Lake Nona High

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Nona High

12500 NARCOOSSEE RD, Orlando, FL 32832

https://lakenonahs.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Maricarmen Aponte

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2017

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)	39%
2018-19 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (60%) 2014-15: A (67%)
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	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here]().	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Lake Nona High

12500 NARCOOSSEE RD, Orlando, FL 32832

https://lakenonahs.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	41%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	B	B	B

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.

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Browning, Paul	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal of Instruction supports curriculum and instruction, specifically as it relates to the master schedule. He conducts observations and provides feedback to staff, implements systems and structures for staff to engage in planning standards-based instruction, monitors student data, as well as works with Curriculum Leaders in each department to ensure a focus on increasing student achievement.
DiMarzo, Amanda	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal conducts observations and provides feedback to staff, implements systems and structures for staff to engage in planning standards-based instruction, monitors student data, as well as works with Curriculum Leaders in each department to ensure a focus on increasing student achievement.
Chang, Martha	Principal	The Principal is responsible for all decisions that impact teaching and learning on our campus. She ensures the safety of our students and staff, conducts observations and provides feedback to staff, implements systems and structures for staff to engage in professional learning, monitors student data, as well as works with Curriculum Leaders in each department to ensure a focus on increasing student achievement.
Lafayette, Tammy	Dean	The Deans support the efforts to establish and maintain a positive culture as they provide staff with resources and training to support building authentic relationships with students, parents and the community.
Wolfe, Rosalinde	Dean	The Deans support the efforts to establish and maintain a positive culture as they provide staff with resources and training to support building authentic relationships with students, parents and the community.
Gregory, Donielle	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal conducts observations and provides feedback to staff, implements systems and structures for staff to engage in planning standards-based instruction, monitors student data, as well as works with Curriculum Leaders in each department to ensure a focus on increasing student achievement.
Smith, Marie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal conducts observations and provides feedback to staff, implements systems and structures for staff to engage in planning standards-based instruction, monitors student data, as well as works with Curriculum Leaders in each department to ensure a focus on increasing student achievement.
Davis, Christopher	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal conducts observations and provides feedback to staff, implements systems and structures for staff to engage in planning standards-based instruction, monitors student data, as well as works with

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Curriculum Leaders in each department to ensure a focus on increasing student achievement.
Perez, Tanya	Dean	The Deans support the efforts to establish and maintain a positive culture as they provide staff with resources and training to support building authentic relationships with students, parents and the community.
Berkes, Scott	Dean	The Deans support the efforts to establish and maintain a positive culture as they provide staff with resources and training to support building authentic relationships with students, parents and the community.
Ramjit, Andrew	Dean	The Deans support the efforts to establish and maintain a positive culture as they provide staff with resources and training to support building authentic relationships with students, parents and the community.
Freiermuth, Keri	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach provides resources and facilitates professional development in order to support our instructional staff with implementing standards-based instruction, appropriate interventions, and research-based best practices. She is considered a lead mentor on campus and supports our beginning and new teachers with teacher induction and certification.
Durbin, Patrick	Administrative Support	The Safe Coordinator provides social-emotional support and/or behavioral support to our students. He also assists with resources and training to staff to ensure the safety and wellbeing of our students.
Hughes, Wilicia	Administrative Support	The Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT) facilitates professional development in order to support our instructional staff with implementing standards-based instruction, appropriate interventions, and research-based best practices.

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	949	927	854	768	3498
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	127	133	165	546
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	95	61	45	292
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	276	302	245	128	951
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	187	126	71	584

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	194	210	170	102	676

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	0	0	0	0	

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

151

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/2/2019

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	154	187	214	433	988
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	63	67	41	233
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	251	242	276	182	951
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213	177	22	7	419

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	199	205	165	160	729

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	154	187	214	433	988
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	63	67	41	233
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	251	242	276	182	951
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213	177	22	7	419

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	199	205	165	160	729

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	68%	55%	56%	63%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	53%	51%	54%	46%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	40%	42%	46%	34%	41%
Math Achievement	64%	43%	51%	50%	34%	49%
Math Learning Gains	62%	49%	48%	35%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	46%	45%	28%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	76%	70%	68%	83%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	73%	73%	68%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	949 (0)	927 (0)	854 (0)	768 (0)	3498 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	121 (154)	127 (187)	133 (214)	165 (433)	546 (988)
One or more suspensions	91 (62)	95 (63)	61 (67)	45 (41)	292 (233)
Course failure in ELA or Math	276 (251)	302 (242)	245 (276)	128 (182)	951 (951)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	200 (213)	187 (177)	126 (22)	71 (7)	584 (419)

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	64%	52%	12%	55%	9%
	2018	65%	50%	15%	53%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	63%	50%	13%	53%	10%
	2018	57%	49%	8%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	73%	67%	6%	67%	6%
2018	68%	62%	6%	65%	3%
Compare		5%			

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	74%	69%	5%	70%	4%
2018	64%	65%	-1%	68%	-4%
Compare		10%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	57%	63%	-6%	61%	-4%
2018	34%	61%	-27%	62%	-28%
Compare		23%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	53%	9%	57%	5%
2018	60%	65%	-5%	56%	4%
Compare		2%			

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	28	39	30	38	44	50	46	44		100	30
ELL	41	52	47	55	62	61	58	61		89	54
ASN	89	71		92	58		89	91		100	90
BLK	63	59	58	49	53	48	64	68		94	40
HSP	60	58	45	61	60	61	71	75		93	58
MUL	72	73		81			69	69		100	55
WHT	80	61	38	74	69	73	86	85		98	66
FRL	58	60	47	58	60	59	69	69		93	56

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	30	37	28	36	23	14	40	45		88	9
ELL	32	45	42	38	34	26	52	46		92	39
ASN	88	71		79	54		91	81		100	83
BLK	57	47	38	35	18	13	54	60		95	28
HSP	59	49	42	47	32	31	66	63		94	45
MUL	76	61		67	39		95			100	50
WHT	76	59	45	64	40	44	79	84		97	63
FRL	55	50	40	44	29	26	61	56		94	41

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	24	41	42	18	31	27	41	51		78	6
ELL	25	43	42	29	36	33	58	34		94	37
ASN	85	67		69	42		89	78		100	55
BLK	51	48	28	33	28	18	79	60		95	36
HSP	54	51	45	43	32	27	79	60		95	40
MUL	81	72		66	42		100			100	27
WHT	75	58	61	62	42	35	87	80		97	58
FRL	48	49	44	37	29	29	76	55		94	34

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	731
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	74
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	63
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Students in the lowest 25th percentile showed the lowest performance in English Language Arts (ELA). Additionally, our Exceptional Student Education (ESE) students showed the lowest performance in both ELA and Math. Based on classroom observations, there is a lack of differentiated instruction for these students. We will continue to support our teachers with utilizing best practices to engage students in the content.

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

9th grade ELA overall achievement decreased by 1%. Our ESE students showed a decrease by 2% in overall achievement for ELA and 1% decrease in achievement for Social Studies. Based on classroom observations, there is a lack of differentiated instruction for our students. We will focus on

supporting our teachers with implementing research-based best practices to maximize learning in the classroom.

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

The lowest 25th percentile learning gains in ELA is only 3% higher than the state average. We will continue to support these students with accessing grade level texts while appropriately scaffolding their learning towards mastery of the standards.

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

Math achievement increased by 11%, Math learning gains increased by 28%, and Math lowest 25th percentile learning gains increased by 29%. We implemented Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) that focused on collaboration to discuss standards, analyze student data, and share best practices. We also implemented weekly tutoring to provide support for our students in Algebra and Geometry.

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

Course failures for ELA and Math increased overall for our 9th and 10th grade students. We also saw an increase in one or more suspensions for 9th and 10th grade students. This can be attributed to our increase in enrollment.

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

1. Focus on learning gains and achievement for our ESE students
2. Focus on learning gains and achievement for our Black and Hispanic subgroups
3. Focus on learning gains for our bottom 25% in ELA
4. Focus on implementing best practices learned through the DPLC to support student learning in all core areas
5. Focus on curating resources and implementing systems of support for our ELL students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Planning and Implementing Culturally Responsive Instruction
Rationale	School subgroup data shows a disparity in our achievement for our Black and Hispanic subgroups, our Economically Disadvantaged students, as well as our Students with Disabilities (SWD). In order to support students, we will focus on the collaborative work of PLCs to plan and implement culturally responsive instruction that includes diverse texts and tasks, student-centered instructional strategies and foster a positive culture by engaging students, parents and the community.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Lake Nona High School will increase learning gains by 5% in FSA ELA & FSA Math for the lowest 25%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Martha Chang (martha.chang@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Build our culture of collaboration between professionals (ESE and non-ESE) to increase student success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Collaboration with general education teachers, paraprofessionals and support staff is necessary to support students' learning toward measurable outcomes and to facilitate students' social and emotional well-being across all school environments and instructional settings (e.g., co-taught). Collaboration with individuals or teams requires the use of effective collaboration behaviors (e.g., sharing ideas, active listening, questioning, planning, problem solving, negotiating) to develop and adjust instructional or behavioral plans based on student data, and the coordination of expectations, responsibilities and resources to maximize student learning.
Action Step	
Description	We will support our instructional staff with: 1. Learning, applying and reflecting on classroom management strategies by offering training in Character Lab and HERO. 2. Sharing student-centered strategies and research-based best practices to increase student engagement. 3. Utilizing culturally relevant and diverse texts, including texts and tasks in the Curriculum Resource Materials (CRMs) and daily lesson plans provided by the District. 4. Utilizing digital tools that enhance the student experience with the content. 5. Analyzing student data in order to monitor progress of our Black and Hispanic subgroups, our Economically Disadvantaged students, and our Students with Disabilities (SWD). 6. Differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all students.
Person Responsible	Marie Smith (marie.smith@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Implementation of shared strategies and practices learned in the District Professional Learning Community
Rationale	Based on school data, our attendance below 90% has significantly increased in all grade levels and course failures have increased in ELA and Math. This displays a weakness in the utilization of effective student-centered instructional practices. Consequently, increased support and training regarding the implementation of District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) strategies and practices will have a positive impact on instruction and student learning.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Course failures will decrease by 5% and overall learning gains in FSA ELA and MSA Math will increase by 5% with the focus that Lake Nona High School will have on implementing best practices learned through DPLC with fidelity.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Martha Chang (martha.chang@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students systematically engage in processing content to generate conclusions through collaborative interactions with other students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	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.

Action Step	
Description	1. The PLC Support Team will model best practices and research-based strategies learning in DPLC within our school's Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). 2. The PLCs will work together to create collaborative lessons that include the implementation of close reading strategies in the classroom. These strategies will support all students, and specifically our ESE students as we engage them in guided analysis of text and scaffold towards mastery of the standards. 3. The PLCs will create norms and sustain a positive and collaborative climate in order to engage in ghost walks and peer observations, as well as share best practices. 4. The PLC Support Team will collect observational data from PLCs and classroom instruction, including a discussion of student work, specifically focusing on the strengths and challenges of our ESE students. 5. The PLCs will analyze Progress Monitoring Activities (PMA) data to determine effectiveness of the implementation of the strategies and practices learned through DPLC and their overall impact on student achievement, specifically disaggregating the data for our lowest performing subgroups and our ESE students.
Person Responsible	Donielle Gregory (donielle.gregory@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).

We will support our Instructional Coach in working with our 9th grade ELA team to increase student achievement. We will collaborate with our Curriculum Compliance Teacher (CCT) to continue to focus on providing resources and support for our ELL students to sustain their growth and achievement.