Independence Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Independence Elementary

6255 NEW INDEPENDENCE PKWY, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://independencees.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Jeffrey Peters

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2015

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)	24%
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 (81%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (75%)
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.](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

Independence Elementary

6255 NEW INDEPENDENCE PKWY, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://independencees.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	19%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

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
Murphy Osborne, Angela	Principal	Dr. Angela Murphy-Osborne, Principal: Dr. Osborne provides guidance for the leadership team and ensures all aspects of the school are functioning as effectively as possible. Through her leadership, the team is able to make decisions about students and then determine and implement best practices based on the needs of the students. Dr. Osborne ensures that the team is implementing common planning effectively. Dr. Osborne also provides opportunities for professional development. Additionally, Dr. Osborne conducts classroom walkthroughs daily. Dr. Osborne will lead the school's SELL team.
Peters, Jeffrey	Assistant Principal	Mr. Jeffrey Peters, Assistant Principal: Mr. Peters provides guidance for the leadership team and ensures all aspects of the school are functioning as effectively as possible. Through his leadership, the team is able to make decisions about students and then determine and implement best practices based on the needs of the students.
Olszewski, Allison	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Allison Olszewski, Instructional Coach: Mrs. Olszewski provides research-based suggestions for intervention and instruction while modeling lessons for teachers. Mrs. Olszewski provides guidance on curriculum and intervention programs. Mrs. Olszewski also supports data collection, assists in data analysis, and provides professional development opportunities for all staff members. Additionally, Mrs. Olszewski oversees and participates in common planning.
Hohman, Amy	Instructional Media	Mrs. Amy Hohman, Media Specialist: Mrs. Hohman teaches information literacy skills, promotes reading motivation and strategies in the Media Center. She also works with teachers during common planning to help with standards-based instruction. She works with coaches and teachers to help build on reading resources available to the students and teachers. Additionally, Mrs. Hohman is our school's ADDitions Coordinator
Bellamy, Jordan	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Ms. Jordan Bellamy, Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT): Ms. Bellamy provides various resources to the staff and parents. She also analyzes data with teachers and researches scientifically-based curriculum and intervention programs. She collaborates with the instructional coach to assess students early and ensure that interventions are in place. She also ensures that teachers have the necessary data to make informed decisions about students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2015, Jeffrey Peters

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.*

2

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

743

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.

5

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	128	114	126	124	117	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	743
Attendance below 90 percent	2	8	8	5	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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

Thursday 7/22/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	9	120	116	123	128	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	624
Attendance below 90 percent	1	12	11	8	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	14	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	5	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	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	

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	9	120	116	123	128	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	624
Attendance below 90 percent	1	12	11	8	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	14	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	5	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	0	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 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				87%	57%	57%	83%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				74%	58%	58%	74%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				72%	52%	53%	63%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				90%	63%	63%	88%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				82%	61%	62%	66%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				82%	48%	51%	66%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				80%	56%	53%	81%	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	81%	55%	26%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	81%	57%	24%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	54%	27%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	88%	62%	26%	62%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	88%	63%	25%	64%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
05	2021					
	2019	84%	57%	27%	60%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	76%	54%	22%	53%	23%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

In first through fifth grades, the students completed the iReady Diagnostic in the fall, winter, and spring. The fifth grade science data was collected using the Performance Monitoring Activities (PMA) assessment.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24	37	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	26	51
	Students With Disabilities	8	8	23
	English Language Learners	5	18	41
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23	37	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	23	46
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	23
	English Language Learners	0	23	32

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28	50	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	39	48
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	8
	English Language Learners	22	44	54
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12	25	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	10	29
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	8
	English Language Learners	11	21	49

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30	55	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	38	61
	Students With Disabilities	19	31	47
	English Language Learners	21	37	60
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7	30	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	18	56
	Students With Disabilities	0	25	53
	English Language Learners	0	17	52

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	41	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	35	56
	Students With Disabilities	14	7	14
	English Language Learners	15	29	40
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12	31	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	31	53
	Students With Disabilities	7	7	36
	English Language Learners	2	24	60

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31	38	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	36	39
	Students With Disabilities	18	9	18
	English Language Learners	15	10	10
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	31	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	27	58
	Students With Disabilities	9	9	27
	English Language Learners	15	24	42
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61	67	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	83	79	83
	Students With Disabilities	80	77	82
	English Language Learners	73	60	36

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	56			57			50				
ELL	76	95	100	87	85	100	84				
ASN	90			95							
BLK	64			64							
HSP	82	89	100	84	76	69	89				
WHT	87	78		84	60		83				
FRL	77	78		76	66		86				
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	34	29	35	60	76	72	13				
ELL	85	78	76	88	89	93	66				
ASN	95	90		95	95		92				

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
BLK	77	67	80	74	63		77				
HSP	85	77	79	88	84	88	72				
MUL	95	75		95	92						
WHT	88	72	63	91	80	85	82				
FRL	79	70	73	81	78	82	69				

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	42	60	59	53	60	53	50				
ELL	64	76	62	83	67	72	50				
ASN	90	83		100	58						
BLK	74	69	64	68	52	50	67				
HSP	77	74	54	84	73	72	71				
MUL	100			100							
WHT	86	74	64	92	66	66	87				
FRL	73	74	52	78	65	60	81				

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	77
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	613
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
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	86

English Language Learners	
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	93
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	64
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
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	73
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	74
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?

Students at Independence showed gains in ELA and math on FSA, as well as last year on i-Ready. From 2018-2019, student scores increased on FSA:
ELA – 83% to 87%
ELA lowest 25% - 63% to 72%
Math – 63% to 72%
Math lowest 25% - 66% to 82%

Our students also showed gains on the iReady progress monitoring assessments during the 2020-2021 school year. From beginning of year to end of year, all grade levels showed growth in ELA:
3rd – 30% to 68%
4th – 32% to 55%
5th – 31% to 44%

The students also showed gains in math:
3rd – 7% to 68%
4th – 12% to 59%
5th – 20% to 57%

Overall, our lowest performing subgroup is our students with disabilities (SWD). In 2019, only 34% of SWD scored on grade level in ELA and 60% in math.

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

Science Students With Disabilities (SWD) performed the lowest with a proficiency level of 13%. In 2019, science SWD was the lowest performance area and showed a significant decrease from 2018 (50% to 13%). In the 2020-2021 school year, our ELL students ended the year with only 36% proficiency in science. Science in our subgroups is the area with the greatest need for improvement.

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

There was a significant increase in enrollment during the 18-19 school year which included an increase in our ESE population. There was limited time spent in teacher-led small group to provide differentiated instruction to meet the specific needs of each student. More time spent in teacher led small group is needed to provide differentiated instruction to meet the specific needs of each student.

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

Our greatest gains were with our Hispanic population.
ELA Achievement: 77% to 85%
ELA Learning Gains: 74% to 75%
ELA Lowest 25%: 54% to 79%
Math Achievement: 84% to 88%
Math Learning Gains: 73% to 84%
Math Lowest 25%: 72% to 88%

ELL students also showed gains in ELA and Math in the 2020-2021 school on iReady in all grade levels.

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

Mrs. Saslov, an ESOL resource, monitors data and works with groups multiple days a week to target their needs. She tracks the classroom and small group data weekly and changes the groups as needed to ensure that we are able to close the achievement gap. She works with groups on an array of topics such as basic language acquisition to specific grade-level standards where there are gaps. Mrs. Saslov works with teachers to create and change the groups based on the needs of the students. She frequently has data meetings with the teachers and conferences with them. These meetings allow her to offer feedback and suggestions for best practices for our ELL students.

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

Coaches and paraprofessionals will push in to classrooms to work with small groups daily. This will allow for a greater number of students meeting in a targeted small group. Small groups will be fluid and allow for teachers to target the specific needs of all students. We are also going to focus on implementing supplemental resources with fidelity (for example: Reading Plus, i-Ready, CAPIT).

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.

This year, one key professional development focus will be the BEST standards. Teachers in grade K-2 will need to learn all components of the standards so they can teach to the depth and extent of the new standards in order to maintain learning gains in ELA. Independence is also receiving professional development on the technology resources to maximize their benefit and improve data analysis in all subjects.

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

Teachers will participate in common planning to collaborate, identify grade-level trends, and plan rigorous standards-based lessons. Teachers will also complete peer observations in order to improve practice and increase collaboration. Additionally, teachers will receive continual feedback.

Also, the SELL team will work closely with the teachers to ensure that SELL strategies are implemented.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Description: Independence will integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally Rationale: Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By strengthening our school's culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: - Sense of belonging (students) - Cultural awareness and action (staff) - School fit (parents and families)
Measurable Outcome:	The Panorama survey was completed by students, staff, and parents/ families. According to the data, the greatest areas of need are: Sense of belonging (student) - 73% Cultural awareness and action (teacher) - 28% School fit (parents and families) - 80% By the end of the school year, our goal is to increase 5% in each of these areas. Our school counselor, Ms. Goracke will monitor these goals.
Monitoring:	Ms. Goracke will create a survey in the middle of the school year to monitor the desired outcome. She will also participate in common planning with teachers, as well as participate in classroom walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susan Goracke (susan.goracke@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence-based Strategy: Independence will 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. Description of Monitoring: 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-based Strategy:	Rationale for Strategy Selection: 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. Resources/Criteria: 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

Independence will implement a school-wide SEL curriculum (Second Step) using the distributive leadership model so that all necessary stakeholders can assist in implementation of the curriculum. This will include individual, small group, and whole group professional development sessions to improve adult social and emotional learning as well as best practices for classroom implementation.

Person Responsible Susan Goracke (susan.goracke@ocps.net)

Independence staff will integrate aligned instructional and SEL strategies throughout the school day, across subject areas, including Second Step curriculum and CASEL. The SELL team will assist in the implementation of integrating instructional and SEL strategies.

Person Responsible Susan Goracke (susan.goracke@ocps.net)

Independence will integrate deliberate school SEL supports for families by intentionally building a sense of community and family. This includes creating a welcoming environment where family culture and languages are recognized and respected as well as quarterly events for families to improve understanding of SEL and weekly newsletters.

Person Responsible Susan Goracke (susan.goracke@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student achievement will increase by continuing to focus on our students in the lowest 25%. In 2018-2019, 72% of our students in our lowest 25% made learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2021-2022, the scores for students in the lowest 25% will increase by at least 3% .
Monitoring:	The leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure teachers are differentiating instruction, as well as providing targeted small group instruction. Dr. Osborne and Mr. Peters will also monitor data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Murphy Osborne (angela.murphy-osborne@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The MTSS Instructional Support Resource Teacher will conduct MTSS meetings, data chats with teachers and collect all MTSS graphs. We monitor student progress through multiple sources of data individualized for each student. This data is then graphed and instruction is adjusted to meet each student's ongoing learning needs. Also, walkthroughs will occur daily to ensure teachers are differentiating their instruction to meet the needs of all students. Data will also be analyzed by administration and teachers to target the specific needs of each student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By targeting the specific needs of our students, overall student achievement will increase, as well as student achievement for our lowest 25%. In order for all students to succeed, instruction often needs to be differentiated to target specific needs. Also, by focusing on the MTSS process, we will target all learners in order to meet their specific needs. Students' achievement gaps will be targeted to ensure they are receiving high quality instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

In August, the MTSS Instructional Support Resource Teacher will provide an MTSS overview and expectations for the year to all instructional staff.

Person Responsible	Joy Saslov (joy.saslov@ocps.net)

Plan for and develop MTSS professional development and in response to ESSA outcomes regarding students with disabilities, discuss specific strategies for targeting the needs of all learners.

Person Responsible	Joy Saslov (joy.saslov@ocps.net)

Provide ongoing MTSS professional development based on the needs of students and staff.

Person Responsible	Joy Saslov (joy.saslov@ocps.net)

MTSS graphs are generated (monthly) from progress monitoring. This data is then graphed and instruction is adjusted, and groups are changed, to meet each student's ongoing learning needs.

Person Responsible	Joy Saslov (joy.saslov@ocps.net)

Provide support for differentiated instruction for teachers through the coaching cycle.

Person Responsible Angela Murphy Osborne (angela.murphy-osborne@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.

Independence is below the statewide average for school discipline and is listed as a safe school. The administration team will complete daily walkthroughs to provide feedback. Coaches will also assist and model in the classrooms to ensure that we continue to have positive behaviors in the classroom and school.

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.

This year, with all students transitioning back to face to face learning, it is important to create a family culture and bring everyone together. Below are some strategies being implemented by our SEL team:

- Student and staff recognition to be incorporated each month
- Include monthly team-building days
- Incorporate staff development opportunities on cultural diversity and responsiveness
- Monthly core values and social skills to help build school culture
- Utilize diverse children's books and multimedia materials to increase representation of underserved populations

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

The core SEL 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.