Whispering Oak Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Whispering Oak Elementary

15300 STONEYBROOK WEST PKWY, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://whisperingoakes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Lee Montgomery

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2022

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)	23%
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 (81%) 2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (74%)
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

Whispering Oak Elementary

15300 STONEYBROOK WEST PKWY, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://whisperingoakes.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	23%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

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
Montgomery, Lee	Principal	School based budgeting, personnel management, classroom observation, school cultural architect
Conley, Joyce	Assistant Principal	Classroom observations, student discipline, scheduling, supporting instruction, data analysis, drive instruction.
Henry-Louis, Marie	ELL Compliance Specialist	Reading coach, ELL monitor, coaches reading strategies, models reading lessons, assists teachers with supporting ELL students.
Moore, Cathy	Instructional Coach	Testing coordinator, instructional coaching, supports common planning.
Chotai, Nimisha	Other	Media Specialist, technology representative, supports literacy and uses of educational technologies.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/19/2022, Lee Montgomery

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.*
0

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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

810

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

15

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	91	103	122	136	131	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	11	10	15	18	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
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	2	2	3	8	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	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	29	152	168	200	197	177	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	923
Attendance below 90 percent	7	7	10	6	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	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	29	152	168	200	197	177	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	923
Attendance below 90 percent	7	7	10	6	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	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%				85%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	80%						74%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%						64%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	89%	46%	50%				85%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	90%						79%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	77%						60%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	83%	61%	59%				77%	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	86%	55%	31%	58%	28%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	87%	57%	30%	58%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2022					
	2019	78%	54%	24%	56%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

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	83%	63%	20%	64%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
05	2022					
	2019	83%	57%	26%	60%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	74%	54%	20%	53%	21%
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	51	65	58	61	71	53	47				
ELL	75	78	64	80	83	60	79				
ASN	89	81		91	92		88				
BLK	78	68		84	90	92	82				
HSP	84	78	64	82	85	68	77				
MUL	89	100		83	90						
WHT	87	81	67	93	91	81	88				
FRL	83	83	72	79	83	67	72				

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	54	60	50	54	80	75	14				
ELL	65	75		63	67		43				
ASN	81	60		76	50		64				
BLK	76			73							
HSP	78	62		71	73		71				
MUL	89			79							
WHT	86	73	62	85	77	74	75				
FRL	74	58		62	62		53				

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	49	70	64	43	55	52	45				
ELL	66	83	80	70	78	62	71				
ASN	90	90		90	90		83				
BLK	76	75	63	68	64	63	61				
HSP	86	76	75	83	75	52	68				
MUL	86	70		86	90						
WHT	86	70	53	87	81	58	84				
FRL	72	68	56	68	66	44	61				

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	80
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	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	639

ESSA Federal Index	
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	74
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	88
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	82
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	77
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	91
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	84
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	77
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?

Overall ELA score of 83% on the FSA was a two-point improvement from 81% on prior year data. Grades 3-5 all made gains of between 2 and 4 points. The math gains were our strongest growth area with 89% achievement level, up 12 points from the prior year and 89% learning gains up 58 points from the prior year. In science, we increased our score by 12 points moving from 71% to 83%. However, our SWD subgroup performed the lowest gaining a 51% overall achievement level in ELA, 61% in math, and 47% in science.

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

The SWD subgroup performed below grade level in ELA dropping from 54% to 51%. This was a 3-point loss. The next lowest performing subgroup was our ELL students, who made a ten-point gain in ELA comparatively. In math, the overall student gain went up by eight points. However, the SWD subgroup only improved their overall math score by seven. In the context of overall gains in ELA increasing by nine points and math increasing by thirty-one points, our SWD subgroup showed minimal improvement.

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

Teachers need additional support in the use of engagement strategies as well as small group and data-informed instruction.

Actions needed to address these areas are as follows: restructuring the intervention delivery model, providing additional teacher and student support in areas of need, and professional development aligned to instructional practice based on student data and teacher observation data.

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

The Math achievement showed the most improvement in all grade levels. Although there was an increase in proficiency, this is still an area of focus. Processes will be implemented to elicit a positive outcome for an improvement in student data which include the following: MTSS Tier III support, data chats, formal and coaching observations, and ongoing data meetings.

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

The action step implemented to enhance student achievement was the targeted intervention support provided by members of the leadership team. We will continue to focus on these processes and adjust them as student data dictates.

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

We will provide school-wide staff development on small group instruction in reading, and math, Instructional coaches will attend PLC meetings to offer support in effective standards-based lesson planning. We will restructure our intervention delivery to meet the needs of all students.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We will provide school-wide staff development in the areas of small group reading, math centers, social-emotional learning, and creating hands-on applicable classroom activities to better immerse students in the learning of the B.E.S.T. standards.

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

We will use diagnostic assessment and common assessment data to identify deficiencies, create differentiated instructional groupings, and monitor student progress. We will have an increased focus on the growth of every student in every grade level by closely monitoring the subgroup data. We will focus on providing standards-based instruction, implementing standards-based learning centers, and providing small group differentiated instruction to support all of our learners.

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.	The area of focus needs to be on our Students With Disabilities subgroup. (SWD) While this group made some marginal gains, there is room for improvement in bolstering this subgroup's performance. The rationale that determined critical need was a look at data comparisons among the SWD subgroup in the ELA and Math subject areas. The data reflected a three-point loss in ELA from 54% to 51% and a marginal gain of seven points from 54% to 61% in math.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, we will increase the proficiency levels of our SWD subgroup by 5% in both ELA and math.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored via classroom walkthroughs and discussions of SWD data points during common planning meetings (strategic instructional strategies for SWD) and data meetings (looking at data points to determine MTSS/enrichment opportunities. Every nine weeks we will continually monitor progress towards grade-level proficiency targets through examination of data combined with strategic planning for targeted instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	We will focus on utilizing scaffolding techniques in teaching the standards to the students. Strategically, the instructor models how to perform a new or difficult task. The instructor and students then work together to perform the task. Through the supportive and challenging learning experiences gained from carefully planned scaffolded learning, instructors will help students become more independent learners. As instructors plan for a lesson, they will consider the various needs of students, including receptive and expressive language, processing speed, and memory. Strategic planning for lessons will present content information in smaller chunks, provide opportunities for additional guided

implemented for this Area of Focus.	practice and utilize repetition. Scaffolding in all content areas will enable us to help SWD, by extending their knowledge to reach more challenging concepts to enrich their learning experience.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Scaffolds are instructional supports teachers intentionally build into their lesson planning to provide students support that is "just right" and "just in time." Scaffolds are put in place to allow all students access to grade-level content within a lesson. Scaffolds allow students to develop the knowledge, skills, and language needed to support their own performance in the future and are intended to be gradually removed as students independently master skills. Each student learns differently. Because of this, some students often fall behind. They simply don't comprehend the material and find themselves being outperformed by their classmates. The scaffolding process addresses this issue. Scaffolding creates a supportive environment with higher levels of engagement between students, teachers, and their peers. Using scaffolding brings together a number of positive practices associated with improved academic outcomes, including peer learning and increased teacher support.

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.

We will provide teachers with professional development through PLC and DP focusing on the needs of SWD.

Person Responsible   Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

SWD students will receive support from both our ESE teachers as well as our interventionists pushing into their classrooms. Monitoring will be conducted via classroom observations, data analysis, and grade-level common planning meetings. Feedback will be provided to teachers based on observations of standards-based instruction in relation to the activities and student evidence used to work with the SWD students.

Person Responsible   Joyce Conley (joyce.conley@ocps.net)

This area of focus will be monitored via our Staffing Specialist, push-in to the classroom to work with students via our ESE teachers. Data will be monitored via the MTSS process and instruction adjusted to meet student needs.

Person Responsible   Joyce Conley (joyce.conley@ocps.net)

#2. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	In the spring 2022 Panorama survey, only 50% of teachers responded that they did not receive adequate feedback concerning their work. Furthermore, only 57% of respondents indicated that the feedback they did receive, was not useful in covering all of the aspects of their instruction.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	As measured by the spring 2023 Panorama survey, we will see an increase of 10% in favorability ratings within the areas of providing feedback categories.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored via the Instructional Framework and the utilization of iObservation to provide more effective feedback with an emphasis on fostering relationships and building teacher capacity through actionable feedback and support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The leadership team compromised of administrators and instructional coaches will utilize the Instructional Framework to conduct calibrated walks to identify the dominant elements and to enhance instructional delivery by providing objective and actionable feedback based on the data calibrations from the observation walks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Through understanding misconceptions, specific instructional strategies, and scaffolding opportunities for instructional elements, teachers will gain specific actionable feedback based on objective observation data that will assist them in making necessary pedagogical changes to more positively impact student achievement. When provided with clear actionable steps, teachers will be better equipped to inform their practice and gain a clearer perspective for improving their craft.

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.

Weekly calibration walks will be conducted by the school leadership team.

| **Person Responsible** | Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net) |

Discussions of relevant domains and trends will be included in common planning and data analysis within PLCs.

| **Person Responsible** | Joyce Conley (joyce.conley@ocps.net) |

Calibrated walkthrough data will be reviewed and discussed weekly by the school leadership team. Coaching cycles will be utilized based on the data.

| **Person Responsible** | Cathy Moore (cathy.moore@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 reviewing the Spring 2022 Annual Stakeholder Survey data, 67% of students responded favorably in relation to the overall social and learning climate of the school. This is a critical area for earning as it impacts how students view their relationships with both teachers and peers in terms of their learning. Only 36% of students responded favorably when asked if other student behavior impacts their own learning.

We will need to integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to the subject material.

By strengthening our school's culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:
Focus on whole child practices that increase cooperative techniques, classroom and school-wide community building, focus on values such as fairness, helpfulness, caring, and responsibility, and encourage students to care about each other and their learning.

The rationale for choosing cooperative learning and community building is to bring students together in an atmosphere of support to systematically focus on academic and social growth. By focusing on student emotional needs utilizing the CASEL framework, academics will be improved as students gain confidence and a better sense of safe self.

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

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of our school building, including our families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with all stakeholders, 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.

We will evaluate the climate and culture for social and emotional learning to implement necessary responsive practices as 67% of student respondents indicated a need for a stronger perception of school climate.

Through the implementation of a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning & leadership, that uses cycles of professional learning to improve teacher motivation strategies we hope to improve upon the 71% our family respondents indicated as an area of growth for our school.

57% of teacher respondents indicated that stronger feedback and coaching to better evaluate the impact of cycles of professional learning will help improve the school climate.

We will monitor, measure, and modify our improvement plan for encouraging and maintaining growth in social and emotional learning & leadership using data-based instructional leadership to positively impact climate and culture. Our SAC, Parent Advisory Council, and teachers will collaboratively work to bolster the 83% rating in terms of stakeholders working together to foster an environment that helps students learn.

We will utilize Panorama survey data in the following areas to gauge further progress:

Student Survey - School Climate, Sense of Belonging
Teachers and Staff - School Climate, School Leadership, Professional Learning About SEL
Family Members - Barriers to Engagement, School Climate