Orange County Public Schools

Summerlake Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Summerlake Elementary

15450 PORTER ROAD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://summerlakees.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Delaine Bender

Start Date for this Principal: 1/28/2020

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)	17%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (61%) 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade
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 was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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

Summerlake Elementary

15450 PORTER ROAD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://summerlakees.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	17%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21
Grade	B	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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
Bender, Delaine	Principal	Duties include serving as the instructional leader responsible for high academic achievement for all students, developing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, and monitoring curriculum, and instruction.
Pinckney, Karen	Assistant Principal	Duties include implementing school-wide Champs behavior, monitoring MTSS behavior data, and assisting classroom teachers with behavior strategies. as well as, providing support to teachers for student achievement based on data-based decision making.
Salinsky, Nicole	Instructional Coach	Duties include serving as the Instructional Coach for teachers to assist them with implementing rigorous lessons, leading the planning for all content areas, and serving as the lead mentor for beginning teachers and interns.
Witman, Brandi	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Duties include overseeing the implementation of curriculum and assessments, ensuring implementation of the MTSS process, identifying appropriate Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, and assisting teachers with curriculum resources.
Cox, Angela	Instructional Media	Duties include overseeing and managing the media center, planning literacy events for the school, leading the Digital Curriculum Team, supporting teachers with digital lessons and resources, and promoting literacy through the school campus. She is also responsible for conducting digital device inventory.
Escobar, Stephanie	School Counselor	Duties include being a member of the Threat Assessment Team, serving as the mental health designee, and providinging small group social skills and counseling for students as needed.
Williams, Chaneiqua	Staffing Specialist	Duties include monitoring compliance of all IEP, Section 504 plans, and ELL meetings with teachers and parents. Coordinating meetings with the Speech Language Pathologist and school psychologist to review data and provide recommendations for instructional support. Closely monitoring ESE and ELL student progress and the accommodations to support student success.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 1/28/2020, Delaine Bender

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

742

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

9

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

0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	21	19	15	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	2	0	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/6/2022

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	17	167	158	189	137	136	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	805
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	0	0	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	

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	17	167	158	189	137	136	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	805
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	0	0	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	

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	77%	56%	56%					57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%							58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%							52%	53%
Math Achievement	82%	46%	50%					63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%							61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%							48%	51%
Science Achievement	72%	61%	59%					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					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

			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					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

			SCIENCE			
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019					
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	38	29	21	43	34	28	21				
ELL	66	54	31	76	56	33	71				
ASN	82	69		86	54						
BLK	60	40		55	27						
HSP	71	53	34	78	54	42	69				
MUL	79			79							
WHT	83	57	57	87	61	54	77				
FRL	61	33	18	67	42	29	41				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	55			73							
ELL	76	72	67	89	68	80	75				
ASN	67	69		85	77		64				
BLK	62			57							
HSP	82	76		87	71	77	81				
WHT	85	52	55	86	63		87				
FRL	73	38		72	52		74				
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

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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	492
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
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	46
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 Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	79
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	45
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?

Trends that emerged across grade levels showed proficiency overall, with the school earning a B grade. However, based on the 2021-2022 state assessment reading proficiency decreased from 81% to 77%, math proficiency decreased from 84% to 82%, and science proficiency decreased from 83% to 72%. The data component that showed the lowest performance was proficiency in ELA and math for Students with Disabilities, compared to other subgroups.

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

The data component that showed the greatest need for improvement from the 2022 state assessment results, is proficiency in reading and math for Students with Disabilities. Students with Disabilities showed a decrease from 55% to 38% in ELA, and a decrease from 73% to 43% in math proficiency.

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

Contributing factors for the decrease in proficiency for Students with Disabilities include teachers needing support in order to differentiate instruction during the ELA and math block. Teachers need additional strategies in Best Practices in Inclusive Education to support and plan instruction for ESE students.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement based on 2022 state assessment results were proficiency in ELA and Math for the Asian subgroup increasing from 67% to 82% in ELA and increasing from 85% to 86% in math.

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

Contributing factors include utilizing the middle of the year i-Ready results to target the intervention and enrichment needs of students, and interventionists providing targeted small group instruction.

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

Strategies needed to implement to accelerate learning include utilizing Interventionists during intervention blocks, differentiating instruction during small groups, providing enrichment opportunities for students that require more rigorous material, and collaborative planning during PLC's to ensure lessons and materials are aligned to the B.E.S.T. benchmarks.

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.

Professional development opportunities that will be provided include how to differentiate instruction based on progress monitoring data to form small groups. We will also implement Best Practices in Inclusive Education to support and plan instruction for ESE students.

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

We will continue to use Interventionists to provide targeted small group instruction in ELA and math and provide after-school tutoring and enrichment opportunities for students.

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 Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	With the implementation of the B.E.S.T standards, new curriculum materials, and changes in grade-level assignments for teachers due to a relief school opening for the 2022-2023 school year, we will focus on collaboratively planning to ensure lesson plans are aligned to benchmarks and resources for differentiated small groups are utilized.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	As a result of staff collaboration throughout the 2022-2023 school year, we expect 81% of students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade to perform at or above grade level on the state-adopted ELA assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Through common planning, our staff will build a culture of positive and supportive collaboration focusing on data analysis, continuous improvement, professional development, and planning B.E.S.T. benchmark-aligned lessons as measured by common assessments and classroom walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Delaine Bender (delaine.bender@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Collaborative Planning allows for Professional Learning Community teams to align benchmarks and tasks to the appropriate level of rigor and utilize best practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	When collaboratively planning, teachers learn the critical content of benchmarks by conducting discussions about misconceptions, performing reviews of assessments, aligning of instructional materials, and maintaining appropriate pacing of each unit.

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.	
Develop common planning expectations, team norms, and identify teacher content experts for planning.	
Person Responsible	Delaine Bender (delaine.bender@ocps.net)
Provide continuous professional development on the B.E.S.T. benchmarks, effective instructional strategies, and determine resources to teach the benchmarks at the appropriate level of rigor.	
Person Responsible	Nicole Salinsky (nicole.salinsky@ocps.net)
Provide opportunities for peers to learn from others through professional development and modeling of effective instruction.	
Person Responsible	Nicole Salinsky (nicole.salinsky@ocps.net)
Provide ongoing coaching support to help build teacher team capacity.	
Person Responsible	Nicole Salinsky (nicole.salinsky@ocps.net)

Monitor classroom walkthrough and iObservation data, analyze data and common assessments during Professional Learning Communities, and collaborative planning meetings.

Person Responsible   Delaine Bender (delaine.bender@ocps.net)

Create a collaborative planning schedule to include ESE teachers and general education teachers in the planning process during Professional Learning Communities.

Person Responsible   Delaine Bender (delaine.bender@ocps.net)

#2. 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.

Results from the 2022 state assessment results show that there is an achievement gap between our general education students and our Students with Disabilities. Based on 2022 state assessment results, Students with Disabilities scored 38% proficiency in ELA compared to 77% overall and 43% proficiency in math compared to 82% overall.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

As a result of focusing on differentiated instruction, we expect 50% of students with disabilities to score at or above grade level on the state-adopted ELA and Math assessments.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor for the desired outcome by conducting classroom observations during the ELA and Math blocks to ensure small group instruction is occurring and accommodations are being provided for Students with Disabilities. Planning meetings will be monitored to ensure ESE and general education teachers' collaborate on the use of differentiated resources and tiered supports. The grade level tracking tool will be utilized to monitor Students with Disabilities' common and i-Ready placement assessment data and compare it to grade-level performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Delaine Bender (delaine.bender@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers will effectively implement differentiated, small group instruction in ELA and math based on assessment results. Targeted support will be provided for Students with Disabilities and professional development will be provided on how to use data to differentiate instruction in small groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for

Using data from multiple assessments to differentiate instruction will ensure Students with Disabilities are provided targeted instruction for student success. Collaborative planning between ESE and general education teachers will ensure the planning and use of supports that provide Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE) in all classrooms.

**selecting this
strategy.**

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.

Provide common planning time for ESE teachers and classroom teachers to discuss effective
differentiated strategies and resources to support Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible	Delaine Bender (delaine.bender@ocps.net)

Provide professional development on using data to differentiate instruction and how to determine small
groups during reading and math blocks.

Person Responsible	Brandi Witman (brandi.witman@ocps.net)

Provide time for teachers to analyze performance on common and i-Ready placement assessments
during data meetings in order to determine areas of focus for small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Delaine Bender (delaine.bender@ocps.net)

Provide teachers with a planning day after the first state progress monitoring and i-Ready placement
assessments to review data, make changes to instructional plans, determine targeted reading and math
instruction, and tiered support for Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible	Delaine Bender (delaine.bender@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, our school will engage in ongoing 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
will use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and
emotional learning and connect conative and cognitive strategies to support student success.

The leadership team will work on personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and
families, based on school and community needs to support positive culture and environment. School
leadership teams will collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School

Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine the next steps. The development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture of authentic family engagement in school staff.

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

The school principal will guide teachers and staff in developing norms and a shared vision for school culture prior to the first day of school.

The school SEL team will plan professional learning to support all staff with the implementation of social-emotional learning in order to connect conative and cognitive strategies.

The School Social Worker will provide lessons on helping students describe their feelings which is a need based on Panorama Survey results and will support teachers in utilizing the resources in the Second Step curriculum to support student's social and emotional learning and skill acquisition.

The leadership team will monitor progress on surveys throughout the year, reflect on the implementation of social-emotional learning, and determine the next steps for professional learning.

Teachers will foster a classroom environment where all students feel connected, comfortable, and part of an inclusive community through classroom meetings. We will continue to focus on building a positive climate and culture by recognizing students for positive behaviors on a weekly basis and character traits each month.