

Orange County Public Schools

Windermere Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Windermere Elementary

11125 PARK AVE, Windermere, FL 34786

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

Demographics

Principal: Janet Bittick

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	12%
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 (79%) 2018-19: A (76%) 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Windermere Elementary

11125 PARK AVE, Windermere, FL 34786

<https://windermerees.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	12%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

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 to lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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
Greer, Diana	Principal	Responsible for ensuring high academic achievement for all students. Monitors curriculum and instruction and assesses all instructional personnel. Coordinates school site strategic planning, and communication of the school improvement plan with the School Advisory Committee. Coordinates and supports staff development on campus to support strategic goals.
Matthews, Bridgette	Behavior Specialist	Provides resources and materials for teachers to use for targeted intervention skills and works with targeted students throughout the day. Assists teachers in collecting progress monitoring data. As the school's MTSS Coach, she is responsible for tracking tiered interventions on campus. Serves as the school's testing coordinator.
Gibbs, Marcy	Instructional Coach	Provides resources and materials for teachers to use for targeted intervention skills and works with targeted students throughout the day. Assists teachers in collecting progress monitoring data. Coordinates staff development on campus to support strategic goals. Responsible for monitoring the progress and compliance of ELL students on campus.
Fonseca, Carissa	Staffing Specialist	Responsible for monitoring compliance of all IEPs and Section 504 plans on campus. Coordinates meetings with SLP and school psychologist to review data and provide recommendations for instructional support. Closely monitors ESE students' progress and the accommodations to support learning gains.
Salvati, Susan	Other	Responsible for providing behavior support on campus. Member of the Threat Assessment Team. Supports the school-wide behavior plan and expectations. Provides social skills for ESE students and helps teachers with de-escalation and calming down techniques to support the classroom environment.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/12/2022, Janet Bittick

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.*

4

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

610

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

5

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

4

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	85	94	78	115	107	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	607
Attendance below 90 percent	1	9	13	11	20	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	0	1	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

Tuesday 7/12/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	69	79	114	108	117	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	599
Attendance below 90 percent	2	4	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	69	79	114	108	117	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	599
Attendance below 90 percent	2	4	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	85%	56%	56%				82%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	77%						66%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%						60%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	89%	46%	50%				87%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	76%						80%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	74%						74%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	85%	61%	59%				85%	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	79%	55%	24%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	84%	57%	27%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2022					
	2019	79%	54%	25%	56%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

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	85%	62%	23%	62%	23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	85%	63%	22%	64%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
05	2022					
	2019	87%	57%	30%	60%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	84%	54%	30%	53%	31%
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	56	56	53	67	70	60	47				
ELL	80	68		83	82						
ASN	91	90		88	80						
HSP	84	78	90	90	83	92	95				
WHT	87	76	67	90	76	77	84				
FRL	70	65	70	60	59	58	64				
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	41		64	53	40	65				
ELL	84			76							
ASN	81	80		87	60						
BLK	58			58							
HSP	88	88		80	63		88				
WHT	86	63	58	88	76	55	79				
FRL	65	56		61	58		50				
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	53	45	46	68	60	69	50				
ELL	57	53	40	83	84		73				
ASN	83	83		92	92		70				
BLK	53	27		43	64						
HSP	73	64	54	85	82		83				
WHT	86	67	70	89	79	75	88				
FRL	63	55	53	53	61	54	67				

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	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	618
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
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	76
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	87
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	87
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	80
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	64
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?

The 2021-22 state assessment data in core content areas of reading and math showed an increase in proficiency from 84% to 85% in reading and 67% from 77% in math. Learning gains in reading and math showed an increase from 67% to 77% in reading and 71% to 74% in math. Though all data points showed an increase in 2022 state assessment results, the data component that showed the lowest performance was learning gains in ELA for our lowest 25% at 67% proficiency. Though this was our lowest data component on the 2022 state assessment, this was an increase from the previous year's data that showed 57% proficiency for our lowest 25% in ELA.

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 would be reading proficiency for Students with Disabilities. Students with Disabilities showed a decline in proficiency from 55% in 2021 to 52% in 2022.

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 to this need for improvement include the ability of teachers to differentiate instruction during the ELA and math block for Students with Disabilities. Teachers need additional Best Practices in Inclusive Education strategies to support and plan instruction for their ESE students.

Actions needed to address this area of improvement include leveraging Common Planning and Professional Learning Communities structures to focus on embedded practices and strategies to use while delivering instruction that differentiates instruction for our ESE students. Provide professional

development in BPIE for all instructional staff to provide resources and guidance on creating supportive learning environments for our ESE students.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement based on 2022 state assessment results was math learning gains for our lowest 25%. Our proficiency increased from 56% to 74% for our lowest 25% of students.

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

Contributing factors included content expert planning structure for common planning, the use of number talks and mental math opportunities in all grades for the first 10 minutes of the math block, math intervention block connected to math block, and differentiated activities and practice during the math block.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we will need to continue to use the expert model during Common Planning to ensure that instruction is aligned to the standards and provides opportunities for differentiation, application, practice, and independent work.

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.

Additional planning days after the first progress monitoring administration so instructional focus calendars can be revised and student data can be reviewed to inform instruction.

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

Continued use of collaborative and distributive leadership structures to support student learning and teacher efficacy.

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.

2022 state assessment results show that there is an achievement gap between our general education students and our Students with Disabilities. Based on 2022 assessment results, the ESSA total index for Students with Disabilities was 58% compared to 77% overall for all students.

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

Students with Disabilities will increase grade-level proficiency and increase learning gains by 7% resulting in an increase in the total ESSA index from 58% to 65%.

**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 block to ensure small group structure and accommodations for Students with Disabilities. Lesson plan checks for specific planning, noting BPIE strategies. Structured time for collaboration between ESE teachers and general education teachers during common planning and Professional Learning communities monthly to ensure the use of targeted and differentiated resources in reading to support Students with Disabilities. The grade level tracking tool will be used to monitor common assessment data for Students with Disabilities compared to grade-level performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

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

Teachers will effectively implement differentiated, small group reading and math instruction based on multiple sources of data during the ELA block. Targeted scaffolded support will be provided for Students with Disabilities, and Professional Development opportunities for instructional personnel on Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE) will be embedded throughout the school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Using data to differentiate instruction will ensure that Students with Disabilities are provided accommodations and scaffolded instruction to experience success. Collaboration in common planning between the ESE teacher and general education teacher will ensure planning and use of necessary supports that provide Best Practices

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

in Inclusive Education in all of our classrooms.

Describe the 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. Provide monthly structured Professional Learning Community time and common planning for ESE teachers and classroom teachers to discuss effective differentiated strategies and resources to support Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

2. Provide Professional development through Instructional Coach and Staffing Specialist on Best Practices in Inclusive Education.

Person Responsible Marcy Gibbs (mary.gibbs@ocps.net)

3. Teachers will analyze student performance on common assessments and discuss proficiency data during monthly data meetings. Specific tracking of subgroup data toward proficiency will be monitored, focusing on Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible Bridgette Matthews (bridgette.matthews@ocps.net)

4. Teachers will be provided half-day planning during the 1st semester after the first state progress monitoring administration to review data, make changes to instructional calendars and refine targeted reading instruction and Tiered support

Person Responsible Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	It is crucial to build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to the subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will create culturally responsive environments so students feel valued and connected and reduce the achievement gap for our Students with Disabilities.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Focusing on Social and Emotional Learning will promote meaningful connections between home and school. There should be an improvement in Early Warning System Indicator data in terms of attendance and grade-level achievement.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The Cognia survey data should show positive results in terms of students feeling safe and positive about their school environment. The use of distributive leadership to support school-wide social-emotional learning will enhance collaboration and build academic expertise with all students. The integration of the Caring School Community framework will strengthen home-school connections and engage all stakeholders.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Our school will implement The Caring School community program as the framework for school-wide Social and Emotional learning. The program builds caring relationships among students and adults and directly teaches social skills that students need in school and in life. All teachers were provided training as part of the Caring School Community Program and follow-up training opportunities, safe practice, and impact data will be reviewed throughout the year. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for	To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through the school-wide implementation of the Caring School Community Program and collaboration with our stakeholders, we will have an opportunity to strengthen the

selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

individual and team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvements and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary.

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Provide Caring School Community materials and overview training to all instructional staff prior to preplanning.

Person Responsible Marcy Gibbs (mary.gibbs@ocps.net)

2. Establish a common language to support a culture and emotional learning on campus with adults and students.

Person Responsible Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

3. Collaborate and communicate with all stakeholders the common language to support social-emotional learning on campus through parent organization meetings and monthly family home projects.

Person Responsible Diana Greer (diana.greer@ocps.net)

4. Continue to promote a positive school culture through the implementation of the school-wide positive behavior plan. Work with the MTSS coach to support tiered interventions in behavior for all students

Person Responsible Bridgette Matthews (bridgette.matthews@ocps.net)

5. Use professional learning opportunities and discussions during common planning to integrate academic and social-emotional learning through the morning and closing circles, class meetings, and engagement structures.

Person Responsible Marcy Gibbs (mary.gibbs@ocps.net)

6. Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts. Classroom observations will be conducted weekly to monitor morning and closing circles, and monthly checks of lessons plan to include Caring School Community lessons

Person Responsible Diana Greer (diana.greer@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 strategies to leverage social and emotional learning to support student success. Through a distributive leadership model, we use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, our school will use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive social and emotional learning culture and connect cognitive and conative 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. The School leadership team collaborates with students, staff, and families through structures such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine the next steps. Positive culture and environment development are further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building family capacity 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 through the Norm setting and the development of a shared vision for school culture prior to the first day of school.

The Leadership team will collaborate and plan with grade-level teams to strengthen team dynamics and build expertise during planning on how to incorporate the development of CASEL core competencies within the curriculum.

Classroom teachers will implement the Caring School Community program and embed the application of social and emotional learning for students throughout the learning day.

The School Principal will coordinate the school's professional development based on the school's needs and framework from the Caring School Community program.

The Guidance Counselor will work on the development of a common language and connect families with resources and help bridge the community and school.

The School Principal will share and collaborate with the School Advisory Council and Parent Organizations on the implementation of the Caring School Community program and strengthening communication with our school families.