Oak Ridge High

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Oak Ridge High

700 W OAK RIDGE RD, Orlando, FL 32809

https://oakridgehs.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Dennis Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan 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.

Table of Contents

Oak Ridge High

700 W OAK RIDGE RD, Orlando, FL 32809

https://oakridgehs.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	96%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	D

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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
Bellinger, Jennifer	Principal	Jennifer Bellinger– Principal: Supervises Biology, US History, SAFE, Behavior Specialist, Assistant Principals, Deans, Instructional Coaches, Athletic Director, Program Assistants/Program Monitors, Security, Title IX Coordinator, and the Testing Coordinator. She is responsible for academic and administrative deans, PASS coordination with deans, academic coaches, administrative/support staff duties, athletics, budget, community tours, faculty/staff celebrations, teacher and staff evaluations, room utilization, and SAC/PTO.
Browne, Michele	Assistant Principal	Michele Browne – Assistant Principal: Supervises Reading 9-12 and English 11-12, Career and Technical Education electives, ESE, ESOL and ESOL Compliance Specialist. Other responsibilities include Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS), AP testing, crisis plan, bus/campus supervision duty, SAC/ PTO lead, PTO/Parental Involvement/ Community Relations, developing School Improvement Plan, clinic and medical issues, and teacher and staff evaluations.
Householder, Laurene	Administrative Support	Laurene Householder – Curriculum Resource Teacher: Serves as the Partners in Education and ADDitions coordinator, manages Title I compliance, parental involvement, and monitors the SIP and Parent and Family Engagement Plan.Organizes and plans community involvement events, facilitates the after school tutoring and enrichment program, facilitates Teach-In and MTSS, manages electronic newsletters and communication.
Sanchez Corona, Brian	Assistant Principal	Brian Sanchez Corona- Assistant Principal: Supervises Guidance Counselors, World Languages, Physical Education electives,College & Career and ROTC. He serves as the 3DE by Junior Achievement: Academy Liaison, and is responsible for Advanced Ed, creating master schedule, school registration, report cards, digital curriculum, and schoolwide data monitoring. He also oversees industry certification exams, bus/campus supervision duty, substitutes/emergency lesson plans, teacher certification, and teacher and staff evaluations.
Young, Danny	Administrative Support	Danny Young - SAFE Coordinator: Provides assistance to our students through crisis intervention, staff referral or self-referral. Serves as the school's homeless liaison and coordinates services between students and external resources that can help them adapt and/or cope with emergencies and extenuating life circumstances.
Gonzalez, Luz	Assistant Principal	Supervises Language Arts-grades 9 and 10, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies and magnet programs, magnet programs-recruiting, supervision and evaluation and school wide student progress monitoring data. She serves as the liaison for City Year and Minority Achievement Office. She is also responsible for bus/campus supervision duty, SAC/

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		PTO alternate, PTO/Parental Involvement/Community Relations, overseeing literacy support personnel and teacher and staff evaluations.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/1/2016, Dennis Gonzalez

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

128

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (48%)

	2016-17: D (39%)
	2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	816	685	644	586	2731
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172	262	279	260	973
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	127	79	43	361
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242	229	93	164	728
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153	121	130	147	551
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	344	246	211	209	1010
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	343	246	58	102	749

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	417	357	256	278	1308

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	6	7	28

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/20/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	700	672	544	604	2520
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227	270	233	253	983
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	61	52	43	287
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202	191	219	139	751
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	306	316	202	39	863

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242	240	205	111	798

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	17	23	52	104
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	30	49	100

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	700	672	544	604	2520
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227	270	233	253	983
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	61	52	43	287
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202	191	219	139	751
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	306	316	202	39	863

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242	240	205	111	798

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	12	17	23	52	104
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	30	49	100

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	33%	55%	56%	25%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	53%	51%	29%	46%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	40%	42%	23%	34%	41%
Math Achievement	38%	43%	51%	17%	34%	49%
Math Learning Gains	60%	49%	48%	27%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	46%	45%	36%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	63%	70%	68%	43%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	73%	73%	48%	67%	70%

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	32%	52%	-20%	55%	-23%
	2018	27%	50%	-23%	53%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	29%	50%	-21%	53%	-24%
	2018	25%	49%	-24%	53%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

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	62%	67%	-5%	67%	-5%
2018	53%	62%	-9%	65%	-12%
Compare		9%			

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	59%	69%	-10%	70%	-11%
2018	53%	65%	-12%	68%	-15%
Compare		6%			

ALGEBRA EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	34%	63%	-29%	61%	-27%
2018	26%	61%	-35%	62%	-36%
Compare		8%			

GEOMETRY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	39%	53%	-14%	57%	-18%
2018	62%	65%	-3%	56%	6%
Compare		-23%			

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	17	29	20	26	34	23	42	33		97	44
ELL	16	40	36	31	61	60	55	25		90	50
ASN	52	57		60			93	80		94	47
BLK	31	47	39	37	56	36	59	56		95	55
HSP	31	43	35	37	64	65	64	62		93	65
MUL	57	43									
WHT	54	55		53	62		76	60		92	81
FRL	29	44	41	37	59	50	60	60		94	61

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	10	31	32	25	26	40	22	41		98	23
ELL	9	29	29	34	44	36	28	43		85	52
ASN	46	42		73	64		73	60		100	73
BLK	25	40	36	40	44	46	53	53		91	50
HSP	29	38	32	40	41	29	52	59		90	61
MUL	64	70					92				
WHT	50	42	10	70	55		73	95		97	69
FRL	27	39	33	38	42	38	52	54		91	56

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	4	18	20	5	20	25	19	24		80	22
ELL	5	21	24	11	33	41	16	15		79	34
ASN	61	54		38	30			73		93	57
BLK	22	26	20	16	27	39	41	44		87	37
HSP	25	29	24	16	26	35	42	45		91	57
MUL	50			25	8						
WHT	44	38	30	28	25		59	86		94	62
FRL	25	29	23	17	27	36	43	48		89	46

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	580

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	69
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	50
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	54
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	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	67
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.

English Language Arts achievement showed the lowest performance at 33%. Without data from 2019, contributing factors continue to be low reading levels of 9th grade cohort coming from the feeder middle schools. This has been an ongoing trend.

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

During the last assessed year, Mathematics achievement showed the greatest decline, from 44% in 2018 to 38% in 2019. Due to changes to the Orange County Public School mathematics progression, a larger percentage of the assessed cohort were level one students as compared to the previous year, resulting in a larger number of students in standard level Geometry as opposed to honors.

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.

English Language Arts achievement showed the greatest gap, 23%, when compared to the state average of 56%. 72% of incoming freshman students were non proficient readers, 50% of ELA teachers had less than three years of instructional experience with FSA standards, and there was a decrease in instructional support from two full time ELA Instructional coaches to one part time coach.

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

Mathematics learning gains showed the most improvement, with 13% growth. A multi-pronged approach focusing on both student and teacher supports contributed to this improvement. Push in support with the instructional coach started immediately after the first common assessment. Teachers and students also received push in support from City Year tutors, UCF tutors, other school-based teachers, and student volunteers. Most notable, was a process for students to revise knowledge deliberately embedded into instructional resource materials.

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

Based on most recent Early Warning Indicator (EWI) data, two areas of concern are the percentage of students scoring Level 1 on state assessments and the percentage with two or more early warning indicators. The percentage of students scoring level 1 on ELA state assessments increased from 34% to 37%. Further compounding efforts to reduce the achievement gap, is the percentage of students with two or more early warning indicators, increasing from 32% to 48%.

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

1. Increase student achievement in English Language Arts (ELA) and reduce the achievement gap when compared to the state.
2. Decrease the percentage of students with two or more early warning indicators.
3. Provide targeted support to increase both achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student achievement in English Language Arts will increase as a result of supporting and improving teacher instructional practice. Providing teachers with an intense focus on content analysis and instructional strategies before lesson implementation as well as providing them with explicit feedback and tiered support to implement instructional strategies with fidelity.
Measurable Outcome:	Student proficiency on the Florida Standards Assessment in English Language Arts will increase to at least 38%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Bellinger (jennifer.bellinger@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy is helping students revise knowledge. Students make additions and deletions, correct inaccuracies of previously taught content and thinking processes as a way of deepening their understanding and creating conceptual changes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Baker & Brown, 1984; Garner, 1987; and Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995, there is a strong relationship between reading strategies used by readers, their metacognitive awareness, and reading proficiency. Better readers have enhanced metacognitive awareness of what they know and their own use of strategies. These, in turn, lead to greater reading ability and proficiency. While this has been a focus in the past, the opportunity to extend this strategy to a blended learning environment will benefit students, many of whom are not learning in a traditional face to face classroom setting.

Action Steps to Implement

Through professional learning communities and other teacher professional development, teachers will analyze texts and assessments prior to introducing them to students. They will discuss possible student misconceptions and develop intentional activities and strategies, taking into account both learning modalities, that they will embed into their lesson plans to better understand and guide student thinking.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Bellinger (jennifer.bellinger@ocps.net)

After each common assessment, teachers will analyze assessment data through multiple lenses: content mastery, fluency with various question types and common student errors. This data will guide the revision of knowledge process.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Bellinger (jennifer.bellinger@ocps.net)

The assessing administrator and instructional coach will provide frequent classroom walkthroughs, both face to face and virtual, to monitor implementation of the strategy and provide immediate feedback. Continued follow-up and tiered coaching will be provided as needed.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Bellinger (jennifer.bellinger@ocps.net)

Through the College and Career Center at Oak Ridge High School, select Oak Ridge High School students will provide academic tutoring and mentoring to Walker Middle School students. Walker administrative team will identify the students best able to benefit from the additional support. This collaboration provides opportunities to strengthen the academic abilities of some of our feeder students, as well as for the high school students to earn community service points.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Bellinger (jennifer.bellinger@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school, both with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the critical need of decreasing the number of students with two or more early warning indicators.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of focusing on this strategy, the percentage of students with two or more early warning indicators will decrease from 48% to at least 43%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Bellinger (jennifer.bellinger@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students make additions and deletions to revise previous knowledge and thinking processes in order to deepen understanding. By using social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making, students have an awareness of the power of interpretations and take various perspectives.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students' revision of knowledge enhances the development of declarative knowledge, allowing students to add to and sharpen their knowledge base. By attending to the conative needs of students in connection with this cognitive process, teachers help to support student facilitation of responsible-decision making.

Action Steps to Implement	

A cross-curricular team of lead teachers and instructional support will actively participate in DPLC meetings and provide site-based professional development for all instructional personnel.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Bellinger (jennifer.bellinger@ocps.net)

Teachers will analyze data after each common assessment to determine content mastery, fluency with questions types, and common errors. Revision of knowledge activities will be guided by data and teachers will plan for reteaching activities to help students meet mastery.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Bellinger (jennifer.bellinger@ocps.net)

Administrators and instructional coaches will provide ongoing monitoring and feedback to teachers, specific to implementation of strategies and plan for tiered coaching support, when the need arises.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Bellinger (jennifer.bellinger@ocps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on recent ESSA data, students with disabilities was the only subgroup to score below 41% of the federal index. An intense focus on this subgroup of students will provide specific targeted support in order to increase both achievement and learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	Average achievement and learning gains among students with disabilities will increase to at least 41% in all tested areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Bellinger (jennifer.bellinger@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will provide intensive standards-based and reading instruction.Students will receive clearly defined learning goals, teachers will use explicit and systematic and well-paced lessons. Students have multiple opportunities to collaborate with peers, practice, respond and receive immediate and corrective feedback from teachers and peers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Effective implementation of the strategy allows students to think about and actively increase the knowledge and skills relative to the content that they are learning. Students' use of these strategies will improve their capacity for learning and allow that learning to be reflected in increased achievement and learning gains across content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

During professional learning communities, teachers will be supported in intentional lesson planning, identifying scaffolds and strategies that may be implemented to support students with disabilities.

Person Responsible — Jennifer Bellinger (jennifer.bellinger@ocps.net)

Teachers will analyze data after each common assessment to determine content mastery, fluency with questions types, and common errors. Revision of knowledge activities will be guided by data and teachers will plan for reteaching activities to help students meet mastery.

Person Responsible — Jennifer Bellinger (jennifer.bellinger@ocps.net)

Ongoing monitoring and feedback will be provided to teachers on pacing, use of instructional strategies and revision of student knowledge. Needs for coaching assistance will be identified and implemented to help teachers modify instructional strategies to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

Person Responsible — Jennifer Bellinger (jennifer.bellinger@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Additional priority areas are identified and addressed in our current Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP).

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.

An intentional and targeted focus on creating and maintaining a positive school culture and environment is part of the mission at Oak Ridge High School. This is accomplished via multiple strategies and ensures that all stakeholders are involved. Providing opportunities for parents to be involved contributes to our positive school culture. These include Title 1 parent events, ELL parent nights, School Advisory Council meetings, and having a designated parent liaison who serves as a link between parents and the school, among others. Another contributing factor to our positive school environment is coordinating with community stakeholders. A designated staff member coordinates school volunteers, mentors and other community partners, facilitates Teach-in and monitors the contributions and impact. This contributes to a seamless and positive experience for students, school personnel and community partners. In addition, Oak Ridge High School recognizes that our feeder schools are also an integral part of our school environment and contribute to our school culture. Collaborating with our feeder schools through performing arts events, athletic events, student forums, as well as peer mentoring, future Pioneers become involved in the school culture before even enrolling, and current Pioneers learn the art of service and practice giving back to the larger community. The Junior Achievement Academy/3DE provides unique learning opportunities for Oak Ridge students. A school liaison ensures seamless coordination in academics, practical internships, business and community partnerships which further enhances the school environment. Maintaining collaborative leadership in academics, athletics, social and cultural aspects of Oak Ridge High School, all contribute to developing and maintaining the positive culture that enables student success.

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00