Moss Park Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Moss Park Elementary

9301 N SHORE GOLF CLUB BLVD, Orlando, FL 32832

https://mossparkes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: William Harris

Start Date for this Principal: 1/25/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
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: A (68%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (64%)
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

Moss Park Elementary

9301 N SHORE GOLF CLUB BLVD, Orlando, FL 32832

https://mossparkes.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 PK-5	No	35%

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	A		A	A

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.

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
Osmond, Stephanie	Principal	Oversees all general operations budget, hiring and instructional leadership of the school.
Vetter, Rob	Assistant Principal	Evaluative Observations -Oversee MTSS Process K-5 -Liaison with Middle School -Serves as principal's designee when principal is off campus. -SIP -Master Schedule -Manages the Computer Lab Schedule, Duty and Lunch Duty -Class List -Oversees Special Projects -Field Trips -Drills -Other Duties as Assigned
Miller, Lisa	School Counselor	Virtual School Administrator Student Special Programs (Foster care, MVP) -Works with Registrar on Child Study Team -Coordinates Red Ribbon Week 9 Week Awards -Character Ed (on Announcements) Guidance Groups SOAR School Threat Assessment School Data and Reports SEDNET Resource for Health Course Child Safety Matters Academic support (study, test taking and organizational Skills) Peer relationships Bullying awareness
Garcia-Jenarine, Maritza	Instructional Media	Admin/Resource Team Member -Text Book Manager -AR Program -Morning Announcements -Book Fairs -Book Clubs -Literacy Week -Classroom Media Resources Destiny Inventory -Circulation of Books -Media Center Inventory -General Supervision of Students

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		-Digital one to one -Other duties as assigned
Villar, Edni	ELL Compliance Specialist	Admin/Resource Team Member ELL Compliance -WIDA Testing -PLC (ELL) Chair -Manages all ELL Records -Schedules and monitors all LEP Meetings - Pulls ELL student groups -oversees ELL paras -General Student Supervision -Intervention Groups -Other duties as assigned
Gardner, Diane	Other	Oversees the progression and monitoring of the Lowest quartile of students in both Math and reading Manages Intervention support
Borgerding, Jeana	Instructional Coach	Ms. Borgerding will support teaching and learning through planning processes, professional development and data analysis as well as through supervision of students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 1/25/2017, William Harris

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.*

1

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

74

Total number of students enrolled at the school

920

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

10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
10

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	18	144	140	152	184	161	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	799
Attendance below 90 percent	4	32	23	25	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
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	1	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 7/29/2022

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	22	122	153	184	168	202	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	851
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	15	14	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	2	2	11	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	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	22	122	153	184	168	202	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	851
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	15	14	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	2	2	11	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	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	72%	56%	56%				72%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%						61%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						50%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	76%	46%	50%				75%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	73%						69%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						44%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	61%	59%				72%	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	75%	55%	20%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	57%	6%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	72%	54%	18%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

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	75%	62%	13%	62%	13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	70%	63%	7%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2022					
	2019	74%	57%	17%	60%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	53%	16%
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	20	44	40	29	54	50	20				
ELL	58	58	41	63	67	54	44				
ASN	65	75		85	79						
BLK	68	76		69	75		76				
HSP	69	68	56	71	70	54	65				
MUL	88			81							
WHT	77	71	63	82	81	63	81				
FRL	59	60	41	63	66	51	61				

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	18	20	18	24	29	27	27				
ELL	58	64	76	57	52	46	68				
ASN	88			84			100				
BLK	63			67							
HSP	68	63	68	65	57	44	70				
MUL	76			82							
WHT	73	54		74	59		70				
FRL	62	54	60	55	46	50	72				
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	27	34	27	34	53	35	19				
ELL	55	56	50	70	65	59	62				
ASN	84	76		94	81		69				
BLK	55	48		59	50		46				
HSP	67	60	51	73	70	54	70				
MUL	79	45		70	67						
WHT	78	62	52	78	69	39	80				
FRL	71	58	49	68	64	48	64				

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	68
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	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	76
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	73
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	65
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	85
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	74
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	58
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?

While our data is higher overall then both the state and the district and while we do demonstrate growth over the course of the school year, when looking at longitudinal data Moss Park trends with high achievement but low gains. This is consistent in each of the assessed content areas that use growth scores. Over all we do see growth in our sub group data at a rate that is consistent with our overall data. For the 2022 School year we have seen an increase in over all learning gains, however our lowest quartile learning gains remain the same.

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

Based on the progress monitoring and the 2022 assessments, the data component with the greatest need for improvement lowest quartile learning gains in ELA. This is the lower data point in all grade levels and
sub-groups.

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

A contributing factor to this performance was the lack of consistent small group with in the classroom and larger amounts of pull out interventions. We will need to focus on push in supports.

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

Based on the progress monitoring and the 2022 assessments, math learning gains showed the most improvement when compared to the previous year. There was a 17% increase in the number of students making gains from the previous year.

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

This year we had a focus on Math centers and math instruction specific to fast facts recall.

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

In order to accelerate learning Moss Park will be implementing pull out learning labs using research based programs during the school day as well as before and after school. Strategic groups of students has occurred in order to ensure that specific students are able to have content front loaded

prior to instruction. MTSS and early intervention will occur daily in both math and ELA allowing for struggling students to attain concepts prior to their introduction in class.

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 has been delivered by the district to 10% of our staff on acceleration of learning as well as early intervention in phonics. Site based professional development will continue on the adoption of new curriculum and standards as well as programs that can support fundamental skills based learning.

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

Additional services will include tutoring for identified students, intervention within the the school day via small groups.

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

:

#1. 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.**	Over the last several years our Students with disabilities have been an underperforming sub group with a federal index score of 25% in 2017-2018, 26% in 2018-2019, and 25% in 2020-2021, where a low federal index score is 40% or less. This is the only ESSA subgroup to be below 40%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	There will be a three percentage point increase in the Students with disabilities ESSA Subgroup Federal index.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	-Common Assessments -Program Use -Walk throughs during intervention time blocks -Focus on ensuring proper program placement for students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Diane Gardner (diane.gardner@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Teachers will create and implement differentiated instruction geared toward meeting the needs of their lowest 25%. The Instructional leadership team will monitor data from common unit assessments, implementation of intervention programs. The instructional leadership team will support the development and implementation of small group instruction including push in support. Additionally the Staffing specialist will work teachers to ensure proper program placement and support services.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Data analysis will help teachers better understand their students' differences and needs. Through analyzing will be able to make informed instructional decisions. These informed decisions will help them create small group learning for their students.

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.

Instructional Coach will assist in best practice planning for differentiated instruction including the use of centers and manipulatives where appropriate

Person Responsible	Jeana Borgerding (jeana.borgerding@ocps.net)

Teachers will remediate and reteach skills in small groups considering the needs of our SWD first (Aligns with district BPIE indicator #5) This will incorporate MTSS for Math during the specific intervention block.

Person Responsible	Diane Gardner (diane.gardner@ocps.net)

Leadership Team members will visit classrooms to identify standards being taught and strategies being used.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Osmond (stephanie.osmond@ocps.net)

Additional student support in the form of before/after school tutoring in line with MAO Acceleration will be initiated by October 1.

Person Responsible   Rob Vetter (robert.vetter@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen an understanding the newly adopted B.E.S.T standards. In the 2022-2023 school year all Kindergarten through fifth grade teachers will need to make adjustments to instructional practices as the standards have changed.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	There will be a three percentage point increase in math and ELA proficiency. Overall ELA achievement will increase from 72% to 75%. Math Achievement will increase from 76% to 79%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	-Common Assessments -Program Use -Walk throughs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Osmond (stephanie.osmond@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Use distributive leadership implement a plan for ensuring teacher leaders have access and information about the new standards in a way that allows them to give the information and resources to their peers. 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 needs assessments, classroom observations, modify our plan of action as indicated by data, and staff needs,
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for	In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. 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. Research indicates that for

selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy. 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 academic development of every student.

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.

Implement a team to help support B.E.S.T Math standards
Ensure a school team receives training on implementation
Create a training plan that leverages the trained school team members to train all necessary stakeholders in implementation of the curriculum
Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum

Person Responsible Jeana Borgerding (jeana.borgerding@ocps.net)

Monitor, Measure, and Modify
Evaluate the climate and culture for teacher learning. Implement necessary responsive practices to support teacher efficacy.
Evaluate the impact of cycles of professional learning on improvement efforts
Monitor, measure, and modify the plan for continuous improvement in understanding available resources and standards using data-based instructional leadership to positively impact climate and culture

Person Responsible Stephanie Osmond (stephanie.osmond@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 allowing teachers ownership of their practice.
Through a distributive leadership model, schools strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students.
School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation of the schools improvement plan 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.

Additionally Moss Park is one of 25 schools to be selected as a Caring School Community pilot program. Classroom teachers were trained on the curriculum prior to the 2021-2022 school year. A committee was formed to support the roll out including a deep look at the culture and environment in order to make adjustments to better facilitate a positive school culture and environment.

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

SELL Team Including guidance, primary, intermediate, ESE and Specialized teachers - Support District SEL Initiative
Caring Schools Community team Including Guidance and Instructional Leadership and Dean - to support the piloting the new SEL Curriculum
SOAR Committee including Dean and teacher stakeholders - To support onboarding of new and return students in the school wide discipline plan
B.E.S.T. Math team including Instructional Coach a primary and intermediate teacher- to support onboarding the new standards.