

Orange County Public Schools

Dr. Phillips High



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Dr. Phillips High

6500 TURKEY LAKE RD, Orlando, FL 32819

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

Demographics

Principal: Jackie Ramsey

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 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)	87%
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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: A (62%)
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.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Dr. Phillips High

6500 TURKEY LAKE RD, Orlando, FL 32819

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School PK, 9-12</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">55%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">74%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	C	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
Knight, Suzanne	Principal	
Bresk, Bridget	Assistant Principal	
Ralph, Doug	Assistant Principal	
Magrino, John	Dean	
Jackson, Jason	Instructional Coach	
Morrow, Vanessa	Assistant Principal	
Downs, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Shuster, Tamie	Dean	
Smith, Riki	Dean	
Wells, Rodney	Dean	
Wical, Joshua	Dean	
Arnold, Maria	Assistant Principal	
Jones, Johndrell	Assistant Principal	

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	1042	1042	982	907	3973
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	269	265	307	1063
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	153	135	98	557
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	270	355	218	138	981
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	309	357	220	53	939

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	275	336	233	157	1001

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	3	7	12	27	49
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	14	25	23	75

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

191

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/8/2019

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	202	287	300	299	1088
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	104	115	64	415
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	294	306	213	128	941
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	325	284	17	4	630

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	281	290	161	107	839

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	202	287	300	299	1088
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	104	115	64	415
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	294	306	213	128	941
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	325	284	17	4	630

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	281	290	161	107	839

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	56%	55%	56%	58%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	53%	51%	48%	46%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	40%	42%	28%	34%	41%
Math Achievement	39%	43%	51%	34%	34%	49%
Math Learning Gains	45%	49%	48%	32%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	46%	45%	33%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	75%	70%	68%	60%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	75%	73%	73%	69%	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	1042 (0)	1042 (0)	982 (0)	907 (0)	3973 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	222 (202)	269 (287)	265 (300)	307 (299)	1063 (1088)
One or more suspensions	171 (132)	153 (104)	135 (115)	98 (64)	557 (415)
Course failure in ELA or Math	270 (294)	355 (306)	218 (213)	138 (128)	981 (941)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	309 (325)	357 (284)	220 (17)	53 (4)	939 (630)

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	53%	52%	1%	55%	-2%
	2018	55%	50%	5%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	53%	50%	3%	53%	0%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	49%	4%	53%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	62%	62%	0%	65%	-3%
Compare		11%			

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	71%	69%	2%	70%	1%
2018	64%	65%	-1%	68%	-4%
Compare		7%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	43%	63%	-20%	61%	-18%
2018	33%	61%	-28%	62%	-29%
Compare		10%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	38%	53%	-15%	57%	-19%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	57%	65%	-8%	56%	1%
Compare		-19%			

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	21	29	28	22	50	67	44	39		92	44
ELL	25	42	41	37	47	38	65	50		91	63
ASN	84	65		74	70		96	88		100	83
BLK	43	44	27	26	42	42	67	63		94	49
HSP	46	46	39	39	48	41	72	69		93	69
MUL	62	56		17	46		69	100		100	64
WHT	77	58	36	62	43	33	83	92		98	76
FRL	43	42	31	32	43	43	67	68		92	58
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	19	31	31	30	44	35	31	25		85	21
ELL	22	44	41	49	54	50	35	42		83	31
ASN	75	64	36	67	58		90	91		96	78
BLK	44	48	38	33	35	28	51	49		93	33
HSP	51	51	41	50	45	43	57	64		90	53
MUL	73	76		41	18		79	71		92	73
WHT	80	61	51	72	57	39	86	84		98	75
FRL	48	49	38	41	42	34	55	56		91	39
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	10	22	19	10	27	25	21	33		76	23
ELL	23	29	24	25	39	45	33	43		76	38
ASN	80	59		62	46		88	84		94	81
BLK	41	42	27	18	25	30	42	47		90	27
HSP	49	40	27	31	33	36	52	67		88	52
MUL	67	59		37	33		75	88		86	50
WHT	80	58	39	55	38	40	83	89		95	71
FRL	45	41	27	24	29	33	48	53		87	40

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	57
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	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	626
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
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	50
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	83
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	50
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	55

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	64
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	66
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	52
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.

After a review of the data using the School Grade Data Analysis Module, ninth and tenth grade math has historically performed the lowest. This is a trend for the past five consecutive school years. Math achievement in 2015 was 42%, 43% in 2016, 34% in 2017, 50% in 2018 and 39% in 2019. A majority of our Geometry teachers have less than 3 years of experience. In addition, ninth and tenth grade English Language Arts (ELA) achievement dropped from 59% in 2018 to 56% in 2019. The 2018-19 school year was the first year Dr. Phillips High School (DPHS) did not offer Intensive Reading courses for ninth and tenth grade lowest 25% performing students. Our English Language Learner (ELL) subgroup continues to grow and requires additional specific supports and scaffolded instructional strategies. Our teachers require training on the five World Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Standards and also need guidance on incorporating high yield strategies for ELLs.

Some additional contributing factors are staff turnover, novice teachers, extended leave, teacher absences, and temporary positions. Overall, highly qualified teacher shortage continues to be a problem across all content areas.

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

Both math and ELA saw an overall decline in 2019. Math achievement went from 50% in 2018 to 39% in 2019. A majority of our Geometry teachers have less than 3 years of experience. ELA achievement went from 59% in 2018 to 56% in 2019. ELA showed a decline in the lowest 25% from 41% in 2018 to 34% in 2019. The 2018-19 school year was the first year Dr. Phillips High School (DPHS) did not offer Intensive Reading courses for ninth and tenth grade lowest 25% performing students. Our ELL subgroup continues to grow and requires additional specific supports depending on students' level of English proficiency. Teachers will utilize scaffolds that are built into the Curriculum Resource Materials such as sentence frames, graphic organizers, and tiered academic vocabulary. Some additional contributing factors are staff turnover, novice teachers, extended leave, teacher absences, and temporary positions. Overall, highly qualified teacher shortage continues to be a problem across all content areas.

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 showed the greatest gap between the school and the state. The school scored 39% while the state scored 51%, creating a 12 point gap. Some Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers struggle with implementing standards-aligned tasks in the classroom. Teachers need assistance with analyzing and using student assessment data to plan and deliver instruction. Several geometry teachers have less than three years of teaching experience and require additional professional learning on high yield strategies.

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

Biology showed the most improvement, with an eight point gain. The increase from 67% to 75% can be attributed to hands-on learning through weekly labs. The teachers also committed to one-on-one and small group tutoring sessions with students that show deficits in learning gains from Performance Monitoring Activities (PMA's) and other formative assessments. Teachers carefully reviewed data and progress monitored throughout the year to ensure that students were receiving high quality instruction. Teachers lead students into standard based instruction with rigor that met all standards and required mastery of standard to meet proficiency.

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

1. Suspensions increased: 415 to 557
2. Level 1's on statewide assessment increased: 630 to 939

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

1. Lowest 25% of ELA: focus on ELL students and increasing teacher capacity in making data-driven decisions for these specific students and utilizing the five World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Standards.
2. Math focus is to increase the proficiency to 50%.
3. Math focus is to increase learning gains to 50%.
4. ELA achievement: focus on increasing proficiency to 61%.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Professional Learning and Growth to Support Student Achievement
Rationale	<p>(1) Several of our site-based Professional Learning Communities need continued support when planning for instruction to ensure the correct level of complexity is being reached based on content standards.</p> <p>(2) Teachers continue to need support on effectively using digital tools to enhance instruction.</p> <p>(3) We see a need to support some of our teachers with incorporating and utilizing the Marzano Instructional Framework when planning meaningful instructional lessons to deliver high-quality rigorous instruction.</p> <p>(4) We need to offer more support for teachers through professional learning communities and whole-staff professional development to increase their proficiency with using student data to make decisions about instruction.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Through the participation in Professional Learning Communities, Dr. Phillips High School will see an increase in effective instructional practices that will lead to a 5-11% increase in student achievement across all content areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Suzanne Knight (suzanne.knight@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of Close Reading Initiative schoolwide with an emphasis on writing
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Close Read strategies have been proven to help students comprehend text that is above their current reading level. Students are taught to annotate text in small chunks to comprehend the text. When using Close Read strategies across multiple curriculum, students are able to apply the strategies to multiple types of text.
Action Step	
Description	<p>(1) Participate in Close Read Strategy Professional Development.</p> <p>(2) Participate in site-based Professional Learning Communities (PLC's)</p> <p>(3) Implement Effective Instructional Tools from School Site Team and PLC's: Marzano Instructional Framework, Marzano Element Strategy Protocols, Depth of Knowledge Levels of Thinking, Marzano Taxonomy, Marzano Instructional Strategies "Crosswalk" Framework, Enhancing the Art and Science of Teaching with Technology by Robert Marzano and Sonny Magana, Curriculum Resource Materials (CRM's), Florida State Assessment Item Specifications, Curriculum Planning and Learning Management System (CPALMS)</p> <p>(4) Implement Culturally Responsive Strategies</p> <p>(5) Implement Digital Curriculum Resource Materials and Utilize Canvas and Nearpod</p>
Person Responsible	Suzanne Knight (suzanne.knight@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Increase Student Achievement in State-Assessed Math Courses
Rationale	<p>(1) Some Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers struggle with implementing standards-aligned tasks in the classroom.</p> <p>(2) Teachers need assistance with analyzing and using student assessment data to plan and deliver instruction.</p> <p>(3) Geometry teachers have less than three years of teaching experience.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The Algebra and Geometry teachers will show an increase of 11% in their overall achievement by implementing standards-based instruction aligned with researched-based strategies. They will also make data driven decisions that will be implemented in the classroom after each Professional Learning Community session or Common Planning session.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Suzanne Knight (suzanne.knight@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Data driven decision making Close Read strategies Tiered Small Group Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will utilize the Algebra and Geometry test item specifications to focus on critical standards and use research based strategies to address these standards. Teachers will continue to implement close read strategies to ensure student comprehension. Teachers will implement tiered small group instruction on a weekly basis.
Action Step	
Description	<p>(1) Math coach will support teachers by providing feedback on lessons through classroom observations.</p> <p>(2) Math Coach will pull bubble students (High level 2 and Low Level 3) once a week. She will be responsible for pulling comparative data to determine groups and provide feedback to instructors.</p> <p>(3) Group students once per Curriculum Resource Material unit for small group learning opportunities to remediate deficiencies in standards and provide a more structured support with the ELL paraprofessionals to assist with small group learning.</p> <p>(4) Data chats with the most deficient students (Algebra 1 score 50% or less, Geometry 60% or less) after each culminating task. Review of tracking sheets with students.</p> <p>(5) Paper based answer sheets (include questions and space for processing their work) for students to show their work in order to receive more specific feedback on each test.</p>
Person Responsible	Suzanne Knight (suzanne.knight@ocps.net)

#3	
Title	Increase Student Achievement in State-Assessed ELA Courses
Rationale	(1) Some ELA teachers struggle with implementing standards-aligned curriculum in the classroom. (2) Teachers need assistance with analyzing and using student assessment data to plan and deliver instruction. (3) ELA lowest 25% students declined from 41% in 2018 to 34% in 2019.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The ELA teachers will show an increase of 5% in their overall achievement scores (56% to 61%) by implementing standards-aligned strategies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Suzanne Knight (suzanne.knight@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	(1) Data driven decision making (2) Tiered Intervention for bottom 25% in other content areas (science and social studies) (3) Targeted progress-monitoring for ELL students
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will understand and utilize student data in order to drive instruction. They will use best instructional practices and strategies to improve ELA student achievement. Teachers will use close reading initiative and progress monitor all students.
Action Step	
Description	(1) Monitor teachers frequently and provide feedback for improvement. (2) Conduct frequent and timely data chats with students, teachers, and literacy coach. At a minimum, data chats will occur after each PMA data point. (3) Utilize literacy coach to assist teachers with progress-monitoring Level 1 & 2 student data. Lowest 25% will receive tiered intervention outside of their ELA course. (4) Teacher grade-level assignments have changed, but continued monitoring by administration for best fit will occur. (5) Bring in outside tutors for level 1's 2's.
Person Responsible	Suzanne Knight (suzanne.knight@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).

The Leadership Team will continue conducting observations to monitor the delivery of high-quality instruction so that there will be a decrease in Level 1's on statewide assessment. Additionally, there will be a decrease in the number of suspensions as the grade-level deans implement the research-based behavior strategy of Restorative Justice.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Professional Learning and Growth to Support Student Achievement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Student Achievement in State-Assessed Math Courses	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Student Achievement in State-Assessed ELA Courses	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00