

Clay County Schools

Oakleaf High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Oakleaf High School

4035 PLANTATION OAKS BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://ohs.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Matthew Boyack

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2019

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)	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 (63%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Clay 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	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Oakleaf High School

4035 PLANTATION OAKS BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://ohs.oneclay.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 PK, 9-12	No	33%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

The mission of Oakleaf High School is to provide a safe, appropriate, and effective learning environment that will meet the needs and assist students in accomplishing educational goals that are significant for their college or career aspirations.

Provide the school's vision statement.

By providing the best education possible, we are giving our students the "armor" to succeed in their lifelong endeavors.

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
Pickett, Treasure	Principal	
Stilianou, Amanda	Assistant Principal	
Thompson, Christina	Assistant Principal	AP for 9th grade
Boyack, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Professional Development Testing Admin
Rains, Alethia	Teacher, K-12	

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	654	675	679	596	2604
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	88	82	68	322

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	84	50	20	10	164	

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)

132

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

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	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	

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	200	400	450	500	1550
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	23	28	22	103
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	22	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141	113	34	0	288

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	90	91	0	0	181

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	61%	60%	56%	55%	54%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	52%	51%	49%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	39%	42%	40%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	59%	55%	51%	61%	60%	49%
Math Learning Gains	53%	46%	48%	52%	51%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	38%	45%	40%	37%	39%
Science Achievement	75%	73%	68%	60%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	81%	73%	73%	78%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	654 (0)	675 (0)	679 (0)	596 (0)	2604 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	84 (0)	88 (0)	82 (0)	68 (0)	322 (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.

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	62%	61%	1%	55%	7%
	2018	58%	56%	2%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	58%	57%	1%	53%	5%
	2018	60%	58%	2%	53%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	74%	72%	2%	67%	7%
2018	85%	90%	-5%	65%	20%
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	83%	80%	3%	70%	13%
2018	80%	78%	2%	68%	12%
Compare		3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	65%	-13%	61%	-9%
2018	52%	66%	-14%	62%	-10%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	64%	0%	57%	7%
2018	57%	61%	-4%	56%	1%
Compare		7%			

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	25	50	54	24	28	18	54	52		91	35
ELL	24	50	56	47	59	50	36	70		82	50
ASN	78	57		71	64		94	94		100	74

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
BLK	50	49	41	53	50	35	70	76		94	58
HSP	61	57	58	58	52	31	73	78		96	65
MUL	69	62	50	63	63	27	76	91		97	48
WHT	66	60	50	64	53	40	79	90		96	68
FRL	51	52	48	50	42	26	65	76		95	53
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	24	41	40	22	39	31	82	44		87	40
ELL	37	53	50	41	46	35		46		71	83
ASN	82	53		81	65		95	96		96	78
BLK	49	52	47	42	42	30	83	71		96	58
HSP	58	57	49	54	55	42	86	79		91	73
MUL	63	56		60	51		100	83		91	81
WHT	66	56	49	65	58	45	91	86		93	73
FRL	50	53	48	47	47	36	81	75		90	59
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	18	35	31	25	45	43	18	51		83	12
ELL	15	39	38	41	50	35	28	29		69	
ASN	80	69		78	64		80	90		100	87
BLK	45	41	34	47	45	38	44	65		94	52
HSP	53	49	35	57	50	38	62	64		88	71
MUL	51	35		57	57		59	63		91	67
WHT	60	55	50	72	57	44	71	80		95	66
FRL	46	45	36	55	50	38	52	59		93	55

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	61
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	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	669
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	51
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	79
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	55
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	61
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	65
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	
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	67
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	54
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.

Our lowest performing area was Learning Gains for LQ Math students. Our LQ students making gains was only 35%. Contributing factors included adjusting to a 1A/1B block format for all LQ students. Teachers are receiving additional training. Also, fewer students are taking Alg 1 at the high school (more at junior high) thus leaving the very lowest with Alg 1. Alg 1 is basically a remedial course at the high school.

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

Our largest drop was Learning Gains for LQ students in the area of ELA (-3) and Math (-3). Not including high student engagement activities and small group instruction for the LQ students contributed to the drop.

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.

Learning Gains for LQ students - State 45%, district-38% and OHS 35%. See the notes in section "A".

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

Bio proficiency- Our school goal was 72% but our actual proficiency rate was 75%. We had a great 10th grade Biology PLC and the 9th grade Environmental Science did a great job preparing students for Biology.

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

Number of student with attendance below 90%

Number of 9/10 students at level 1 on state wide assessments.

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

1. Learning Gains for our Math LQ students
2. Learning Gains for our ELA LQ students
3. Implement Social/Emotional Learning for all students
4. Increase teacher led small group instuction
5. Increase the amount of high cognition/high participation activities in classrooms.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	To cultivate a deep sense of student engagment in what students are learning.
Rationale	Our lower quartile students did not perform to expectations during the 2018-19 school year. Our ELA LQ Learning Gains dropped 3% from 49% to 46%. Our math LQ gains dropped from from 38% to 35%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase our ELA LQ Gains to 48% (+2) and our Math LQ Gains to 38% +3).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Treasure Pickett (treasure.pickett@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Exposing teachers to a bank of student engagment activities, introducing small group instruction and giving Learning Walk Feedback based on the Cognitive engagement quadrant (4 Levels of engagement/cognitiion).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We want teachers to have all students fully engaged in class, not just "ritually compliant". We need our LQ students engaged in group discussions with rigorous task, high level questioning, and sharing their individual voice. We need teachers to support LQ students through small group discussions.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Distributed and explained the LW tool during pre-planning department meetings 2. Mark appropriate quadrant areas during LW 3. Professional Development on student engagement activities. Teachers participated in a Gallery Walk and Socratic Seminar to learn new student engagment activities. 4. All activites are in a Google Drive labeled "Student Engagement Activities" 5. Professional development on small group instuction.
Person Responsible	Treasure Pickett (treasure.pickett@myoneclay.net)

#2	
Title	Develop and improve the social and emotional health of the students.
Rationale	Because teachers see students regularly for 10 months of each year, they are in a key position to help protect the mental health of these children. Teachers can be the first to notice signs and symptoms of mental illness in their students. They can also help prevent mental illnesses from developing in the first place, through preventive measures in the classroom.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	100% of the teachers will utilize 7 Mindsets program once a week. Improve Panorama Survey results Improvements in academic engagement and achievement Improvements in student attendance
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Treasure Pickett (treasure.pickett@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Training in the form of a 3 hour, 7 Mindset training implemented during preplanning. A year-long 7 Mindsets usage calendar. Introduced the 7 Mindsets to the parents of new 9th grade students during open house.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Panorama Data: ° 19% of students felt they were connected to an adult at the school ° 20% of students felt attentive and invested in class ° 29% of students felt they mattered to others at the school
Action Step	
Description	1. Weekly 7 Mindset program used during enrichment school-wide 2. Once a quarter, dedicate a section in planners for students to write down their academic & personal goals. (5th period) 3. Created 7 Mindsets posters for school-wide reinforcement of the 7 Mindsets program 4. Increasing rewards for positive behavior.
Person Responsible	Treasure Pickett (treasure.pickett@myoneclay.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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 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.

Oakleaf High School works at building positive relationships with families to increase involvement through a plethora of communication methods. The Focus Parent Portal provides parents with continuous access to their student's academic and attendance progress. In addition, the use of the Edulink Systems allows OHS to send school improvement communication via phone calls, emails and apps. Furthermore, the principal sends Sunday night messages to all parents providing pertinent information regarding school activities which fosters effective communication. Oakleaf also maintains a strict policy that includes contacting parents of students who have missed two or more consecutive days of school, and or whose grades have fallen below a "C" average.

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.

Oakleaf High provides ongoing counseling and mentoring for students through our Guidance Department, Teacher/student mentoring program as well as school sponsored activities that meet the social-emotional needs of the student body. Oakleaf High also has military counselors to address the social-emotional needs of students in military families. These counselors are provided by the Department of Defense Education Activity (DODEA), which supports military children with specific concerns such as family separation due to deployment, and relocation transitions.

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

Oakleaf High School supports the transition of incoming freshmen each year through a dynamic orientation process called Knighthood. This event familiarizes students with the high school environment, informs them of pertinent information to ensure a successful high school transition, and provides team building activities to acquaint students with their fellow classmates. Oakleaf also provides an Academy program that divides its incoming freshman cohort into two academies, with a teacher-academic leader in each academy. The academy structure provides additional support to students in their transition into high school.

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.

The MTSS Leadership Team is the coordinating body that develops and implements the action plan to best meet the needs of all learners. The MTSS Team will identify resources, collect and analyze data, arrange professional development for all discerned staff, and ensure implementation of the Problem-solving/Response to Intervention model so that all students' needs are identified and addressed. The entire MTSS Leadership Team will meet monthly, while sub-groups of the MTSS Leadership Team will meet bi-weekly, for the analysis of collected data and to make instructional decisions, progress monitor data to identify all possible Tiers of students. The team will share researched strategies to enhance professional development and instructional modes of delivery to enhance the implementation and success of MTSS intervention. The data-based problem solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP to address effectiveness of core instruction include ensuring the 80% of students are successful at Tier 1, 15% of students are in Tier 2 and 5% or less of students are in Tier 3. If at least 80% are not successful, then additional intervention must be considered. With school-wide initiatives that include: writing across all content areas with a focus on evidence-based strategies that innovate students, engaging students with strategies that allow students to read, talk and write, focusing

on contextual reading analysis with text dependent responses and empowering faculty /department meetings by strengthening Professional Learning Communities to allow for teacher leadership and job-embedded professional development towards a common goal. Progress measuring will be done by individual teachers quarterly to ensure success rate. The Intervention Facilitator will be available to support teachers ensure that core instruction benchmarks are being met.

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

OHS guidance department works closely with students to ensure that they are on track throughout their academic and career planning, as well as graduation. Guidance Counselors are the point of contact for college visits. In addition, Oakleaf High has a Career Specialist who provides different opportunities in which students can determine the area of specialty in which they are interested to begin taking the coursework for their field of study.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To cultivate a deep sense of student engagement in what students are learning.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Develop and improve the social and emotional health of the students.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00