

Orange County Public Schools

Windy Ridge K 8



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Windy Ridge K 8

3900 BEECH TREE DR, Orlando, FL 32835

<https://windyridgek8.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Karena Chunoo

Start Date for this Principal: 6/28/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	48%
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 (74%) 2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (77%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Windy Ridge K 8

3900 BEECH TREE DR, Orlando, FL 32835

<https://windyridgek8.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)
Combination School PK-8	No	48%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

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.

To ensure that every child has a promising and successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Chunoo, Karena	Principal	Windy Ridge K-8 is an International School of Innovation. As the leader of an International School of Innovation, the principal is responsible for setting the vision and leading the work of the four pillars of excellence; Language, Arts, STEM, and Citizenship. In addition, supporting the professional learning community model with on-going, data-driven collaboration focused on project based learning structures and standard based outcomes is paramount. For the principal, closing the achievement gap between our English Language Learners continues to be a high priority this year. Additionally, as a leader in the community she is the representative of the school in establishing and maintaining community based partners.
Herrera, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Herrera provides various resources to the staff and parents. She analyzes data with teachers and guides them in providing data-based instruction. She collaborates with the instructional coaches to assess students early and ensure that interventions are in place. She participates in common planning to ensure that lessons coincide with state standards. She helps create the master schedule that complies with district and state mandates. She assists the principal in hiring, supervising, and evaluating faculty and staff members.
Briley, Vicki	Staffing Specialist	Ms. Briley facilitates meetings in the MTSS process with the MTSS team. She collaborates with the teachers to implement the proper interventions based on the students' needs. Ms. Briley provides professional development to staff on the MTSS process. She works with the school psychologist to identify specific student needs and assisting with Tier 3 interventions. Ms. Briley also completes all ESE documentation for compliance.
Ly, Refman	Dean	Mr. Ly provides an educational atmosphere which promotes student learning, student achievement, and student discipline. He also implements School Board policies designed to maintain proper student discipline.
MacElhiney, Siobhan	Other	Ms. MacElhiney designs, executes and assesses individualized programs based on the needs of our students. She works with the Math and Reading Coaches to ensure interventions are provided to support areas of weaknesses in all grade levels. Ms. MacElhiney leads our tutors as they work together with students to close learning gaps.
McKenzie, Gina	Instructional Coach	Ms. McKenzie provides research-based suggestions for intervention and instruction in reading. She provides guidance on all reading curriculum and intervention programs. She supports data collection, assists in data analysis, and provides professional development opportunities for all staff members. Ms. McKenzie works with teachers to implement Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		interventions. Additionally, she oversees and participates in common planning and helps create formative assessments. She also works with new teachers to place them with mentors and provide professional development opportunities.
Velez, Juvi	Instructional Coach	Ms. Velez provides research-based suggestions for intervention and instruction in reading. She provides guidance on all math curriculum and intervention programs. She supports data collection, assists in data analysis, and provides professional development opportunities for all staff members. She works with teachers to implement Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions. Additionally, she oversees and participates in common planning and helps create formative assessments.
VanSickle, Keri	School Counselor	Ms. Van Sickle works with students regarding all guidance issues specific to Elementary School. She teaches character development classes weekly throughout the school and works in small groups with students with behavior, social skills, divorce, or death issues.
Peters, Tammie	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Peters fosters a positive climate and safe environment that promotes both academic and social-emotional growth of all students by collaborating with all stakeholders. She supports and facilitates PLC's to ensure lessons are standards aligned, cognitively engaging, and include best practice strategies. She collaborates with stakeholders to analyze data and make instructional decisions to ensure high expectations for student learning that will lead all students to both academic and social-emotional success. Mrs. Peters monitors and supports high quality instruction through building teacher capacity while conducting observations with actionable feedback. Mrs. Peters ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS procedures and following state statute. She helps create the master schedule that complies with district and state mandates. She assists the principal in hiring, supervising, and evaluating faculty and staff members.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/28/2022, Karena Chunoo

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

90

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,178

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

13

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

7

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	9	115	135	140	132	155	123	100	104	0	0	0	0	1013
Attendance below 90 percent	3	27	23	31	26	33	15	12	20	0	0	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	2	9	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	5	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	36	31	22	21	3	0	0	0	0	115
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	25	20	23	17	6	0	0	0	0	92
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	26	17	16	17	6	0	0	0	0	83

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/22/2022

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	6	123	133	123	141	186	108	111	97	0	0	0	0	1028	
Attendance below 90 percent	3	15	15	16	16	18	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	94	
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	7	2	10	7	3	0	0	0	0	32	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	14	24	8	8	14	0	0	0	0	68	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	9	2	4	7	0	0	0	0	28	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	13	0	0	0	0	36	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	18	0	0	0	0	33	
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	1	0	0	10	11	6	11	21	0	0	0	0	60	

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	3	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		

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	6	123	133	123	141	186	108	111	97	0	0	0	0	1028
Attendance below 90 percent	3	15	15	16	16	18	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	7	2	10	7	3	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	14	24	8	8	14	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	6	9	2	4	7	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	13	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	18	0	0	0	0	33
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	1	0	0	10	11	6	11	21	0	0	0	0	60	

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	3	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		

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	69%	57%	55%				78%	62%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	64%						66%	60%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						63%	55%	54%
Math Achievement	76%	41%	42%				82%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	73%						63%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%						56%	54%	52%
Science Achievement	76%	57%	54%				74%	56%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	63%	59%				84%	74%	78%

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	65%	55%	10%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	70%	57%	13%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	56%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
06	2022					
	2019	74%	52%	22%	54%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
07	2022					
	2019	84%	48%	36%	52%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
08	2022					
	2019	89%	54%	35%	56%	33%
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	75%	63%	12%	64%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	62%	57%	5%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
06	2022					
	2019	84%	43%	41%	55%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
07	2022					
	2019	93%	49%	44%	54%	39%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
08	2022					
	2019	61%	36%	25%	46%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-93%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	86%	49%	37%	48%	38%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	84%	66%	18%	71%	13%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	95%	63%	32%	61%	34%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%

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	25	44	53	37	50	52	38				
ELL	55	64	62	67	67	60	63	97	72		
ASN	83	81		90	81		86		94		
BLK	58	73	69	55	67	68	61				
HSP	63	58	62	71	69	65	69	95	77		
MUL	50			79							
WHT	77	63	69	85	76	67	86	88	93		
FRL	64	63	70	67	69	60	73	96	66		
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	33	52	36	34	41	29	27				
ELL	59	74	71	62	48	48	48	59	72		
ASN	87	76		82	54		84	75	86		
BLK	58	58		54	35	27	57		53		
HSP	67	72	68	67	47	46	55	74	80		
WHT	78	67	60	80	50	47	79	90	91		
FRL	62	62	53	64	46	44	53	71	81		
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	59	58	54	53	46	33	43	50			
ELL	62	65	65	73	65	65	53	60	59		
ASN	94	67		97	71		88	100	100		
BLK	74	62	50	72	49	40	62				

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
HSP	64	63	63	75	61	60	60	68	86		
WHT	87	70	67	88	70	57	85	91	89		
FRL	70	65	62	77	62	57	65	73	84		

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	72
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	720
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	66
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	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	64
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	68
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	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	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	68
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?

ELA proficiency SWD and ELL needs attention

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

Elementary ELA Proficiency

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

A deep understanding of MTSS, Intentional planning instructional strategies for ESE and ELL students, were contributing factors for the decrease in academic achievement.

Teachers will learn and implement instructional strategies discussed in PLC's in order to decrease the achievement gap and provide targeted instruction to in both foundational and comprehension skills.

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

The most improvement was shown in in the Lowest 25% in math.

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

Strategic support was provided to students in the Lowest 25%. Additional walkthroughs from Math Coach and an increase focus on math interventions during PLC time.

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

Continuing rich data driven conversations that lead to intentional instruction to close achievement gaps during PLC's with English Language Arts and ensuring that the new ELA BEST standards are implemented.

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.

Teachers will attend IMPACT, BEST standards, Defined Learning, SIPPS training as part of ongoing professional development.

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

Additional focus on MTSS procedures and targeted staff to work with SWD and ELL's. Instructional opportunities will be provided with after school tutoring.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

When looking at subgroup data, it is evident that we must take a closer look at core instruction in ELA. Our SWD and ELL population scored significantly lower. In order to support these students we must continue to improve our MTSS procedures and track the progress of identified students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will see substantial improvement in the academic achievement of our subgroups by providing and monitoring differentiation. Our goal is to increase ELA proficiency with Students with Disabilities from 25% to 35% and ELL students from 55% to 60%.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this with formal progress monitoring meetings, classroom walkthrough data, and time on task after school tutoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karena Chunoo (karena.chunoo@ocps.net)

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

Teachers will be supported in all phases of the planning process with additional guidance and support for strategically planning for differentiation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Differentiated instruction consistently yields positive results across a broad range of targeted groups. Differentiated instructional strategies allows for a deep understanding of student needs.

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. Structured planning that focuses on differentiated assessment task of student learning during PLC's.
2. Professional development opportunities that support enrichment and intervention of learning.
3. Walkthroughs to include targeted differentiated strategies discussed with specific and actionable feedback.

Person Responsible

Karena Chunoo (karena.chunoo@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**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 was chosen based on school proficiency score.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase ELA proficiency from 69% to 75%.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this area of focus with classroom walkthrough and progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karena Chunoo (karena.chunoo@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The evidence based strategies being implemented for this area of focus is Professional Learning Communities and staff development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

PLCs allow educators opportunities to directly improve teaching and learning. PLCs allow teachers an easy way to share best practices and brainstorm innovative ways to improve learning and drive student achievement. PLC's will focus on standards aligned instruction, small group instruction, student engagement, and best practices.

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. Structured planning in all core content areas with the support of content area coaches as well as the ECS.
2. Staff development opportunities for implementing ELL/ESE strategies across both content and curricular resources.
3. Consistent classroom visits from school administration and teams followed by specific and actionable feedback.
4. Work with teachers to ensure culturally aware lessons are taken place within units of instruction.

Person Responsible

Karena Chunoo (karena.chunoo@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.

Windy Ridge K-8 is an International School of Innovation. Our school is built upon four pillars of excellence: Language, Arts, STEM, and Citizenship. These four pillars are catalyst for celebration of the rich tapestry of diversity that we have every day. Silverhawk students come from many countries, backgrounds, religions and socio-economic groups. In order to recognize our diverse student population, you will see 25 international flags adorning the entrance way into our school. Our pillars of excellence are interwoven into community celebrated events like Heritage and History, Lunar New Year, Dawali Chinese Mooncake Day, and Ramadan so that each and every Silverhawk family feels embraced and connected. In order to develop students' social skills and promote positive behavior Windy Ridge is a Caring School Community. Through direct teaching of responsibility, empathy, and cooperation, students feel heard, known, and cared for by the school community. Students become intrinsically motivated to contribute productively to the local and global community. They feel invested in, and where they know they matter.

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

Principal and Assistant Principals oversee all aspects of our positive school culture and climate. Our School Counselors provide support in crises, social and emotional learning, and serves as our schools mental health designees. Teachers attend professional development in SEL and use social and emotional learning to strengthen and build academic expertise in all students. The Dean of Students addresses behavior concerns using restorative practice model as well as celebrates academic success by promoting and organizing Student of the Month and weekly positive rewards through Hawk Bucks and Golden Tickets. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps.