

Orange County Public Schools

Lake Whitney Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Whitney Elementary

1351 WINDERMERE RD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

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

Demographics

Principal: Pamela Crabb

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2021

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)	26%
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 (76%) 2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (73%)
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	N/A
* 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	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Whitney Elementary

1351 WINDERMERE RD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://lakewestones.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	26%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

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
Crabb, Pamela	Principal	Duties include serving as an instructional leader by providing teachers with a common vision based upon data-based decisions by promoting standards-based instruction in order to maximize student achievement.
Spensieri-Hughes, Kristen	Instructional Coach	Duties include serving as Instructional coach for reading, MTSS, PLCs,, beginning teachers and student interns.
Dudek, Nancy	Instructional Media	Duties include serving as classroom coach for teachers to assist them with implementing rigorous reading and learning strategies.
Durham, Tambi	School Counselor	Duties include monitoring students mental and emotional health to ensure that students are ready for learning.
Smirti, Kimberlee	Reading Coach	Duties include overseeing the implementation of the curriculum and assessments of students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/11/2021, Pamela Crabb

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.*

30

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

591

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

1

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

2

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	105	96	99	85	105	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	595
Attendance below 90 percent	3	26	18	26	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	1	0	2	0	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 8/8/2022

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	90	112	90	110	95	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	567
Attendance below 90 percent	6	1	6	9	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	6	8	14	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	90	112	90	110	95	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	567
Attendance below 90 percent	6	1	6	9	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	6	8	14	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	82%	56%	56%				84%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	71%						68%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						49%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	89%	46%	50%				86%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	79%						77%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	78%						64%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	81%	61%	59%				83%	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	88%	55%	33%	58%	30%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	74%	57%	17%	58%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
05	2022					
	2019	86%	54%	32%	56%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

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	87%	62%	25%	62%	25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	86%	63%	23%	64%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2022					
	2019	84%	57%	27%	60%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	83%	54%	29%	53%	30%
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	31	31	31	59	69	82					
ELL	61	90		67	36						
ASN	74	73		85	88						
BLK	62	61		81	78						
HSP	88	75		92	68		75				
WHT	83	70	52	90	81	72	83				
FRL	72	61	45	77	78	73	83				
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	38	40		58	36		60				
ELL	73			86							
ASN	83	75		92	81		88				
BLK	68	50		68	30		45				
HSP	86	71		81	73		67				
WHT	88	66	45	91	65		94				
FRL	78	70		83	75		71				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	61	71		45	62		50				
ELL	61	73		78	73						
ASN	89	56		95	100		85				
BLK	60	60	50	67	65		50				
HSP	86	77	58	82	69		93				
WHT	87	70	44	89	77	74	88				
FRL	78	70	60	82	82	64	70				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	535
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	64
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	80
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	71
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	80
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	76
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	70
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 emerge across grade levels include:

ELA proficiency shows a 1% to 2% decrease from 2018- 83%; 2019 - 84%; 2021 - 84% and 2022 82%.

ELA Learning Gains show a 4% to 3% increase from 2018 - 67%; 2019 - 68%; 2021 - 67% and 2022 71%

ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% show 2% to a 7% increase from 2018 - 53%; 2019 - 50%; 2021 48% and 2022 - 55%

Math proficiency showed an increase in gains or stayed the same from 0% to 3% in 2018 - 89%; 2019 - 86%; 2021 - 67% and 2022 - 89%

Math Learning gains show 3% to 12% gain increase from 2018 - 76%; 2019 - 77%; 2021 - 67% and 2022 79%

Math Learning gains of the lowest 25% show 15% to 20% gain from 2018 - 63%; 2019 - 64%; 2021- 58% and 2022 - 78%

Science proficiency in 5th grade showed a decrease of 1% from 2018 - 82%; 2019 - 83%; 2021 - 81% and 2022 - 81%

Overall trends school-wide from 2018 to 2022 show an increase in overall proficiency across grades 3,4 and 5. 2018 - 513; 2019 - 511; 2021 - 492 and 2022 - 535

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

The greatest need for improvement based on the 2022 state assessments are the ELA learning gains of the lowest 25%, which were at 55%. Although this was an increase of 7% from the 2021 score of 48%, the data does indicate that this is an area that we need to continue to improve in when looking at the other state assessment breakdown for Lake Whitney.

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

Learning gains of the lowest 25% show a contributing factor of differentiation in ESE instruction in the intermediate grade levels. To address this need for improvement, we have added a primary and intermediate interventionist to further help differentiate students while still teaching the standards.

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

Math learning gains of the lowest 25% showed the most improvement. Math learning gains in 2021 were 58% and math learning gains of the lowest 25% in 2022 were 78% for a gain of 20%.

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

Contributing factors for the learning gains of the lowest 25% in math include repetition of facts, math challenges, small group instruction, and teaching rigorous lessons.

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

At each grade level, beginning in 1st grade, an enrichment class will be implemented. Students in the top percent at each grade level were chosen based on diagnostic assessments, classroom assessments, and teacher input.

The following is an overview of the specific goals of the enrichment program:

- To bring together highly capable students to challenge them in an individualized, creative, and more effective learning dynamic.
- To provide accelerated academic opportunities for students of high intellectual achievement.
- To offer project-based learning activities which will prepare students for learning opportunities beyond the grade-level learning curriculum.
- To offer an environment where highly capable students are encouraged to reach their full potential.
- To address the social and emotional needs of students through peer interaction and fostering a sense of community.

Another strategy that will be utilized is a primary and intermediate interventionist. These interventionists will work with students and teachers who need extra support to close their achievement gaps by differentiating the curriculum.

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 will include differentiated lessons, for all levels of students, interventionists to push into classrooms and track data, and professional learning communities to address data trends as well as curriculum.

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

By looking at the data trends for the upcoming school year, we will be able to identify if the data has improved. This will guide the need for differentiated instruction for enrichment teachers. Ongoing monthly data chats will assist us in adjusting individual students' learning paths.

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.

This area of focus comprises of increasing learning gains in ELA lowest quartile and reducing the achievement gap for students with disabilities(SWD). The rationale for this area of focus is the learning gains for ELA are significantly lower than that of students in the general education classroom.

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

We plan on seeing an increase in ELA learning gains for our lowest quartile from 55% proficiency to 58% proficiency.

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

Members of the leadership team will monitor grade-level PLC meetings for how closely teachers apply curriculum content and processes as they are designed. The leadership team will monitor classroom academics via classroom walkthroughs and observations. Teacher curriculum interactions and activities will result in positive child outcomes and achieve school readiness goals. Interventionist teachers will differentiate instruction and schedule students as they monitor and adjust instruction and monitor how closely the implementation was aligned to the way the intervention was designed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@ocps.net)

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

Teachers will use collaborative lesson planning in PLC meetings to analyze data, prepare for, and implement standards-based instruction focusing on differentiating reading and writing strategies to improve teacher proficiency and student achievement. Members of the leadership team will monitor grade-level PLC meetings for fidelity.

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

Teachers need to identify the individual academic levels of their students in order to differentiate their instruction to match the students' needs. Interventionists and teachers need to work together to collaborate on the instruction and monitor results.

**resources/
criteria used for
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.

1. Teachers will meet weekly in Professional Learning Communities to analyze assessment data to drive instruction for individual students.

Person Responsible Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@ocps.net)

2. Teachers will choose from a variety of text and deliberate questioning techniques when planning standards-based lessons and units.

Person Responsible Kristen Spensieri-Hughes (kristen.spensieri-hughes@ocps.net)

3. Teachers will be provided additional time to create formative assessments in their PLCs. Teachers will develop and implement formative assessments.

Person Responsible Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@ocps.net)

4. Teachers will analyze student performance on common assessments to determine student progress toward grade-level standards.

Person Responsible Kimberlee Smirti (kimberlee.smirti@ocps.net)

5. Teachers will determine appropriate differentiated activities based on common assessment outcomes. Teachers will consult with interventionists and MTSS coordinator to implement support facilitation and tiered instruction.

Person Responsible Kimberlee Smirti (kimberlee.smirti@ocps.net)

6. Teachers will monitor the progress of students regularly and make academic adjustments if students are struggling. All students will be included in this including SWD, and students in tiered instruction.

Person Responsible Kristen Spensieri-Hughes (kristen.spensieri-hughes@ocps.net)

7. Teachers will be provided additional time and professional development to support differentiated and engaging lessons for social-emotional learning.

Person Responsible Tambi Durham (tambi.durham@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.

With the implementation of the B.E.S.T standards, new curriculum materials, and changes in grade-level assignments for teachers due to implementing an enrichment class, 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 85% 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:

Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@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 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, create team norms, and identify teacher content experts for planning.

Person Responsible

Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@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

Kimberlee Smirti (kimberlee.smirti@ocps.net)

Provide opportunities for peers to learn from others through professional development and modeling of effective instruction.

Person Responsible

Kimberlee Smirti (kimberlee.smirti@ocps.net)

Provide ongoing coaching support to help build teacher team capacity.

Person Responsible

Kimberlee Smirti (kimberlee.smirti@ocps.net)

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

Person Responsible Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@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 Pamela Crabb (pamela.crabb@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 professional development based and on social emotional learning, implementing the B.E.S.T standards, and iReady professional development as well as leveraging social and emotional learning and leadership for student success. Our school uses social and emotional learning to 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 and determine the next steps. The development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based 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.

Pamela Crabb, Principal, develop a positive culture and environment to enhance school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in all stakeholders

Tambi Durham, Guidance Counselor, mental-health designee, attends district-wide professional learning throughout the year

Patricia Gencarelli, Behavior Specialist - collaborate with staff on personalizing and developing a positive culture and environment to enhance social skills

All Instructional Personnel - bridge the community and school, to help connect families with resources and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff