

Orange County Public Schools

# Lake Whitney 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>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Lake Whitney Elementary

1351 WINDEMERE RD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Elizabeth Prince**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/7/2000

<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>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	21%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (66%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](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 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
Prince, Elizabeth	Principal	Duties include serving as instructional leader by providing teachers with a common vision based upon data-based decisions by promoting standards-based instruction in order to maximize student achievement.
Abel, Kristin	Instructional Coach	Duties include serving as Instructional coach for reading, MTSS, PLCs,, beginning teachers and student interns.
Dudek, Nancy	Instructional Media	Duties include serving as classroom coach for teachers to assist them with implementing rigorous reading and learning strategies.
Smirti, Kimberlee	Other	Duties include overseeing the implementation of the curriculum and assessments of students.
Durham, Tambi	Guidance Counselor	Duties include monitoring students mental and emotional health to ensure that students are ready for learning.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 8/7/2000, Elizabeth Prince

**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.*

41

**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.*

2

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

43

### 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>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	21%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (66%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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	68	76	90	92	73	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	510
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	4	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

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

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

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

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

Thursday 7/16/2020

### 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	61	84	78	60	100	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	480
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	3	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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

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

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

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

**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	61	84	78	60	100	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	480
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	3	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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

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

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

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



## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

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	84%	57%	57%	80%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	58%	58%	67%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	52%	53%	56%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	86%	63%	63%	82%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	77%	61%	62%	77%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	48%	51%	60%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	83%	56%	53%	79%	50%	51%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	88%	55%	33%	58%	30%
	2018	89%	55%	34%	57%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	57%	17%	58%	16%
	2018	79%	54%	25%	56%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2019	86%	54%	32%	56%	30%
	2018	76%	55%	21%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	87%	62%	25%	62%	25%

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
	2018	89%	61%	28%	62%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	86%	63%	23%	64%	22%
	2018	87%	62%	25%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	84%	57%	27%	60%	24%
	2018	80%	59%	21%	61%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	83%	54%	29%	53%	30%
	2018	76%	53%	23%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						

### Subgroup Data

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b>
SWD	61	71		45	62		50				
ELL	61	73		78	73						
ASN	89	56		95	100		85				
BLK	60	60	50	67	65		50				
HSP	86	77	58	82	69		93				
WHT	87	70	44	89	77	74	88				
FRL	78	70	60	82	82	64	70				
<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	55	50	36	59	59	50					
ASN	92	68		100	79						
BLK	68	54		74	57						
HSP	67	53	33	77	79	64	82				
WHT	88	74	64	91	77	69	82				
FRL	65	45	22	75	65	52	62				

2017 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	44	29	23	40	65	60					
ELL	50			50							
ASN	86	59		93	94						
BLK	70	73		60	55						
HSP	72	66	42	72	76		64				
WHT	82	68	63	85	76	66	81				
FRL	66	61	50	56	68	53	57				

### 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	76
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	100
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	611
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	77
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	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
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	78
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	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	72
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.**

ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% continues to be of concern with a 50% proficiency level. This is a re-occurring trend with ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% scoring at 53% in 2018 and 56% in 2017. A contributing factor is the lack of differentiation in ELA instruction in fourth and fifth grades.

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

ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% with a proficiency level of 50% showed the greatest decline of 3 percentage points from 56% proficiency level in 2018.

**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.**

Our school grade components scored higher than the state average in all areas on the 2019 FSA. However, in ELA learning gains for the lowest 25 percentile, the gap between Lake Whitney and the state was only three percentage points. Overall proficiency levels in ELA were at 84% while the state was at 56%. A contributing factor is the lack of differentiation in ELA instruction in fourth and fifth grades.

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

Math learning gains showed the most improvement in the 2019 assessment period by increasing two percentage points from 76% proficient in 2018 to 78% in 2019. We offered a competitive math team that was comprised of third through fifth grade students.

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

Lake Whitney had one third grade student, two fourth grade students, and two fifth grade students with two or more EWS. These students were ESE for reading and math, and free and reduced lunch. Our concern is the lack of proficiency or learning gains for these students.

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

1. ELA learning gains for the lowest 25%
2. ELA learning gains for all students
3. Math learning gains for the lowest 25%
4. Our ESE and free and reduced lunch students did not show as much growth as we had hoped

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

## #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** This area of focus comprises of increasing learning gains in ELA lowest quartile and reducing the achievement gap for black students, Hispanic students, and students with disabilities(SWD). The rationale for this area of focus is the learning gains for ELA dropped in 2019 compared to 2018 in the student subgroups of Black, Hispanic, and ESE.

**Measurable Outcome:** We plan on seeing an increase in ELA learning gains for our lowest quartile from 50% proficiency to 53% proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Elizabeth Prince (elizabeth.prince@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will use collaborative lesson planning in PLC meetings to analyze data, prepare for, and implement standards-based instruction focusing on differentiating reading and writing strategies to improve teacher proficiency and student achievement. Members of the leadership team will monitor grade level PLC meetings for fidelity.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers need to identify the individual academic levels of their students in order to differentiate their instruction to match the students' needs.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will be provided additional time to plan differentiated lessons based on culturally responsiveness, social emotional learning, best practices in their PLCs.

**Person Responsible** Elizabeth Prince (elizabeth.prince@ocps.net)

2. Teachers will choose culturally diverse text and deliberate questioning techniques when planning standards-based lessons and units.

**Person Responsible** Kristin Abel (kristin.abel@ocps.net)

3. Teachers will be provided additional time to create formative assessments in their PLCs.

**Person Responsible** Elizabeth Prince (elizabeth.prince@ocps.net)

4. Teachers will analyze student performance on common assessments to determine student progress toward grade level standards.

**Person Responsible** Elizabeth Prince (elizabeth.prince@ocps.net)

5. Teachers will determine appropriate differentiated activities based upon common assessments.

**Person Responsible** Kristin Abel (kristin.abel@ocps.net)

6. Teachers will monitor progress of students regularly and make academic adjustments if students are struggling.

**Person Responsible** Kimberlee Smirti (kimberlee.smirti@ocps.net)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The area of focus is to build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Our rationale is 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 closing the achievement gap with our students.

**Measureable Outcome:**

We will use the Cognia survey to collect and analyze school-wide SEL data. When analyzing the survey results from 2019, fifty-one percent of students agreed that students treat adults with respect. We will utilize class meetings to build an atmosphere of mutual respect between students and adults.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tambi Durham (tambi.durham@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

We will use the distributive leadership model and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. We have developed a SELL team which will attend DPLC training and then train faculty and staff at the school level. 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**

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

**Person Responsible**

Tambi Durham (tambi.durham@ocps.net)

2. Establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students.

**Person Responsible**

Elizabeth Prince (elizabeth.prince@ocps.net)

3. Use a class meeting to examine the current school climate and culture.



**Person Responsible** Tambi Durham (tambi.durham@ocps.net)

4. During PLC meetings, teachers will determine relevant strategies to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration across the school.

**Person Responsible** Elizabeth Prince (elizabeth.prince@ocps.net)

5. Implement strategies for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture.

**Person Responsible** Tambi Durham (tambi.durham@ocps.net)

6. Understand the connections between social and emotional learning and instructional strategies.

**Person Responsible** Kristin Abel (kristin.abel@ocps.net)

7. Use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and social and emotional learning.

**Person Responsible** Kristin Abel (kristin.abel@ocps.net)

8. Using the Cognia survey data, the leadership team will monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts based on through teacher reflection time during PLC meetings..

**Person Responsible** Kristin Abel (kristin.abel@ocps.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**The school leadership team will monitor teacher implementation of differentiated learning opportunities for students my classroom walkthroughs, PLC meetings, school-wide professional development, data meetings, and student led conferences. The leadership PLC will meet regularly to analys school-wide data and trends.**

## 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.

Building a positive school culture includes establishing norms, values, behaviors, climate, and attitudes of the principal, teachers, students, parents, and community members towards learning and teaching. Schools with positive culture present some characteristics such as an attractive classroom climate, teachers who are committed to teaching, student involvement in teaching and learning activities, establishing good relationships between school staff and students, effective management, and teamwork in the school and classroom. Lake Whitney offers many opportunities for stakeholders to have positive interactions with the school. These opportunities include student based incentives and rewards, teacher and staff team building and camaraderie, Parent-Teacher Organization involvement, and community support through Spirit Nights, events, and Teach-in.

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

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