

Orange County Public Schools

# William Frangus Elementary



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# William Frangus Elementary

380 KILLINGTON WAY, Orlando, FL 32835

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Decheryl Britton**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/13/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (41%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

## **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](http://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**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Britton, DeCheryl	Principal	Mrs. Britton is the building level administrator who oversees the daily school operations and curricula implementation school wide. In addition, she ensures the fiscal and non-fiscal resources are appropriately utilized to foster a well-rounded learning environment for students and staff, and routine updates to community and staff in regards to district-wide initiatives and requirements are communicated to all stakeholders.
Webster, Arlene	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Webster is the 3rd-5th grade ELA Coach and 4th and 5th grade Writing Coach. She plans, models, and provides support to teachers and students to help with increasing teachers' instructional pedagogy and students' proficiency levels. In addition, Mrs. Webster is the beginning teacher lead coordinator and the FSA testing administrator.
Glover, Ashley	Instructional Coach	Ms. Ashley Glover is the Kindergarten- 2nd grade Instructional Coach for ELA and Math & MTSS Coordinator. She plans, models, and provides support to teachers and students to help with increasing teachers' instructional pedagogy and students' proficiency levels. As the MTSS coordinator, she oversees the intervening process for students who need additional academic support and/or a diversified educational plan.
Brooks, Janelle	Guidance Counselor	Ms. Janelle Brooks is the Guidance Counselor who ensures that the social-emotional wellbeing of all students are taken into account when addressing academic and behavioral needs.
Latham, Jalma	Dean	Mrs. Latham is the Administrative Dean who oversees school wide discipline as well as having an academic focus on 4th grade math. She plans, models, and provides support to teachers and students to help with increasing teachers' instructional pedagogy and students' proficiency levels. In addition, she is the MTSS Behavior Coordinator overseeing the intervention process for students who need additional supports to foster a safe and productive learning environment.
Ransom, Alecia	Other	Ms. Ransom is the Staffing Specialist/Curriculum Compliance Teacher. She identifies, monitors, and staffs students based upon their needs as depicted through the MTSS process and then transitioning to the individual exceptional student plan. In addition, she oversees the parent leadership council and monitors and maintains ELL compliance.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Monday 6/13/2016, Decheryl Britton

**Number of teachers with a 2019 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 2019 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.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

35

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (41%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	

<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year**

**The number of students by 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	13	62	71	77	86	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	390
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	15	15	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

**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	2	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 7/8/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	13	3	8	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	5	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	25	32	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

**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	2	1	4	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

**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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Prior Year - Updated**

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	13	3	8	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	5	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	25	32	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

**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	2	1	4	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	50%	57%	57%	44%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	58%	58%	57%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	52%	53%	45%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	53%	63%	63%	50%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	48%	61%	62%	51%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27%	48%	51%	37%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	51%	56%	53%	41%	55%	55%

<b>EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey</b>							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

### Grade Level Data

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

<b>ELA</b>						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
	2018	38%	55%	-17%	57%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	57%	-15%	58%	-16%
	2018	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
	2018	43%	55%	-12%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

<b>MATH</b>						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	46%	61%	-15%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	63%	-20%	64%	-21%
	2018	48%	62%	-14%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
	2018	47%	59%	-12%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	53%	-5%
	2018	39%	53%	-14%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data**

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	38	42	28	50	36	30				
ELL	41	61	62	48	47	36	53				
BLK	49	62	70	49	46	21	49				
HSP	42	45		60	50		56				
WHT	64	60		59	48		43				
FRL	45	55	55	48	46	29	44				

2018 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	38	33	37	45	38	27				
ELL	26	40		44	40						
BLK	41	57	47	45	48	44	37				
HSP	41	38	27	59	39	9	36				
WHT	58	77		52	65						
FRL	45	56	41	48	46	37	38				

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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
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
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	55
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends**

As identified on FSA 2019 Math learning gains and bottom 25% showed the lowest performance. In comparison with FSA 2018 Math data, learning gains and bottom 25% dropped as compared to the FSA 2017 Math data. Some contributing factors for the low performance encompass teacher preparation for delivery of instruction, and inconsistent student monitoring and intervening.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline**

As identified on FSA 2019 Math, the bottom 25% showed the greatest decline from 37% to 27% being proficient/show learning gains. Contributing factor for the decline is inconsistent student monitoring and intervening.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends**

The greatest gap compared to state average on FSA 2019 is the Lowest 25th percentile (bottom 25%) in Math. Some contributing factors for the low performance encompass teacher preparation for delivery of instruction, and inconsistent student monitoring and intervening.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

As indicated on the 2019 Science Assessment, 5th grade science performance increased by 10 points from the 2018 Science Assessment (41% to 51%). Science teachers and leadership team created lesson plans that supported the standards coupled with hands-on experiments to scaffold student learning and deepen their understanding of science concepts. Science Saturday enrichment also played a vital part in the academic success.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Attendance below 90% increased from 57 to 65. Additional monitoring of students' attendance with the joint collaboration of the attendance team and social worker is an area to more frequently monitor to ensure families are provided with additional support from the school and/or related services to assist with increasing student school attendance when applicable.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year**

1. Math Bottom 25%
2. Math Learning Gains
3. Math Proficiency

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Data shows a trend of the bottom 25% in math continuing to drop in academic performance.

**Measureable Outcome:** The expectation is that the bottom 25% in math will increase from 27% to 40% as measured by the FSA 19 Math state assessment compared to FSA 21 Math assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Differentiated small group instruction based on whole group and common assessment data. This will be monitored through mini assessment data and teacher observations.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** It will meet the needs of all learners and increase fluency and accuracy.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers will collaborate during common planning to plan for differentiated whole group and small group instruction that is culturally relevant. Professional learning communities will meet to discuss common assessments and next steps for targeted instruction. In addition, teachers will conduct student data chats to hold students accountable for their learning and academic success.

**Person Responsible** DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

Administration will conduct teacher data chats to ensure consistent data monitoring and targeted instructional support for identified students as well as conduct classroom observations.

**Person Responsible** DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Data shows a trend of the learning gains in math continuing to drop in academic performance- 2017 68%, 2018 51%, 2019 48%

**Measureable Outcome:** The expectation is that 55% of 5th grade students taking the math state assessment will show a learning gain as compared to 48% in 2019.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Students will use math academic vocabulary to orally communicate with peers and teacher as well as in written form to deepen their understanding of the math concept/skill. Monitoring will be done through peer observation, coach, and principal observation with actionable feedback.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Through these multiple processing methods, students will gain greater automaticity with mathematics concepts as they will see the content, write it, and speak it many times.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Provide teachers with ongoing various professional learning opportunities that allow them to gain more competence in the area of engaging students in academic discourse conversations and writing across the content area. In addition, teachers will share successful strategies during professional learning communities to continue to promote a growth mindset towards development of self efficacy.

**Person Responsible** DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

Coach and principal will monitor through classroom walks/observations on a regular basis and provide feedback to teachers on instructional methodologies to improve academic discourse and writing across the content area to improve classroom instruction.

**Person Responsible** DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

Teachers will provide immediate feedback to students in regards to verbal and written communication as it relates to the standard(s) in whole group and small group work assignments and/or discussions.

**Person Responsible** Jalma Latham (jalma.latham@ocps.net)



**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The achievement gap for the Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below was 41% as indicated on the ESSA FSA 2019 performance.

**Measureable Outcome:** The expectation is that the Students with Disabilities subgroup performance will increase to 42% or higher on the ESSA FSA 21 state assessment performance.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Increase our systematic use of explicit instruction during whole group instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explicit instruction will provide the opportunity for more examples and non-examples as well as language to facilitate student understanding, anticipate common misconceptions, highlight essential content, and remove distracting information.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. ESE professional development on- learning strategies through district and school based professional development opportunities.

**Person Responsible** Alecia Ransom (alecia.ransom@ocps.net)

Professional Learning Community- analyzing common assessment data and identifying actionable next steps through the continuous improvement model process.

**Person Responsible** DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

General Education teacher, Support Facilitator and Staffing specialist will collaborate and determine best practices for explicit instruction based on the standard during common planning, professional learning communities, IEP meetings, and ESE data teacher data chats.

**Person Responsible** Alecia Ransom (alecia.ransom@ocps.net)

The leadership team will monitor the use of explicit instructional strategies by classroom observations, common assessment data and i-Ready weekly data outcomes.

**Person Responsible** DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

**#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:

**Measureable Outcome:** Anticipated impact of a culture and climate on student achievement

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Janelle Brooks (janelle.brooks@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis 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:** In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. 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 a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organization improvement and change.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Staff will understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies through the District Professional Learning Community.

**Person Responsible** DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

The school based SEL team, will monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts.

**Person Responsible** DeCheryl Britton (decheryl.britton@ocps.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**The leadership team will provide ongoing daily classroom support to teachers and students as well as monitoring student data. In addition, the leadership team will participate in monthly leadership classwalks identifying areas of support that will be addressed through professional development as needed, and assisting with developing actionable action steps to address on the spot identified needs.**

## Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build

academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.