curriculum.

Person Responsible Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

Integrating Aligned Instructional and SEL Strategies

Identify student social and emotional learning needs to prepare for academic instruction

Determine cognitive and conative strategies that align with the standard

Interpret standards and student needs to intentionally integrate aligned instructional strategies

Person Responsible Joyce Conley (joyce.conley@ocps.net)

Deliberate School SEL Supports for Families

Identify strategies to support family engagement based on Panorama Family Members Survey - Barriers to Engagement that relates to strengthening communication, building community and creating connections such as:

Strengthening Communication

Create and facilitate opportunities to welcome families and introduce key staff (back to school night, Open House, principal breakfast)

Develop a school-wide digital communication outreach plan to inform students and families of how they can connect to the school events and resources

Person Responsible Nimisha Chotai (nimisha.patel@ocps.net)

Monitor, Measure, and Modify

Evaluate the climate and culture for social and emotional learning to implement necessary responsive practices

Implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning & leadership that uses cycles of professional learning.

Evaluate the impact of cycles of professional learning on improvement efforts

Monitor, measure, and modify the plan for continuous improvement in social and emotional learning & leadership using data-based instructional leadership to positively impact climate and culture

Person Responsible Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The rationale that determined critical need was a look at data comparisons among the ELL sub group in all subject areas. The data reflected that there were drops in grade level achievement within all areas.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2021-2022 school year we will increase the proficiency levels of our ELL subgroup by 10% in both ELA and math.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored via our ESOL Compliance Specialist, push-in to classroom to work with students via our Bilingual Spanish para professional as well as our Portuguese Para professional. Data will be monitored via the MTSS process and instruction adjusted to meet student need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will utilize the ELL Instructional strategies checklist to plan rigorous instruction in every grade and every class. Every nine weeks we will continually monitor progress towards grade-level proficiency targets through examination of data combined with strategic planning for targeted instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This specific strategy provides continuous support to and professional development for teachers. Combined with student and classroom observational data planning is aligned to provide instructional support to further support student growth.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide continuous support and professional development for teachers. Use PD aligned to student growth needs and Deliberate Practice aligned to teacher needs We will utilize the instructional framework to align instruction with ELL student need.

Person Responsible Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

ELL students will receive support from both our Bilingual Spanish paraprofessional as well as our Portuguese paraprofessional pushing into their classrooms. Monitoring will be conducted via classroom observations, data analysis, and grade level common planning meetings. Feedback will be provided to teachers based on observations of standards-based instruction in relation to the activities and student evidence used to work with the ELL students.

Person Responsible Joyce Conley (joyce.conley@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Whispering Oak Elementary reported 0.4 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. We will focus primarily on lowering threats and intimidation and harassment. In order for all students to feel safe, successful, accepted, and connected to others, we will focus on creating safe and orderly classrooms. Through guidance and SEI lessons, we will focus on teaching students to regulate their emotions, understand and relate to the feelings of others, and make responsible decisions about their behavior and act independently and skillfully upon them.

We will utilize the principles of restorative justice by working to teach students to take responsibility for hurtful actions and repairing the harm caused to others. We will encourage students to learn and grow as opposed to being punished for their mistakes.

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.

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

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 next steps. 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.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00