Sunset Park Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sunset Park Elementary

12050 OVERSTREET RD, Windermere, FL 34786

https://sunsetparkes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Stacey Price

Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	33%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (61%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (62%)
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	ATSI
* 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

Sunset Park Elementary

12050 OVERSTREET RD, Windermere, FL 34786

https://sunsetparkes.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	33%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Price, Stacey	Principal	Instructional leader of the school. Ensure a safe learning and working environment for all staff and students.
Turner, Debra	Assistant Principal	Assist principal with instructional leadership of the school. Ensure safe working and learning environment for all staff and students.
Althouse, Megan	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Coordinate assessments, manage curriculum materials, monitor effective instructional practices and coordinate professional development.
Nash-Brown, Timothy	Instructional Coach	Instructional coach for K-5. Also serves as lead mentor for new teachers.
	ELL Compliance Specialist	Ensures compliance for all ESOL initiatives.
Geib, Brittany	Instructional Media	Coordinate and manage the Media Center collection. Provide instructional media support for teachers and students. Assist TSR with digital media responsibilities. Assist teachers with Canvas.
Manzano, Karen	School Counselor	School Guidance Counselor and Mental Health Designee

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/18/2022, Stacey Price

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

Total number of students enrolled at the school

766

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

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	93	113	124	138	153	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	766
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	3	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Monday 9/12/2022

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	121	117	142	153	149	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	820
Attendance below 90 percent	20	11	18	11	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	
	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	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	

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	121	117	142	153	149	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	820
Attendance below 90 percent	20	11	18	11	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	
	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	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	66%	56%	56%				74%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	65%						61%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						50%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	70%	46%	50%				68%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	64%						56%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						42%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	61%	59%				73%	56%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	73%	55%	18%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	57%	8%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2022					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	56%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	72%	62%	10%	62%	10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	73%	63%	10%	64%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	53%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	18	41	38	35	36	21	32				
ELL	55	58	40	63	56	32	60				
ASN	73			73							
BLK	53			47							
HSP	57	60	47	64	62	47	65				
MUL	75	55		81	27						
WHT	76	71	60	78	73	36	73				
FRL	65	70	59	63	65	59	56				
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	31	27		31	18		42				
ELL	61	60	44	61	64	44	63				
ASN	90			90							
BLK	88			81							
HSP	63	51	40	61	62	43	63				
MUL	64			86							
WHT	75	67		76	57	30	78				
FRL	67	52	27	59	53	25	65				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	29	34	24	19	29	27	19				
ELL	61	55	48	59	55	48	58				
ASN	100	100		100	91						
BLK	85	62		80	75						
HSP	63	55	47	58	49	42	66				
MUL	90			80							
WHT	80	66	63	71	61	41	77				
FRL	64	68	70	63	57	45	62				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	494
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	73
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

FSA 2022 data indicated a slight decrease in proficiency in ELA (-4%), Math (-1%) and Science (-5%). Learning gains indicated increases in ELA (+6%) and Math (+3%) and (+5%) for Math learning gains of the lowest quartile. There was a significant increase in leaning gains for ELA (+22%).

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

As evidenced by FSA 2022, ELA learning gains in the lowest quartile demonstrated the greatest need for improvement for incoming 5th graders.

Based on iReady EOY, our ELL and SWD subgroups are focus areas for improvement in reading and math, especially for grades 3 through 5. These areas had gaps of 20 to 30 points across all grade levels.

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

Many students were returning to in-school instruction from virtual instruction during the Pandemic. Students experienced learning gaps during virtual instruction that needed to be addressed throughout the school year. Ongoing support during small group instruction and intervention block will continue to address these learning gaps. Additional support for our subgroups (ELL and SWD) will also be provided. Enrichment and extension opportunities for students performing at or above grade level is also needed in reading and math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

As evidenced by FSA 2022, areas of greatest improvement included:
ELA LG, +6 (59-65%)
ELA LG25, +22 (30-52%)
Math LG, +3 (61-64%)
Math LG25, +5 (39-44%)

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

Contributing factors for this improvement included: focus on small group instruction, intervention blocks for reading and math, and EngageNY for math instruction. PLCs also focused conversations around standards-based unit assessments to drive instructional adjustments to support student needs.

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

As we roll out new benchmarks for ELA and Math, as well as new curriculum in these content areas, our PLCs will be critically important to ensure a high level of collaboration focused on instructional practices to meet the needs of our 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 continue to provide ongoing support for ELA, math and writing to ensure support for our teachers. Administrators and instructional coaches will attend weekly PLCs. Monthly PD will also be provided. A Google survey will be provided in August to seek teacher input to develop a PD calendar to meet teacher needs.

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

The PLC framework will be streamlined to provide support for the new benchmarks while maintaining focus on data-driven instruction. While we are maintaining a high level of proficiency at our school, it will be important to stay focused during this year of new benchmarks and curriculum to keep this high level of student achievement in tact.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	To implement core instruction in reading and math aligned to B.E.S.T. standards.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The measurable goals for this area of focus includes: *65% of students will be proficient in reading. *70% of students will be proficient in math.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Monitoring will include: 1. Weekly classroom visits with feedback 2. Data chats with PLCs following standards-based unit assessments 3. FAST progress monitoring data (fall, winter, spring)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacey Price (stacey.price@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students will engage in processing content through collaborative interactions with other students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	In order for students to effectively construct meaning, they must be actively engaged in processing of information by interacting with the teacher, students and the content.

Action Steps to Implement	
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.	

1. Provide professional development to support effective implementation of B.E.S.T. standards in ELA and Math.
2. Provide ongoing feedback regarding effective instructional practices through weekly classroom visits.
3. Monitor student performance through data chats with grade-level teams and individual teachers.

Person Responsible	Stacey Price (stacey.price@ocps.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to school climate	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	School climate survey ratings decreased in several areas. Areas of concern include: * Feedback and coaching 36% (SWLC 52%) * School leadership 30% (62%)
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The measurable goals for this outcome include: *Feedback and coaching - 50% *School leadership - 60%
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	1. The new principal will conduct a collaborative assessment activity with the Leadership Team prior to preplanning to determine areas of need and suggested improvements. 2. Grade-level teams and departments will have an opportunity to participate in Principal Roundtable discussions during preplanning. 3. A midyear Google survey will be conducted with all staff in December/January to evaluate items related to feedback/ coaching and school leadership.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacey Price (stacey.price@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The use of distributive leadership is necessary to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is critical to invest in the collective capacity of a school building.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Principal will be an active member of the SELL team.
2. Grade-level teams and departments will have opportunities for input and feedback during quarterly Principal Roundtable events.
3. Administrators and instructional coaches will attend weekly PLCs to engage in instructional planning and review assessment data.
4. Administrators will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs and provide timely feedback.

Person Responsible	Stacey Price (stacey.price@ocps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	While proficiency rates in reading and math are high, our students with disabilities are not making academic progress. iReady EOY subgroup data indicate average gaps of 30 percentage points in reading and 27 percentage points in math when compared to all students. This is consistent with prior year FSA data.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Measurable goals for this area of focus include: *10% increase in proficiency rate in reading for SWD *15% increase in proficiency rate in math for SWD
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Monitoring will include: 1. Subgroup tracking for standards-based unit assessments through Performance Matters 2. Subgroup tracking for FAST progress monitoring
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacey Price (stacey.price@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students will engage in processing content through collaborative interactions with other students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	In order for students to effectively construct meaning, they must be actively engaged in processing of information by interacting with the teacher, students and the content.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Utilize PLCs to review student assessment data and weekly lesson plans
2. Conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs and provide timely feedback to impact instructional practices
3. Utilize standards based unit assessments to plan small groups and differentiated learning opportunities
4. Ensure IEP accommodations are being provided in the general education classroom.

Person Responsible Stacey Price (stacey.price@ocps.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 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.

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

Teachers will communicate regularly with families to support the social, emotional and academic needs of our students. Monthly PTO meetings and quarterly SAC meetings will provide opportunities for community input and feedback to improve our school. Our school also utilized the House system to foster a sense of belonging and achievement in our school.