

Orange County Public Schools

Ocoee High



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Ocoee High

1925 OCOEE CROWN POINT PKWY, Ocoee, FL 34761

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

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Karcinski

Start Date for this Principal: 7/16/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

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

Provide the school's vision statement

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Karcinski, Lisa	Principal	Lisa Karcinski(Principal), Travis Diesel, Donna Dalton, Kelsey Bergh, and Demetria Wilson (Assistant Principals): Provide the common vision for the use of data-based decision making and oversees the implementation of MTSS. Each Assistant Principal is responsible for a specific portion of the MTSS.
Dalton, Donna	Assistant Principal	
Edwards Lee, Cathy	Other	
DeNoon, Patricia	Other	
Morris, Monique	Dean	
Diesel, Travis	Assistant Principal	
Gallup, Jeff	Instructional Media	
Siers, Sherrie	Instructional Coach	
Siers, John	Dean	
Wilson, Demetria	Assistant Principal	
Bergh, Kelsey	Assistant Principal	
Skeens, Brittany	Instructional Coach	
Restivo, Krista	Instructional Coach	
Holden, Carl	Dean	Discipline

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/16/2020, Lisa Karcinski

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

129

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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 Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	

* 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	769	685	653	609	2716
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	374	167	198	223	962
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	62	52	38	201
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	54	33	28	129
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	176	168	201	745
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190	173	166	160	689
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208	195	73	164	640

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	283	302	262	315	1162

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	3	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	38

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	628	625	625	596	2474
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	142	119	169	528
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	110	96	48	368
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	269	280	299	178	1026
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223	283	214	143	863

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	217	242	233	130	822

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	2	4	6	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	13	19	11	57

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	628	625	625	596	2474
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	142	119	169	528
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	110	96	48	368
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	269	280	299	178	1026
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223	283	214	143	863

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	217	242	233	130	822

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	2	4	6	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	13	19	11	57

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	41%	55%	56%	44%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	53%	51%	45%	51%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	40%	42%	34%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	35%	43%	51%	34%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains	48%	49%	48%	35%	44%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	46%	45%	34%	39%	45%
Science Achievement	65%	70%	68%	57%	66%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	73%	73%	57%	69%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	41%	52%	-11%	55%	-14%
	2018	44%	50%	-6%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	40%	50%	-10%	53%	-13%
	2018	41%	49%	-8%	53%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	67%	-2%	67%	-2%
2018	55%	62%	-7%	65%	-10%
Compare		10%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	69%	-3%	70%	-4%
2018	57%	65%	-8%	68%	-11%
Compare		9%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	27%	63%	-36%	61%	-34%
2018	22%	61%	-39%	62%	-40%
Compare		5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	40%	53%	-13%	57%	-17%
2018	43%	65%	-22%	56%	-13%
Compare		-3%			

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	16	28	27	21	43		33	54		73	23
ELL	13	26	28	25	43	47	40	29		91	41
ASN	67	64		50	61		88	83		100	63
BLK	35	39	32	30	49	48	60	66		95	36
HSP	34	32	30	35	44	43	64	59		95	53
MUL	63	50		46			83				
WHT	58	50	47	47	52	53	71	74		93	65
FRL	36	37	33	34	48	50	61	64		94	45

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	16	44	43	16	24		33	25		70	11
ELL	10	24	21	28	33		35	21		84	31
ASN	61	46		65	38		72	56		96	56
BLK	40	44	37	32	34	38	53	52		91	29
HSP	37	39	27	29	32	33	53	53		93	38
MUL	61	50		27	18		64	60		100	55
WHT	55	51	40	43	44	30	61	75		94	49
FRL	39	42	32	32	34	33	53	54		93	33

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	572
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	72
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	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	61
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	50
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

During the 2019-2020 school year using Progress Monitoring Assessment (PMA) for quarter 3, 9th grade ELA classes showed a proficiency of 40%, while 10th grade ELA classes showed a proficiency of 44%. ELA 9 maintained the score overall from the 2019 test and ELA 10 was higher than the 2019 FSA ELA Spring administration. However, when looking at the levels of ELA 9 and 10 courses (standard, honors, and Pre-AICE) the higher level courses (honors and Pre-Aice) did not show as much growth. English 9 did not have growth in any honors or Pre-AICE classes during the 3rd quarter PMA. One of the contributing factors was the lack of planning for the advanced classes due to the distribution of classes among the ELA teachers. In ELA 9, we had 9 teachers 3 of which taught multiple grade levels and all of which taught multiple preps. The trend we are now seeing is that our advanced students are not meeting or exceeding the score that they previously earned.

Looking at PMA 3 data, the lowest performance for math was overall achievement with 33% compared to 35% from the 18-19 FSA. The biggest drop was in geometry which went from 40% on the 18-19 FSA to 27% on the Q3 PMA. In geometry we had two teachers who were new to the content. Lack of teacher experience with the standards and content contributed to the drop in geometry scores.

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

Our greatest decline again is with our advanced learners. Cohorts of Pre-Aice students dropped 2-10% lower than the 2019 test scores. (Some honors courses dropped as well, especially in 9th grade.) These students had not maintained their scores from the previous year or showed growth. Time must be spent adjusting the curriculum resources materials to provide enrichment opportunities. Not all teachers diligently and continually communicated specific areas of concern through the year for all students.

We had a 2% decline in math achievement moving from 35% proficient on the 18-19 FSA to 33% proficient on the Q3 PMA. Comparing 18-19 FSA data to PMA Q3 data, geometry went from 40% proficiency to 27% proficiency and Algebra went from 27% to 39%. One contributing factor to this decline is lack of teacher experience with the standards and content within the geometry PLC. As a cohort, last year's geometry students had lower baseline data at 25% compared to the 18-19 cohort with baseline data at 35%.

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

Math achievement was the data component that the greatest gap compared to the state average. The statewide average includes students of all levels who take the Algebra I End-of-Course Assessment (EOC) and the Geometry EOC. A number of these students are levels 3, 4, and 5 students and targeted to take these courses in middle school. The majority of students enrolled in Algebra 1 and Geometry at Ocoee High School are level 1 and level 2 students who did not take these courses in middle school, therefore the math achievement score is based on the same population of level 1 and level 2 students who did not take the course in middle school. This contributes a great deal to the gap in achievement between the state's math achievement which was 51% and Ocoee High School's 35%.

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

The largest improvement was closing the gap amongst the 10th grade classes. Our baseline data for FSA 2019 was 40% and PMA 3 showed growth of 4%. One of two strategies we used was having one-on-one conferences with all students not performing at their previous 2019 level. ELA 10 teachers committed to having these data chats in the classroom with their students after each PMA. The assistant principal and literacy coach also met with students who were not performing at the level that they should have, in these data chats the students would identify and color code charts showing growth (or non-growth) for the PMA and have a discussion about progress and concerns. The second strategy that was implemented was purposeful grouping, based on performance on standards-based assessments (both formative and summative) to ensure that all students were being monitored and also for their specific deficit. Algebra 1 achievement showed the most improvement going from 27% on the 18-19 FSA to 39% on the 19-20 Q3 PMA. The contributing factors to this growth included strategic student placement based on teacher strengths, opening up teacher practice, modeling strategies through regular professional development, a strong PLC partnership, and continuous lesson observation with actionable feedback.

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

Two areas of concern regarding the 2018-2019 EWS data are the increase of students with two or more indicators with 822 students versus the 790 students in 2017-2018 data. Moreover, the indicator category which increased the most was students who scored a level 1 on statewide assessment. 2017-2018 data reflected 535 students and 2018-2019 data increased to 863 students. All grades level 10-12 increased in this category except grade nine which decreased by 91 students.

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

1. Increase Learning Gains in ELA Achievement
2. Increase Achievement for ESE
3. Increase Achievement for LY
4. Increase Achievement in Math
5. Culturally Responsive Instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Based on performance data on the FSA 2019 and the Progress Monitoring Assessment during quarter 3 of 2020, our school and the ELA department will be focusing on asking questions of low expectancy students as part of our school-wide deliberate practice focus. Ocoee High School teachers are in need of strategies to engage all students, monitor the students' progress towards mastery of the standards and use this data to inform their instruction toward achievement goals. Marzano identifies low expectancy as any student that the teacher does not expect to perform well. This is crucial for all students but is also a pivotal piece for ensuring the enrichment/differentiation for our advanced students. The instructional coaches will onboard new teachers with monitoring, grouping and questioning strategies to ensure that questions are being posed to all students at the appropriate level. Monitoring strategies will ensure that all students are engaged in rigorous questioning. Professional development throughout the school year will provide learning opportunities for our staff. The ELA teachers will plan for the questions/activities to reach every level of student to ensure growth. Coaches will monitor the progress of our classes to determine the achievement and effectiveness of the strategies being provided to the staff.

Measureable Outcome:

Ocoee High School will increase student performance in the FSA ELA through a focus on standards-based instruction and questioning strategies with all students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Donna Dalton (donna.dalton@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Questioning of low expectancy students with the same frequency and depth as high expectancy students will be the evidence-based strategy utilized to increase student performance on the FSA. Students will receive the same opportunity to respond to high level questions to stimulate thinking and be expected to provide reasoning, justification, and evidence of claims.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

By asking questions of low expectancy students, in all levels of classes, with the same frequency and depth as with high expectancy students and monitoring for evidence of the quality of participation of the majority of students, teachers will convey high behavioral and academic expectations drives and fortifies high student achievement. The leadership team will conduct observations and provide feedback to teachers as it related to questioning and monitoring all levels of students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will be provided professional development on implementing lesson plans aligned to the standards and using the Curriculum Resource Materials (CRM) and other district and state resources to guide their planning process.
2. The leadership team will conduct observations and provide teachers feedback as it relates to learning goals aligned to the standard to insure lessons are on the trajectory and ultimately reach the level of learning required by the standard.
3. Instructional coaches will work with teachers through the coaching cycle and targeted professional development. Instructors will have the opportunity to observe peers who have embedded the process effectively through open practice.
4. School will actively participate in the District Professional Learning Community.

5. The District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) core team will provide site-based focused professional development.
6. Teachers will be provided professional development on classroom management, Canvas, Performance Matters and Skyward in order to consistently monitor students' progress.
7. General and special education teachers will use regularly scheduled collaborative planning time to plan effective instruction and assessment for all students. (Best Practices for Inclusive Education School Level Assessment)
8. ELA teacher leads will attend training by district personnel on how to analyze and monitor data including students on the cusp of being proficient and the lowest 25%.
9. PLCs will review data after each culminating task and PMA to inform instruction through the year.
10. Teachers, coaches, AP, or mentors will conduct data chats throughout the school year for teachers and students to keep them informed of their personal progress.

Person Responsible Sherrie Siers (sherrie.siers@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on performance data on EOC 2019, there is a sense of urgency to increase all levels of achievement in Math. Ocoee High School teachers are in need of strategies to monitor progress and use this data to inform their instruction toward achievement goals. The Math department will focus on engaging all level of students to support their students towards proficiency.

Measureable Outcome:

Ocoee High School will increase student performance in the Math EOC through a focus on standards-based instruction and questioning strategies with all students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelsey Bergh (kelsey.bergh@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Questioning of low expectancy students with the same frequency and depth as high expectancy students will be the evidence-based strategy utilized to increase student performance on the Math EOC. Students will receive the same opportunity to respond to high level questions to stimulate thinking and be expected to provide reasoning, justification, and evidence of claims.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

By asking questions of low expectancy students with the same frequency and depth as with high expectancy students and monitoring for evidence of the quality of participation of the majority of students, teachers will convey high behavioral and academic expectations drives and fortifies high student achievement. Most of the professional development that is conducted this year will be focused on building teacher's capacity with this element. The implementation will be cross-curricular in the sense that the information will be disseminated to all content areas. We will be closely monitoring the progress of our Math students at all achievement levels to determine the effectiveness of our efforts and adjust or implement interventions as needed. The leadership team will conduct observations and provide feedback to teachers as it relates to questioning and monitoring all levels of students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will be provided professional development on implementing lesson plans aligned to the standards and using the Curriculum Resource Materials (CRM) and other district and state resources to guide their planning process.
2. The leadership team will conduct observations and provide teachers feedback as it relates to learning goals aligned to the standard to insure lessons are on the trajectory and ultimately reach the level of learning required by the standard.
3. Instructional coaches will work with teachers through the coaching cycle and targeted professional development. Instructors will have the opportunity to observe peers who have embedded the process effectively through open practice.
4. School will actively participate in the District Professional Learning Community.
5. The District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) core team will provide site-based focused professional development.
6. Teachers will be provided professional development on classroom management, Canvas, Performance Matters and Skyward in order to consistently monitor students' progress.
7. General and special education teachers will use regularly scheduled collaborative planning time to plan effective instruction and assessment for all students. (Best Practices for Inclusive Education School Level Assessment)

- 8. Math teacher leads will attend training by district personnel on how to analyze and monitor data including students on the cusp of being proficient and the lowest 25%.
- 9. PLCs will review data after each culminating task and PMA to inform instruction through the year.
- 10. Teachers, coaches, AP, or mentors will conduct data chats throughout the school year for teachers and students to keep them informed of their personal progress.

Person Responsible Brittany Skeens (brittany.skeens@ocps.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to Instructional Practice of ESSA Subgroups ELL and ESE

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Ocoee High School's ELL and ESE population scored below proficiency on the Federal Percent of Points Index

Measureable Outcome: We will score above 41% on the Federal Percent of Points Index.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Donna Dalton (donna.dalton@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Support questioning of low expectancy students and monitor understanding of ELL and ESE students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By establishing a questioning culture within the classroom, ELL and ESE students will be encouraged and required to actively participate in the lesson, thus improving their understanding of the academic vocabulary/content, while also fostering their conversational English.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. PLCs will meet regularly to collaboratively develop effective lesson plans using materials provided by the district and the state.
- 2. Instructional coaches will work with Professional Learning Communities to provide professional development in scaffolding instruction, questioning strategies, and monitoring techniques.
- 3. Teachers who are proficient in scaffolding will open up practice to allow others to observe instruction.
- 4. Instructional coaches will work with Professional Learning Communities to provide professional development in understanding data in regards to their ELL and ESE students and their progress.
- 5. Teachers who are proficient in using questioning and monitoring strategies will open practice to allow others to observe instruction.

Person Responsible Sherrie Siers (sherrie.siers@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Develop an on-going school-wide approach to social and emotional learning with support for our students, faculty, families, and stakeholders. An established Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership (SELL) program will foster improved attitudes towards school and the students' well-being.

Measureable Outcome: Through ongoing professional development, there should be an increase in the understanding of Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) and how it affects students and their learning, ultimately leading to improved engagement and achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sherrie Siers (sherrie.siers@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Increase awareness and understanding of SEL through professional learning communities and mentoring of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Increasing awareness and understanding of how SEL affects our students and teachers allows teachers to more effectively implement instructional strategies that are meaningful for students and helps build a firm foundation for student/teacher and teacher/teacher relationships. This, in turn, can assist in the teaching and learning process, thereby increasing student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assign an administrative lead to oversee and monitor SELL Initiatives.
2. Provide professional development to faculty on SEL and the effects of SEL on learning and achievement.
3. Teacher leaders will participate in a book study, relating to SELL.
4. School administrators consistently communicate and reinforce expectations that all school personnel share responsibility for all of students well being and achievement.

Person Responsible Lisa Karcinski (lisa.karcinski@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team has created a schoolwide Multi-Tiered System of Supports tracker to identify and focus on current students and incoming ninth graders who have below a 2.0. Each student is assigned a mentor who will monitor academic, discipline, and attendance goals on a bi-weekly basis.

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.

Administrators will introduce a focus of Social Emotional Learning (SEL) during pre-planning that puts forth building and sustaining a positive school culture, throughout the school year. This targeted focus will include, developing relationships with students and staff members through measures such as: being personable, breaking down barriers, building capacity through collaboration. Opportunities will be provided for teachers to feel empowered. A faculty focus group with administration will be created to ensure that all voices are heard.

More attempts to energize staff by creating an environment where people enjoy coming to work, such as Friday Fellowships, creative games and friendly competition with prizes. The administrative team will make deliberate attempts to recognize students and staff who are exemplifying the characteristics associated with social emotional learning with tokens of recognition. Each administrator has to take the charge and go over the top with school spirit as it starts with leadership.

To maintain this positive school culture, administration will collect feedback on the efforts to know what needs to be enhanced or changed. PLCs will take the lead to communicate shared concerns with administration and faculty. Administration will continue to include all stakeholders (both tested and non-tested areas) in student achievement and results analysis, and continue to make data-driven decisions collaboratively.

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				\$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	140-Substitute Teachers	0252 - Ocoee High	General Fund		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Thirty days of substitute pay at \$150 dollars per day</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	140-Substitute Teachers	0252 - Ocoee High	General Fund		\$5,000.00

						<i>Notes: Thirty days of substitute pay at \$150 dollars per day</i>
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Instructional Practice of ESSA Subgroups ELL and ESE				\$4,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110		0252 - Ocoee High	General Fund		\$4,000.00
						<i>Notes: PLC lead teams professional development. One hour per month times 13 instructional employees.</i>
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1530	239-Other	0252 - Ocoee High	General Fund		\$3,000.00
						<i>Notes: Student and staff incentives</i>
					Total:	\$17,000.00