

Orange County Public Schools

Oak Hill Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Oak Hill Elementary

11 S HIAWASSEE RD, Orlando, FL 32835

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

Demographics

Principal: Cicely Marks

Start Date for this Principal: 6/16/2020

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 White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: D (37%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 2/9/2021.

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 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
Marks, Cicely	Principal	Serves as instructional leader and responsible for the overall performance of the school, teacher evaluations and continual monitoring of the School Improvement Plan with the involvement of the School Advisory Committee
Welch, Pamela	Instructional Coach	Develops curriculum related support materials, leads Curriculum Planning Team projects and teacher meetings, provides support for the unpacking of core content standards and programs, assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection and analysis, plans/provides professional development and school improvement plan implementation process.
Prater, Robert	Dean	Provides guidance and leadership in the area of student conduct and the development of making parent/student/teacher/school connections.
Weaver-Baker, Terica	Guidance Counselor	Provides support and guidance in meeting the overall needs of students. Conducts MTSS related meetings as needed, for the purposes of intervention, parent communication and student guidance.
Medrano, Tamara	Instructional Coach	Coordinates guidance on the school reading and math plan, provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III interventions of reading/math plans with specific focus on decreasing the disproportionate classification in Special Education and English Language Learners.
Mohamed, Roshan	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/16/2020, Cicely Marks

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

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 White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: D (37%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	35	73	64	92	72	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	404
Attendance below 90 percent	12	9	10	20	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	25	17	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	25	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	19	17	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	0
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

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	78	89	75	75	105	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
Attendance below 90 percent	8	11	7	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	5	0	5	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	1	7	19	28	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	25	46	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	

Students with two or more indicators 1 0 1 17 25 25 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 69

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	

Retained Students: Current Year 0 0 2 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4

Students retained two or more times 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 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	

Number of students enrolled 78 89 75 75 105 75 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 497

Attendance below 90 percent 8 11 7 7 7 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 47

One or more suspensions 5 0 5 2 6 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 23

Course failure in ELA or Math 1 1 7 19 28 33 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 89

Level 1 on statewide assessment 0 0 0 25 46 35 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 106

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	

Students with two or more indicators 1 0 1 17 25 25 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 69

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	

Retained Students: Current Year 0 0 2 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4

Students retained two or more times 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 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	47%	57%	57%	44%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	58%	58%	45%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	52%	53%	38%	48%	48%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	59%	63%	63%	52%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	62%	61%	62%	41%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	48%	51%	24%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	42%	56%	53%	28%	55%	55%

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	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
	2018	50%	55%	-5%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	57%	-15%	58%	-16%
	2018	36%	54%	-18%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
	2018	40%	55%	-15%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
	2018	50%	61%	-11%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	63%	-11%	64%	-12%
	2018	48%	62%	-14%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	54%	57%	-3%	60%	-6%
	2018	51%	59%	-8%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	37%	54%	-17%	53%	-16%
	2018	27%	53%	-26%	55%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	14	35	25	9	35	29					
ELL	43	47	25	59	66	45	31				
BLK	47	42	28	57	60	38	44				
HSP	43	50	35	53	63	42	31				
WHT	53	50		82	75						
FRL	45	46	35	55	58	35	47				

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	8	25	29	24	20	9	8				
ELL	25	33	35	35	34	22					
BLK	46	43	38	51	38	22	26				
HSP	38	41	31	45	43	27	33				
WHT	35	36		67	36						
FRL	43	46	39	51	39	24	30				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	47
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	53

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	377
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
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	46
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	46
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	
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	65
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	47
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 performance was the lowest 25% learning gains for ELA. In Math 31% of our lowest 25% of students made gains, which is down 7% from the previous year score of 38%. Data in this category from the past three years show this is a trend. The contributing factors were the limited time spent teaching foundational reading skills as well as Tier III structure and implementation. This was also an area of concern within the 2019/2020 iReady and common assessment data.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was the ELA lowest 25th percentile. In 2018 38% of the lowest 25th percentile were proficient compared to 31% in 2019. The contributing factors were the limited time spent teaching foundational reading skills as well as Tier III structure and implementation. This was also an area of concern within the 2019/2020 iReady and common assessment data.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to state average was the ELA lowest 25th percentile, in 2019 the state average was 53% compared the school average of 31% showing a gap of 22 percentage points. The contributing factors were the limited time spent teaching foundational reading skills as well as Tier III structure and implementation. This was also an area of concern within the 2019/2020 iReady and common assessment data.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math learning gains. 41% of students, in 2018, made learning gains in math compared to 62% showing increases in 2019. New actions that were taken in this area include: adjusting the math block to include whole group and small group instruction, math intervention two times a week and math tutoring before and afterschool.

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

Based on the EWS data potential areas of concern are attendance and both ELA and Math course failure. Most recent data shows 22% of third graders have an attendance rate below 90 percent. Data also indicates a course failure rate of 30 percent in ELA and Math for 3rd-5th grade students.

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

1. Learning gains for lowest 25th percentile in ELA.
2. Proficiency in ELA, Math and Science
3. Social and Emotional Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Three year trend data shows a decrease in overall proficiency, learning gains, and learning gains among the bottom 25th percentile. School wide decreases in proficiency indicate a need to examine core instruction. Decreases in overall learning gains and learning gains among the lowest quartile reflect the need for explicit instruction and systematic interventions. Instructional practice specifically related to standards aligned instruction helps to ensure that a higher level of learning is attained and guides teachers in the planning, implementation and assessment of student learning.

Measureable Outcome: By increasing the rigor and effectiveness of standards based instruction, proficiency in ELA will increase from 47% to 57%, learning gains will increase from 44% to 58%, and learning gains in the bottom 25th percentile will increase from 31% to 52%. Math proficiency will increase from 59% to 65%, learning gains will increase from 62% to 65%, and learning gains in the bottom 25th percentile will increase from 39% to 48%. Science proficiency will increase from 42% to 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will effectively implement differentiated small group instruction for all students. We will use iReady Diagnostic Assessments and SIPPS to identify deficiencies and monitor student progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy was selected because teaching is focused precisely on what the students need to learn next to move forward. Ongoing observation of students combined with systematic progress monitoring assessments enables teachers to form groups of students who fit a distinct instructional profile and address their specific needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Based on classroom walk-through data, teachers will be tiered and provided with coaching support based on need. Teachers identified as Tier III will go through a full coaching cycle in order to support growth in identified areas.

Person Responsible Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

Teachers will be provided with ongoing professional development monthly on the following: SIPPS, Canvas, Literably, Guided Reading, Differentiated instruction/UDL Principles, Writing across the curriculum, and Integration of digital resources.

Person Responsible Pamela Welch (pamela.welch@ocps.net)

Common Assessment and iReady data will be monitored and serve as evidence that professional development, coaching and feedback is having effectively increased student achievement in Reading and Math.

Person Responsible Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

Intense focus on foundational reading skills in Kindergarten through Second and remediation of foundational skills in 3rd-5th grade. Teachers will be provided with professional

development on holistic approach to reading which includes phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, writing and comprehension.

Person Responsible Roshan Mohamed (roshan.mohamed@ocps.net)

Instructional and support staff will be provided with professional learning to include: the instructional framework, differentiating instruction, guided reading and the use of close reading strategies across the curriculum.

Person Responsible Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

Establish Structure and Expectations for Common Planning - Implementing the use of the Common Planning Protocol

Person Responsible Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

Provide teachers with expectations for lesson planning along with lesson planning checklist during pre-planning

Person Responsible Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

Leadership team members will participate in all common planning meetings to assist with standards deconstruction, aligning tasks and activities to the depth of knowledge of the standards and the streamlined instructional framework

Person Responsible Pamela Welch (pamela.welch@ocps.net)

Redesign the MTSS Process and Implementation of Tier III Instruction - During pre-planning, teachers will be provided with an overview of the MTSS process to include the purpose, common language, components of MTSS and data collection and forms

Person Responsible Tamara Medrano (tamara.medrano@ocps.net)

MTSS meetings will be conducted monthly with instructional staff to monitor the effectiveness of core, Tier II and Tier III instruction.

Person Responsible Tamara Medrano (tamara.medrano@ocps.net)

i-Ready instructional grouping profiles will be used to form intervention and enrichment groups.

Person Responsible Tamara Medrano (tamara.medrano@ocps.net)

Teachers will maintain a data spreadsheet which includes student performance on common assessments, iReady and intervention progress which will be used to make informed data based instructional decisions.

Person Responsible Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Walkthroughs

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Most recent ESSA data reveals that Students With Disabilities have scored below the 41% Federal index for two consecutive years with an average of 26% proficiency. In addition, subgroup students continue to fall below the district and state averages in both proficiency and learning gains. Classroom walkthroughs are a key component to improving and sustaining student achievement. With a focus on targeted walkthroughs and actionable feedback, Leadership Team members will be able to equip teachers with actionable feedback surrounding instructional best practices which will increase student achievement.

Measureable Outcome: By increasing the effectiveness of classroom walkthroughs and targeted feedback, the number of Students With Disabilities scoring below the federal index will increase from 26% to 45% exceeding the federal index of 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Oak Hill will utilize distributive leadership to provide teachers with continuous feedback on the use of high yield instructional strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: When classroom walkthroughs are utilized as a tool to guide a cycle of continuous improvement by focusing on instruction, a collaborative culture is developed. Classroom walkthroughs provide teachers and administrators with an opportunity to examine instructional strategies and techniques while implementing best practices which will increase student engagement, motivation and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Principal Will Establish a Classroom Walkthrough Schedule for all Leadership Team Members to Include Targeted "Look Fors."

*Instructional Coach/Resource Teachers - Instructional Strategies and Best Practices as it relates to instruction in core content areas to include: standards based culturally relevant instruction, use of academic notebooks, writing across the curriculum, the use of close reading strategies, engagement, academic discourse and the use of technology

*MTSS Coach - Differentiated small group instruction

*Staffing Specialist - Use of accommodations, systematic explicit instruction, scaffolded supports, flexible grouping and assistive and instructional technologies

*Guidance Counselor - Evidence of SEL implementation to include the effective use of intrapersonal, interpersonal and decision making skills

*Dean - Evidence of SEL implementation and Positive Behavior Supports

*Media Specialist - Integration of technology/digital learning

Person Responsible Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

Build Capacity of Coaches and Leadership Team - Leadership Team members will engage in professional learning to include: Clinical Educator, Facilitative Coaching Series and Advanced Coaching Academy

Person Responsible Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

Build Capacity of Coaches and Leadership Team - Leadership Team members will be provided with opportunities to lead school-wide initiatives to include: PBIS, Social Emotional Learning, MTSS, After School Tutoring, Digital Curriculum Implementation, Common Planning Meetings and Curriculum Nights

Person Responsible Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

Implementation of Coaching Cycle Based on Walkthrough Data

Person Responsible Pamela Welch (pamela.welch@ocps.net)

PLC meetings will be utilized to establish clear expectations related to the purpose and process of conducting classroom walkthroughs in addition to the Corrective Programs Classroom Walkthrough tool.

Person Responsible Roshan Mohamed (roshan.mohamed@ocps.net)

The Leadership Team will meet weekly to establish a focus for subsequent walkthroughs by working with teachers to identify the “look-fors” or the specific elements/effective instruction or guiding principles of learning that they wish to target for implementation.

Person Responsible Roshan Mohamed (roshan.mohamed@ocps.net)

The Leadership Team will meet weekly to establish a focus for subsequent walkthroughs by working with teachers to identify the “look-fors” or the specific elements/effective instruction or guiding principles of learning that they wish to target for implementation.

Person Responsible Pamela Welch (pamela.welch@ocps.net)

Classroom walkthrough trends and data will be discussed weekly during Leadership Team Meeting and shared with teachers during weekly common planning meetings

Person Responsible Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

Classroom walkthrough trends and data will be discussed weekly during Leadership Team Meeting and shared with teachers during weekly common planning meetings

Person Responsible Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@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:

Measureable Outcome: With the implementation of Social and Emotional Learning school-wide, the percentage of Students With Disabilities that are scoring below the 41% federal index will increase from 26% to 45%. In addition, the number of students with an attendance rate below 90% will decrease from 64 to 32.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Terica Weaver-Baker (terica.weaver-baker@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Distributive leadership and social and emotional learning will be used to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. OHES will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. OHES will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessment, 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 change and improvement. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model, OHES can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and social and emotional learning strategies and resources to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise.

Person Responsible Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

All staff will be introduced to the SEL Competencies to include: self-awareness, social awareness, self-management, relationship skills and decision making.

Person Responsible Terica Weaver-Baker (terica.weaver-baker@ocps.net)

Teachers will be provided with multiple opportunities to experiment with new strategies in a low risk environment in their own teaching settings. In addition, teachers will observe other teachers practicing the use of new strategies and give feedback to each other.

Person Responsible Pamela Welch (pamela.welch@ocps.net)

A common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students will be established to include a character trait of the month in which a character trait will be highlighted and reinforced school-wide.

Person Responsible Terica Weaver-Baker (terica.weaver-baker@ocps.net)

Positive Behavior Supports will be implemented school-wide to reinforce and highlight positive behaviors and choices.

Person Responsible Tamara Medrano (tamara.medrano@ocps.net)

Morning Meetings will be implemented and used as a means to integrate academics along with social and emotional learning.

Person Responsible Terica Weaver-Baker (terica.weaver-baker@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

- a. Subgroup students will be provided with extended learning opportunities which will provide them with the opportunity to practice standards in addition to individualized tutoring and small group instruction. After school and/or Saturday School will be offered as an additional opportunity to practice standards.**
- b. Instructional staff along with the Leadership Team will increase communication and support to families of subgroup students.**
- c. The Parent Engagement Liaison will work with teachers and the Leadership Team to host quarterly curriculum outreach events specifically designed to empower and build the capacity of targeted parents.**
- d. Quarterly conferences will be held with parents of all subgroup students.**

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, Oak Hill Elementary engages 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, Oak Hill uses the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture and strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from Oak Hill including the mental health designee attends district wide professional learning throughout the year. This 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. The school leadership collaborates 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.