

Orange County Public Schools

# Ocoee High



## 2019-20 School Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Ocoee High

1925 OCOEE CROWN POINT PKWY, Ocoee, FL 34761

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Laura Beusse**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

<b>2018-19 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students <span style="color: orange;">English Language Learners</span> Hispanic Students Multiracial Students <span style="color: orange;">Students With Disabilities</span> White Students
<b>School Grade</b>	2018-19: C
<b>School Grades History</b>	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: C 2014-15: B 2013-14: C
<b>2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N
<b>Year</b>	A

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement**

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement**

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Beusse, Laura	Principal
Principal	
Dalton, Donna	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Edwards Lee, Cathy	Other
Other	
DeNoon, Patricia	Other
Other	
Morris, Monique	Dean
Dean	
Diesel, Travis	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Bergh, Janet	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Gallup, Jeff	Instructional Media
Instructional Media	
Siers, Sherrie	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Siers, John	Dean
Dean	
Wilson, Demetria	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Bergh, Kelsey	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Smith, Ashley	Dean
Dean	

## 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	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

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

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

Tuesday 7/23/2019

**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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173	195	200	183	751
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	101	76	55	358
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	287	298	282	153	1020
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	314	206	10	5	535

**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	288	236	163	103	790

**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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173	195	200	183	751
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	101	76	55	358
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	287	298	282	153	1020
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	314	206	10	5	535

**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	288	236	163	103	790

**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	
Number of students enrolled	628 (0)	625 (0)	625 (0)	596 (0)	2474 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	98 (173)	142 (195)	119 (200)	169 (183)	528 (751)
One or more suspensions	114 (126)	110 (101)	96 (76)	48 (55)	368 (358)
Course failure in ELA or Math	269 (287)	280 (298)	299 (282)	178 (153)	1026 (1020)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	223 (314)	283 (206)	214 (10)	143 (5)	863 (535)

**Grade Level Data**

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

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						



ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State 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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Percent Tested	98%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
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
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
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
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
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
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
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
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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**

In 2018-19 the lowest data component was the English Language Arts Language Arts lowest 25th percentile at 33%. One of the contributing factors to the reduction in achievement include half of the ELA staff were first year teachers at Ocoee High School. New teachers were not thoroughly familiar with all of the teaching strategies to reach struggling students. Support for the English Language Learner students suffered as ELL paraprofessional position remained vacant despite efforts to fill it. The trend over time is that the ELA lowest 25th percentile value has improved slightly over the past two years.

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

The data that showed the greatest decline from the 2017-2018 school year, in comparison to the 2018-2019 school year was ELA learning gains, which decreased from 45% to 40%. One of the contributing factors is that students who had previously scored at or above on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) did not maintain their scale score or make learning gains. Students were not provided enough enrichment classroom opportunities to increase their skills. Additionally, teachers did not communicate to students the specific areas of the FSA in which they scored the lowest. Therefore, students could not focus on these areas for improvement.

#### **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 1 End-of-Course Assessment (EOC) and the Geometry EOC. A number of these student 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 theses courses in middle school, therefore the Math achievement score is based up this same population of level 1 and level 2 students who did not take the courses 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 data components that showed the most improvement were both the mathematics achievement and mathematics learning gains with 13 and 14 points. There were a number of actions that led to the improvement in those areas including teachers attending regular professional development implementing lesson plans aligned to the standards while using the Curriculum Resource Materials (CRM) and other state resources to guide the planning process. The leadership team conducted observations and provided teachers feedback as it related to learning goals and scales aligned to the standard. Instructional coaches identified and shared necessary data for students whose performance on the assessment would most positively impact school success across multiple categories including lowest 25%, learning gains and achievement. Appropriate supports were planned for during PLC time and put in place for those students as well. In addition, instructional coaches provided detailed data analysis to teachers for every student based on Progress Monitoring Activities (PMA) and culminating task results and that data was used to create individual study plans for each student. Meanwhile, teachers worked collaboratively to create and implement an intensive rotational review spanning the three weeks prior to the FSA. Students were grouped according to standards-based needs and rotated between teachers, providing the opportunity for students to experience instruction from multiple perspectives and styles. Lastly, incentives were offered to encourage strong study efforts and best performance on the assessment.

### **Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

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 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:**

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	ELA and Math Achievement Learning Gains
<b>Rationale</b>	Based on performance data, Ocoee High School has a sense of urgency to increase achievement in FSA ELA and Math Assessments. Ocoee High School teachers are in need of strategies to monitor student progress toward their achievement goals. Ocoee High School will focus on engaging students and processing information to support students in their efforts toward proficiency.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Ocoee High School will increase student performance on the FSA and Math EOCs through a focus on standards-based instruction and processing information.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Janet Bergh (janet.bergh@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Helping students process content will be the evidence based strategy utilized to increase student performance on the FSA and Math EOCs. Students will systematically engage in processing content to generate conclusions through collaborative interactions with other students and through the writing process.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	In order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, learners must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, the students, and the content. The leadership team will conduct observations and provide feedback to teachers as it relates to helping students process content through the Marzano Evaluation model.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>4. School will actively participate in the District Professional Learning Community.</li> <li>5. The District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) core team will provide site-based focused professional development.</li> <li>6. Teachers will be provided professional development on classroom management, Canvas, Performance Matters and Skyward in order to consistently monitor students' progress.</li> <li>7. General and special education teachers will use regularly scheduled</li> </ol>

collaborative planning

time to plan effective instruction and assessment for all students. (Best Practices for Inclusive Education School Level Assessment)

8. ELA teachers will be trained by district personnel on how to analyze and monitor data including students on the cusp of being proficient and the lowest 25%

**Person  
Responsible**

Sherrie Siers (sherrie.siers@ocps.net)

---



<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	ESE Student Achievement
<b>Rationale</b>	Ocoee High School Exceptional Student Education (ESE) population scored below proficiency on the Federal Percent of Points Index.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	We will score above 41% on the Federal Percent of Points Index.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Demetria Wilson (demetria.wilson@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	In order to increase our systematic approach to providing scaffolded supports.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Scaffolded supports provide temporary assistance to students so they can successfully complete tasks that they cannot yet do independently and with a high rate of success. Teachers select powerful visual, verbal and written supports; carefully calibrate them to students' performance and understanding in relation to learning tasks; use them flexibly; evaluate their effectiveness; and gradually remove them once they are no longer needed. Some supports are planned prior to lessons and some are provided responsively during instruction.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will meet regularly to collaboratively develop effective lesson plans using materials provided by the district and the state.</li> <li>2. Instructional coaches will work with Professional Learning Communities to provide professional development in scaffolding instruction.</li> <li>3. Teachers who are proficient in scaffolding will open up practice to allow others to observe.</li> <li>4. Leadership team conducts classroom observations to insure standards based instruction occurs regularly, and provides teachers actionable feedback.</li> </ol> <p>Instructional coaches will share strategies for differentiation, engagement, processing and small group instruction.</p>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Demetria Wilson (demetria.wilson@ocps.net)

<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	English Language Learner (ELL) Student Achievement
<b>Rationale</b>	Ocoee High School's ELL population scored below proficiency on the Federal Percent of Points of Index.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	We will score above 41% on the Federal Percent of Points Index.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Donna Dalton (donna.dalton@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Text Dependent Writing will be the strategy utilized to score above 41% on the Federal Percent of Points Index.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Support text-dependent writing instruction where ELLs write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes and audiences depending on students' level of English proficiency.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PLCs will meet regularly to collaboratively develop effective lesson plans using materials provided by the district and the state.</li> <li>2. Instructional coaches will work with Professional Learning Communities to provide professional development in scaffolding instruction</li> <li>3. Teachers who are proficient in scaffolding will open up practice to allow others to observe instruction.</li> <li>4. Instructional coaches will work with Professional Learning Communities to provide professional development in planning and facilitating students to use literacy strategies to write with evidence in response to complex text.</li> <li>5. Teachers who are proficient in using writing strategies will open practice to allow others to observe instruction.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Sherrie Siers (sherrie.siers@ocps.net)

<b>#4</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Culturally Responsive School Plan
<b>Rationale</b>	Our rationale is to narrow the achievement gap observed among students from diverse backgrounds by providing professional learning and support to instructional staff.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Through ongoing professional development there should be an increase in the understanding of our diverse student population as instructional staff learn strategies to increase engagement of all students by honoring cultural and personal experiences that support learning.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Janet Bergh (janet.bergh@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Increase awareness and understanding of our diverse student population through professional learning communities and mentoring of all freshmen and other students in need by teachers participating in Culturally Responsive training and integrating research from the book "Emotional Poverty in all Demographics" by Ruby K. Payne. Administration, teachers, and staff will participate in a school-wide bus tour at the beginning of the school year followed by professional development regarding strategies to deal with anger and anxiety in the classroom.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Increasing awareness and understanding of diverse backgrounds allows teachers to more effectively implement instructional strategies that are meaningful for students and help build a firm foundation for student and teacher relationships. This, in turn, can assist the teaching and learning process, thereby increasing student achievement.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assign an administrative lead to oversee and monitor MAO Initiatives.</li> <li>2. Continue "Diverse Leading Ladies", where minority female students will meet regularly with their school sponsor who will empower these scholarly ladies to make significant and impactful contributions in the Ocoee High School feeder elementary and middle schools and their communities.</li> <li>3. All faculty will tour the neighborhoods where our students live as a means of gaining understanding and engage in professional development on how to deal with a diverse population.</li> <li>4. Teacher leaders will participate in an "Emotional Poverty" book study.</li> <li>5 Restorative Justice practices will be used as a means of resolving conflicts between students, between students and teachers, and between teachers and teachers.</li> <li>6. School administrators consistently communicate and reinforce expectations that all school personnel share responsibility for all of students well being and achievement.</li> </ol>

**Person Responsible** Laura Beusse (laura.beusse@ocps.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities** (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)**

**Part IV: Title I Requirements**

**Additional Title I Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students**

**PFEP Link**

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

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services**

score.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another**

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact**

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations**

**Part V: Budget**

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ELA and Math Achievement Learning Gains</b>				<b>\$10,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

	2110	140-Substitute Teachers	0252 - Ocoee High	General Fund		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: 60 days of substitute pay @150.00 per day.</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ESE Student Achievement</b>				<b>\$4,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	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>			
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: English Language Learner (ELL) Student Achievement</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culturally Responsive School Plan</b>				<b>\$4,200.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1530	651-Bus(es)	0252 - Ocoee High	General Fund		\$1,200.00
			<i>Notes: 3 Charter buses to tour staff through attendance zone of school.</i>			
	1530	239-Other	0252 - Ocoee High	General Fund		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Leadership and faculty book study on culturally responsive instruction.</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$18,200.00</b>