Rolling Hills Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Rolling Hills Elementary

4903 DONOVAN ST, Orlando, FL 32808

https://rollinghillses.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Farah Henderson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/23/2018

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: F (20%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
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 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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

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

Provide the school's vision statement

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership
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
Henderson, Farah	Principal	- Responsible for all operational, behavioral, and academic systems - Oversee instruction and serves as the curriculum leader of the school
Williams, Michele	Instructional Coach	Responsible for supporting and coaching teachers in implementing instruction PK-5.
Holiday, Valencia	Instructional Coach	Responsible for supporting and coaching teachers in implementing mathematics instruction PK-5.
Tondreau-Demosthenes, Natasha	Other	Coordinates the ESE eligibility process when a student does not respond to interventions, coordinates and monitors ESE services, coordinates 504 Plan eligibility process and monitors plans.
Bawden, Korey	Assistant Principal	- Responsible for all operational, behavioral, and academic systems under the direction of the principal - Serves as an instructional and curricular leader
Thompson, Keron	Dean	- Provides discipline support for teachers and classified personnel. - Oversees the mentor program for students - Implements a school-wide discipline plan and provide professional development for teachers.
Jones, Madison	Other	Oversees the MTSS process; focusing on implanting and monitoring intervention for the Lowest 25%, provides student support to Tier 3 students, provides support to Data Leads of each grade level to ensure understanding of data collection and use

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 6/23/2018, Farah Henderson

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.*
1

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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
31

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: F (20%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[Diane Leinenbach](#)
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](#).	

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	24	82	66	63	96	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
Attendance below 90 percent	10	22	28	20	34	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	5	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	2	8	21	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	27	29	26	23	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	1	3	5	5	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	5	7	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	45	31	24	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	3	6	4	14	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	27	29	26	23	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	1	3	5	5	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	5	7	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	45	31	24	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	3	6	4	14	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	38%	57%	57%	28%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	58%	58%	38%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	52%	53%	37%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	51%	63%	63%	30%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	71%	61%	62%	43%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	48%	51%	42%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	56%	56%	53%	31%	55%	55%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey (title spans top of table)

Grade Level Data
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
03	2019	25%	55%	-30%	58%	-33%
	2018	23%	55%	-32%	57%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	57%	-18%	58%	-19%
	2018	16%	54%	-38%	56%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
	2018	33%	55%	-22%	55%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		29%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	62%	-15%	62%	-15%
	2018	25%	61%	-36%	62%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	63%	-11%	64%	-12%
	2018	20%	62%	-42%	62%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		32%				
Cohort Comparison		27%				
05	2019	46%	57%	-11%	60%	-14%
	2018	42%	59%	-17%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		26%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	54%	-1%	53%	0%
	2018	28%	53%	-25%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
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	26	39		40	61						
ELL	38	66		49	72	73	43				
BLK	34	59	65	51	71	72	57				
HSP	52	67		42	65						
FRL	36	61	66	47	73	73	57				

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	29	50		21	44						
ELL	33	44		27	22						
BLK	25	33	33	27	42	45	24				
HSP	43	69		52	57						
FRL	28	39	39	30	46	43	29				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
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	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	460
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
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
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
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	59
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
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

Based on the data from the 2018-2019 FSA, the data component that showed the lowest performances was ELA achievement.

ELA achievement at Rolling Hills was 38% for the 2019 assessment period. This is 10% higher than the 2018 assessment period, which was 28% of students showing proficiency.

Data in this category has consistently been the lowest performance at Rolling Hills Elementary.

Based on 2019-2020 iReady, "End-of Year View", 14% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th-grade students were proficient in ELA. The last iReady diagnostic taken was the Middle of the Year diagnostic.

The contributing factors was low proficiency scores in 3rd grade in 2019, 25%. This score was influenced by limited pull-out time for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students in FBS to meet specific instructional needs.

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

All data components at Rolling Hills increased for the 2019 assessment period. This can be attributed to the focus on standards-based instruction that was implemented during the 2018-2019 school year. The teachers spent their time in PLC's focusing on what the standard was asking and how they could implement it in their classroom.

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

ELA achievement had the largest gap when compared to the state for the 2019 assessment period. The state reports an overall proficiency level in ELA achievement at 56%; whereas, Rolling Hills performed at a proficiency level of 28%, which shows a 19% differential. Incoming 3rd-grade students are not showing proficiency in reading according to the iReady diagnostics.

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

Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% has shown the most improvement from the 2017-18 school year to the 2018-19 school year.

In 2018, 43% of our lowest 25% showed a learning gain. In 2019, the students showed a 28% increase with 71% of our lowest 25% showing a learning gain.

The school identified the lowest 25% from the beginning of the school year and focused on increasing mastery through differentiated instruction with small groups.

Based on the 2019-2020 iReady, "End-of-Year View", 8% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th-grade students were proficient in math. The last iReady diagnostic taken was the Middle of the Year diagnostic

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

There are 69 students at Rolling Hills with two or more early warning indicators.

There are also 142 students who had attendance below 90%.

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

1. Small-Group Instruction
2. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Area of Focus is small group instruction for the 2020-2021 school year. Small group instruction allows for instructors to provide intimate, differentiated and focussed standards-based instruction to increase overall achievement and learning gains. Currently, the overall school proficiency rate for ELA is 38%. Based on 2018-2019 FSA Reading scores 3rd Grade had 25% of students score a level 3 or higher, 4th Grade had 39% of students score a level 3 or higher, and 5th grade had 45% of students score a level 3 or higher. The overall school proficiency rate for Math is 51%. Based on the 2018-2019 FSA Math scores, 3rd grade had 47% of students score a level 3 or higher, 4th grade had 52% of students score a level 3 or higher, and 5th grade had 46% of students score a level 3 or higher. Based on 2019-202 iReady, "End-of Year View", 14% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th-grade students were proficient in ELA. The last iReady diagnostic taken was the Middle of the Year diagnostic. Based on the 2019-2020 iReady, "End-of-Year View", 8% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th-grade students were proficient in math. The last iReady diagnostic taken was the Middle of the Year diagnostic. This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need because it focusses on the needs of individual students.
Measureable Outcome:	For the 2020-2021 school year, students at Rolling Hills Elementary School will show an overall proficiency rate of 48% in ELA. This will show an overall increase of 10%. For the 2020-20201 school year, students at Rolling Hills Elementary Schoo will show an overall proficiency rate of 60% in math. This will show an overall increase of 9%. By the Middle of the Year iReady Diagnostic, 30% of our 3rd, 4th, and 5th-grade students will be showing proficiency for the end-of-year view. By the Middle of the Year iReady Diagnostic, 50% of our 3rd, 4th, and 5th-grade students will be showing proficiency for the end-of-year view. Common assessment data in ELA will show 45% of students performing at or above proficiency. Common assessment data in Math will show 55% of students performing at or above proficiency.
Person responsible for	Farah Henderson (farah.henderson@ocps.net)

monitoring outcome:	
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction delivered through push-in and pull-out support from the leadership team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction allows the teacher to deliver instruction that meets the needs of the individual student. We will plan to differentiate instruction using common assessment data, iReady data, FSA data, and classroom observations. This will allow the teachers and leadership team members to effectively administer standards-based individualized small group instruction to improve overall proficiency in ELA and math. This strategy will allow Rolling Hills to work with a wide range of students to meet their needs within the classroom instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Establish structure and expectations for small-group instruction.
- Leadership team will create expectations for small-group instruction within the classroom.
-Teachers will be provided with expectations and resources during pre-planning week.

Person Responsible	Michele Williams (michele.williams@ocps.net)

Leadership team and teachers will identify students who are at risk for additional small group pull-out instruction.
-Students will be identified using common assessment data, i-Ready data, and past FSA data.
-The list will be fluid based on the list based on assessment data and classroom observations.

Person Responsible	Michele Williams (michele.williams@ocps.net)

Administration will assign leadership team members different classrooms to provide push-in support for small group instruction.
-Leadership team members will be pushing into different classrooms to work with a targeted group of students.
-Leadership team members will use research-based strategies to work with the students on standards-based and remediation instruction.

Person Responsible	Farah Henderson (farah.henderson@ocps.net)

Using periodic common assessment data, teachers will meet in common planning to readjust student grouping and align instructional practices (skills, standards and delivery) to meet individual needs.
-The data will also be used to create new groups and re-align the instruction to best meet students' needs.
-Data will also be monitored to ensure that effective instruction is being used along with conducting classroom observations.

Person Responsible	Korey Bawden (korey.bawden@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is student attendance. Student attendance impacts student learning directly. If students are not in school it is very difficult for them to learn the content and increase their overall proficiency, This was identified as a critical need because we had 142 students at Rolling Hills Elementary with an attendance rate below 90%, this was 35% of our student population.
Measureable Outcome:	During the 2019-2020 school year, 65% of our students had an attendance rate above 90%. For the 2020-2021 school year, 85% of our students will have an attendance rate above 90%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Korey Bawden (korey.bawden@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The school will create a structured attendance system to support students and parents when chronic absenteeism is prevalent. This will include the following: -Communicate with families when students are absent. -Hold workshops for parents -Visit the home when students are not in school
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementing a system of support that utilizes the Parent Engagement Liaison, School Social Worker, Teachers, and Administrators will help to curb chronic student absenteeism and promote positive school attendance. Students need to be in school to learn and this strategy will help keep the focus on improving student attendance.

Action Steps to Implement

The school registrar will identify students who are chronically absent.
-The registrar will hold monthly meetings with the Assistant Principal and School Social Worker.

Person Responsible	Korey Bawden (korey.bawden@ocps.net)

Teachers will identify students that have been absent from their class for an extended amount of time.
-Teachers will be asked to provide weekly updates on students who have been absent from class.
-The Parent Engagement Liaison will reach out to the parents of these students to check on the student and encourage student attendance.

Person Responsible	Josephine Anderson (josephine.anderson@ocps.net)

The school will host different parent workshops throughout the school year
-The school will host a Meet the Teacher event
-The school will host an Open-House
-The school will host an ELA night
-The school will host a STEAM night

These events will encourage and promote student attendance. The school will also reach out

to parents of students who are chronically absent and personally invite them to these events to invite them into the school community.

Person Responsible Korey Bawden (korey.bawden@ocps.net)

The School Social Worker and Assistant Principal will conduct attendance meetings and home visits for chronically absent students
-Attendance meetings will be held for students who are absent 5 days in a 10 day period or 10 days in a 30 day period.
-Home visits will be conducted for students that are absent and we are unable to reach the parent/guardian.

Person Responsible Korey Bawden (korey.bawden@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: - Students with two or more indicators.
Measureable Outcome:	Improvement in Early Warning Systems indicator data - Students with two or more indicators is currently at 15% of our student population. By the end of the 2020-2021 school year that number will decrease to 10%. Based on the Cognia 2019-2020 survey, only 52% of students said that they agree that there "Principal and teachers ask me what I think about school. In 2020-2021 we will increase that to 70% of students saying that my Principal and teachers ask me what I think about school.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Korey Bawden (korey.bawden@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 organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies.

| **Person Responsible** | Farah Henderson (farah.henderson@ocps.net) |

Establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning at your school with adults and students
-Send a list of students who are displaying two or more indicators to their current classroom teacher.

| **Person Responsible** | Farah Henderson (farah.henderson@ocps.net) |

Use a process to examine the current school climate and culture

| **Person Responsible** | Korey Bawden (korey.bawden@ocps.net) |

Determine relevant strategies to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration across the school
-Implement strategies for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture

| **Person Responsible** | Londrea Redding (londrea.redding@ocps.net) |

Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts

| **Person Responsible** | Farah Henderson (farah.henderson@ocps.net) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Area of focus:
The area of focus for our school are small-group instruction and attendance. Both of those areas are addressed within the areas of focus. We chose those areas because they will create the greatest opportunities for students to increase their proficiency. When students work in small groups it allows for differentiated and focused instruction. When students are in school it allows them to learn the material and work with the teacher to correct any misconceptions.

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 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, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. The 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.