

Orange County Public Schools

Dover Shores Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Dover Shores Elementary

1200 GASTON FOSTER RD, Orlando, FL 32812

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

Demographics

Principal: Randall Hart

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 KG-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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: C (43%)
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 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
Hart, Randall	Principal	<p>Dr. Randall D. Hart – Principal</p> <p>The principal is responsible for the operation and management of all activities and functions which occur at Dover Shores Elementary. He weekly monitors reading and math lesson plans and provides feedback when necessary. He attends PLC meetings to provide guidance related to the writing of lesson plans, creation of assessments, and analysis of the resulting data. The principal also conducts ongoing professional development trainings and implements the iObservation assessment program. Dr. Hart also tutors third-grade students who are below grade level in math and serves as chair of the school's MTSS team.</p>
Dubois, Amy	Instructional Coach	<p>Amy DuBois – Curriculum Resource Teacher</p> <p>Ms. DuBois coordinates staff development and provides training and assistance to individual teachers including overseeing new hires through the induction process and overseeing the mentoring of new teachers. She coordinates school-wide testing and weekly monitors first-grade reading and math lesson plans and provides feedback. She attends first grade PLC meetings at least four times per month, along with supervising our i-Ready math and reading software program. She also tutors fourth and fifth-grade students who are below grade level in reading. In addition, she serves as our school SAC chair. Ms. DuBois is the textbook coordinator.</p>
Rodriguez, Ericka	Instructional Coach	<p>Ms. Rodriguez collaborates with the principal in order to identify teachers who need assistance through the coaching cycle. She supports K through five grade levels by modeling scientifically-based instructional strategies in classrooms in reading, math, writing, and science. Furthermore, she assists teachers with backward planning during grade-level PLCs to ensure standards-based instruction is being implemented with fidelity, along with creating common assessments to drive instruction. She meets with teachers who are part of the induction program on a monthly basis to evaluate and improve instruction by providing instructional strategies focusing on Marzano elements, common assessments, interpretation of data, and effective classroom management techniques. She also tutors third-grade reading students.</p>
Kilby, Julia	Guidance Counselor	<p>Provides personal and social growth counseling which includes individual and group counseling relating to academic success, understanding of self and others, communication skills, decision making, relationship skills, conflict resolution and goal setting.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>Provides crisis intervention services, e.g. suicide prevention, child abuse, health concerns, substance abuse and follow-up services as appropriate.</p> <p>Conducts individual conferences and group meetings with parents to effectively communicate with and involve parents in improving student performance. This also includes the referral of students and parents to appropriate specialists in keeping with district guidelines.</p> <p>Maintains student guidance records and confidentiality.</p> <p>Uses data to develop strategies to positively impact students.</p> <p>Guides individuals and groups of students through the development of educational plans, career awareness and personal and social growth issues.</p>
<p>Reddick, Amy</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>Ms. Reddick monitors the implementation of our Emotional Behavioral Disabilities (EBD) program and assists with teaching academic and social skills to our students. She maintains appropriate records, data, and reports on the status and disposition of all placement referrals and student profiles. She also develops functional behavior assessments and behavior intervention plans. In addition, she weekly monitors kindergarten, reading, and math lesson plans and provides feedback.</p>
<p>Montenegro, Ebony</p>	<p>Assistant Principal</p>	<p>Mrs. Montenegro assists the principal and behavior specialist with school-wide discipline situations. Teacher observations and reviews are also conducted. Facilitates & Supports weekly PLC meetings with instructional coach. Monitors attendance and tardy rates. Supervises PEL. Supervises monthly emergency drills. Assist principal with the implementation and supervision of programs which will enhance test scores and implement benchmarks. She also reviews Orange County Student Code of Conduct with all students, with assistance from the behavior specialist. Ms. Montenegro oversees the Title I compliance process. Tutors level 1 and 2 students as requested by the principal. She coordinates several school-wide incentive programs including Honor Roll Ice Cream Socials. Serves as the principals designee for MTSS, IEP, and LEP committee meetings. Other duties as assigned by the principal.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/16/2020, Randall Hart

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

36

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: C (43%)
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	76	79	79	85	71	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
Attendance below 90 percent	4	21	19	17	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	0	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/16/2020

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	81	78	67	68	73	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	435
Attendance below 90 percent	18	11	9	9	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	1	1	38	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1	13	23	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	5	13	9	34	40	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	12	
Number of students enrolled	81	78	67	68	73	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	435
Attendance below 90 percent	18	11	9	9	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	1	1	38	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide assessment	1	13	23	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	5	13	9	34	40	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	60%	57%	57%	58%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	58%	58%	63%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	53%	63%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	63%	63%	64%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	61%	62%	73%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	48%	51%	54%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	67%	56%	53%	63%	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	48%	55%	-7%	58%	-10%
	2018	49%	55%	-6%	57%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	57%	-4%	58%	-5%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	55%	54%	1%	56%	-1%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	62%	-9%	62%	-9%
	2018	48%	61%	-13%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	63%	-4%	64%	-5%
	2018	67%	62%	5%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	60%	57%	3%	60%	0%
	2018	54%	59%	-5%	61%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	60%	54%	6%	53%	7%
	2018	46%	53%	-7%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	35	36	25	62	64					
ELL	47	60	53	47	63	56	50				
BLK	50	44		65	56						
HSP	55	63	50	59	70	55	63				
WHT	76	69		74	41		71				
FRL	50	58	45	53	59	42	54				

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17			17	30						
ELL	47	58	53	47	66	58					
BLK	45	22		62	78		40				
HSP	60	66	53	60	70	67	48				
WHT	66	62		76	75		75				
FRL	58	58	46	60	68	63	49				

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	25	25	20	23	35	25	27				
ELL	31	61	60	50	71	59					
BLK	36	46	50	41	60	40	27				
HSP	62	66	63	67	77	60	63				
WHT	69	74		78	75		89				
FRL	58	63	63	64	73	54	63				

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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	466
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
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	54
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	66
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	52
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.

The data showing the lowest performance was in the lowest quartile for math, with additional concerns with the lowest quartile in ELA. Fifth grade was a particular area of improvement. This has been a low performing component last year also.

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

The greatest decline is the lowest quartile for ELA and Math. A need to identify specific needs and appropriate interventions could be a factor in the decline.

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

The greatest gap was in Math with a difference of 5 points compared to the state average.

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

Science showed the greatest improvement. Additional resources and strong PLC planning factored into the improvement.

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

All students have the ability to learn and be successful, looking at past data, we have shifted our focus to increase two potential areas of concern ELA and Math. Only 44% of our lowest twenty-five percent of students made learning gains in the 2018-2019 school year. As a result, our current goal is for 63% of our lowest 25% of students to make learning gains in ELA. In math, 48% of our lowest 25% of students made learning gains in the 2018-2019 school year. Our current goal is for 63% of the lowest 25% of students to make learning gains.

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

1. Lowest quartile students in ELA
2. Lowest quartile students in Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Lowest quartile students in Math and Reading, especially in our ESSA subgroup of students with disabilities. Our data shows that our lowest quartile students are not making adequate growth especially our students with disabilities. A particular concern is our 5th grade students given this current years situation of distance learning and proposed learning gaps.

Measureable Outcome: As a result, our expected outcome is an increase of 65% of the bottom 25% of students in ELA will make a learning gain. Previously only 44% of students in the bottom quartile for ELA made a learning gain. In math the expectation is that 65% of the bottom quartile will make a learning gain, previously it was 48%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Randall Hart (randall.hart@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: In order to increase student outcomes with our students with disabilities additional instructional support will be provided by members of the School-Based Leadership Team during the ELA and the Math instructional blocks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Providing additional support will allow for more focused instruction and more differentiated small groups for the lowest quartile students.

Action Steps to Implement

Members of the SBLT will support small groups during the ELA block and the Math block to provide an added layer of instruction and support as well as targeted instruction based on student needs.

Weekly, monthly, and quarterly monitoring of school-wide data and the lowest 25% of students.

Person Responsible Randall Hart (randall.hart@ocps.net)

Members of the SBLT will push-in during the ELA block and the Math block to provide an added layer of instruction and support as well as targeted instruction based on student needs.

Weekly, monthly, and quarterly monitoring of school-wide data and the lowest 25% of students.

Person Responsible Randall Hart (randall.hart@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Instructional professional development to build teachers capacity and understanding new learning strategies to be implemented effectively to increase student achievement.

Measureable Outcome: Teachers will increase their knowledge of best practices as well as their instructional delivery and technique.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Randall Hart (randall.hart@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Through continued professional development, teachers will increase the effectiveness of close reading by utilizing complex text in all content areas, plan for rigorous discussions, continuing the implementation of close reading strategies, and combining writing strategies to complement the close reading of complex texts. In addition, teachers will increase their knowledge and implementation of digital resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Reading for meaning is a foundational skill that has impacted our students' ability to fully comprehend and respond to text. Our students' literacy capabilities will increase through a dedicated focus of close reading and consistent application of skills.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Leadership Team will provide professional development modules to improve instructional delivery to meet the needs of all students with the emphasis on ELL and ESE students.
2. Teachers will develop and implement activities based on the School's Culturally Responsive Plan.
3. Teachers will design and deliver effective standards-based instruction.
4. Teachers will choose, appropriate, content specific complex text.
5. Teachers will assign standards-aligned, differentiated tasks to meet the needs of all students with emphasis on ELL and ESE populations.
6. Teachers will implement and use digital learning tools to enhance and engage learners.

Person Responsible Randall Hart (randall.hart@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus

Description To improve practices and impact student, staff and stakeholders.

Rationale:

Measurable Outcome: Using the Advanced Ed Survey data, all areas including 3-5 students, staff and parents will increase by 5% improving the overall school climate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eboni Montenegro (eboni.montenegro@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Improve and implement school wide positive behavior support plan, Integrate Inclusion through a variety of literary text and cooperative based groups to impact student social and emotional learning. Implement school wide programs with varied opportunities of participation linked to learning. Sharing opportunities for staff empowerment and collaboration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Enhancing the schools environment to improve the overall school climate and culture.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-wide PBIS & SEL
2. Staff empowerment through social connections and District and school SEL training's.
3. Presentation of resources for families in multiple languages, variation in programs offered with cultural relevance.

Person Responsible

Eboni Montenegro (eboni.montenegro@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Select teachers will be a part of the instructional team learning best practices to be implemented through professional development for school-wide for literacy and math fluency improvement.

Targeted professional development will be provided for whole-school as well as for PLC groups to increase teachers' efficiency in analyzing available data and developing appropriate instructional practices.

Teachers will receive on-going training to support the inclusion of digital instruction school-wide.

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.

Dover Shores Elementary continues to be committed to partnering with parents, families, and the community in an effort to build capacity for parental involvement and to help support student achievement. We will continue to build positive relationships through our PTA, SAC, and school-wide programs led by our PEL that emphasize links to learning for parents.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00