

Orange County Public Schools

Apopka High



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 20 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 25 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Apopka High

555 W MARTIN ST, Apopka, FL 32712

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

Demographics

Principal: Lyle Heinz

Start Date for this Principal: 6/28/2018

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 82% |
| 2020-21 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 (54%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (48%) |
| 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 | |

* 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 20 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Apopka High

555 W MARTIN ST, Apopka, FL 32712

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School 9-12 | No | 67% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 72% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | 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.

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 | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Heinz, Lyle | Principal | Supervise and evaluate the Assistant Principals, instructional support personnel, and exceptional student education department. Liaison for SAC/PTSA/Alumni foundation and school resource officers. Responsible for school budget and resources. |
| Owens, Marcia | Assistant Principal | Supervise and lead the science and social studies departments. Monitor student attendance, tutoring programs, five star award, additions volunteers and summer school. |
| Ryan, Dominique | Assistant Principal | Supervise and lead the English, reading, and performing arts departments. Maintain the facilities and inventory of the school. Create and monitor the safe school plan and conduct drills as required. |
| Fowler, Cecilio | Other | AP coordinator is responsible for working with all AP teachers to ensure students are registered for exams, provide tutoring schedule for AP classes. |
| Pickels, Katherine | Dean | Assist the reading department in lesson planning and delivery of instruction. Title IX coordinator. Monitor and assist with student behavior |
| Bowman, Holly | Curriculum Resource Teacher | Develop PD for staff, coach individual teachers and assist faculty in pulling and analyzing data |
| McCormick, Kelly | Instructional Coach | Develop PD for staff, coach individual teachers and assist faculty in pulling and analyzing data |
| Herskovitz, Janet | Staffing Specialist | All IEP's including meetings and implementation of accommodations. |
| Oliver, Stevie | Dean | Student safety and interventions for behavior. |
| Jenkins, Eddie | Dean | Student safety and interventions for behavior. |
| Richard, Demetria | Teacher, K-12 | Culturally responsive teaching champion |
| Willard, April | Instructional Media | Digital learning lead. Assist students and teachers in providing resources for all students with a focus on digital devices. |
| Bray, Tayer | Assistant Principal | Supervise Guidance and Student services |
| Rolston Cary, Jodie | Assistant Principal | Supervise Student Behavior |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/28/2018, Lyle Heinz

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.*

3

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

166

Total number of students enrolled at the school

3,407

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

22

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

19

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22**

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 | 53 | 790 | 904 | 794 | 808 | 3349 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 218 | 250 | 253 | 202 | 958 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 89 | 73 | 35 | 31 | 236 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 126 | 171 | 111 | 145 | 578 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 202 | 202 | 135 | 235 | 804 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 144 | 225 | 165 | 157 | 713 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 178 | 206 | 168 | 73 | 652 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 263 | 295 | 246 | 249 | 1089 |

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 | |

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 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/28/2021

2020-21 - 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 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 829 | 821 | 922 | 814 | 3386 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 122 | 186 | 219 | 638 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 82 | 122 | 74 | 349 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 | 131 | 205 | 156 | 628 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 | 159 | 320 | 327 | 965 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 183 | 174 | 195 | 179 | 731 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 167 | 182 | 89 | 180 | 618 |

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 | 222 | 237 | 310 | 308 | 1077 |

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 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 33 |

2020-21 - 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 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 829 | 821 | 922 | 814 | 3386 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 122 | 186 | 219 | 638 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 82 | 122 | 74 | 349 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 | 131 | 205 | 156 | 628 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 | 159 | 320 | 327 | 965 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 183 | 174 | 195 | 179 | 731 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 167 | 182 | 89 | 180 | 618 | |

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 | 222 | 237 | 310 | 308 | 1077 |

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 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 33 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 50% | 55% | 56% | 50% | 54% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 47% | 53% | 51% | 48% | 51% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 34% | 40% | 42% | 38% | 40% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 35% | 43% | 51% | 54% | 49% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 47% | 49% | 48% | 49% | 44% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 45% | 46% | 45% | 37% | 39% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 70% | 70% | 68% | 58% | 66% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 65% | 73% | 73% | 63% | 69% | 71% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 52% | -1% | 55% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 50% | -3% | 53% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |

| 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 |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 68% | 67% | 1% | 67% | 1% |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 64% | 69% | -5% | 70% | -6% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 33% | 63% | -30% | 61% | -28% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 34% | 53% | -19% | 57% | -23% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The data used for monitoring is our quarterly assessments from ELA 9, ELA 10, Biology, United States History, Algebra, and Geometry.

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 53 | 48 | 53 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 41 | 37 | 42 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8 | 6 | 15 |
| | English Language Learners | 13 | 24 | 15 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 47 | 43 | 47 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 40 | 36 | 39 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 29 | 20 | 27 |
| | English Language Learners | 32 | 42 | 44 |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 80 | 72 | 77 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 72 | 66 | 70 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 50 | 33 | 58 |
| | English Language Learners | 44 | 56 | 75 |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 46 | 38 | 50 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 38 | 31 | 42 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13 | 16 | 23 |
| | English Language Learners | 26 | 22 | 22 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 28 | 29 | 33 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 26 | 28 | 32 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33 | 16 | 29 |
| | English Language Learners | 41 | 31 | 44 |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 51 | 45 | 45 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 45 | 40 | 40 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 23 | 29 | 33 |
| | English Language Learners | 28 | 36 | 24 |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 100 | 67 | 67 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 100 | 100 | 50 |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | 0 | NA |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | NA | NA | NA |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | NA | NA |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | NA | NA |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 15 | 22 | 16 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 13 | 22 | 15 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10 | 21 | 18 |
| | English Language Learners | 38 | 33 | 26 |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 60 | 54 | 60 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 50 | 47 | 54 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 33 | 50 |
| | English Language Learners | 100 | 0 | 100 |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 62 | 63 | 57 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 55 | 56 | 50 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 32 | 38 | 32 |
| | English Language Learners | 32 | 35 | 25 |

| Grade 12 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | NA | NA | NA |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | NA | NA |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | NA | NA |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 33 | 29 | 14 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 40 | 40 | 17 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 50 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 50 | 75 | 67 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 67 | 50 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 50 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 33 | 57 | 43 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 33 | 57 | 43 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 11 | 35 | 33 | 5 | 17 | 23 | 30 | 24 | | 90 | 26 |
| ELL | 15 | 37 | 35 | 14 | 33 | 50 | 30 | 28 | | 88 | 37 |
| ASN | 80 | 64 | | | | | 64 | | | 100 | 89 |
| BLK | 41 | 44 | 30 | 13 | 23 | 33 | 48 | 51 | | 94 | 44 |
| HSP | 38 | 44 | 34 | 17 | 21 | 26 | 54 | 41 | | 91 | 48 |

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| MUL | 58 | 47 | | 21 | 17 | | 78 | 42 | | 93 | 43 |
| WHT | 61 | 56 | 42 | 31 | 26 | 31 | 72 | 65 | | 96 | 58 |
| FRL | 37 | 43 | 33 | 14 | 22 | 30 | 49 | 45 | | 93 | 45 |
| 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 | 19 | 36 | 30 | 22 | 43 | 43 | 34 | 37 | | 94 | 24 |
| ELL | 15 | 26 | 20 | 30 | 48 | 42 | 36 | 43 | | 92 | 38 |
| ASN | 67 | 56 | | 47 | | | 94 | 69 | | 100 | 68 |
| BLK | 42 | 44 | 30 | 26 | 42 | 41 | 60 | 58 | | 98 | 37 |
| HSP | 42 | 43 | 34 | 34 | 48 | 47 | 64 | 60 | | 96 | 47 |
| MUL | 63 | 51 | | 50 | 50 | | 80 | 58 | | 100 | 40 |
| WHT | 61 | 53 | 40 | 44 | 52 | 47 | 82 | 77 | | 96 | 58 |
| FRL | 41 | 42 | 32 | 30 | 46 | 45 | 63 | 57 | | 96 | 39 |
| 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 | 36 | 31 | 39 | 41 | 31 | 27 | 33 | | 83 | 19 |
| ELL | 18 | 45 | 44 | 53 | 55 | 36 | 28 | 19 | | 95 | 34 |
| ASN | 68 | 59 | | 64 | 82 | | 72 | 94 | | 92 | 67 |
| BLK | 43 | 43 | 31 | 48 | 45 | 28 | 50 | 54 | | 86 | 32 |
| HSP | 42 | 46 | 43 | 51 | 49 | 40 | 51 | 58 | | 97 | 48 |
| MUL | 65 | 55 | | 38 | 38 | | 46 | 55 | | 94 | 56 |
| WHT | 62 | 54 | 38 | 63 | 50 | 45 | 71 | 72 | | 93 | 57 |
| FRL | 41 | 44 | 37 | 47 | 46 | 33 | 51 | 56 | | 92 | 39 |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 45 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 38 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 494 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 89% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 29 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 37 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 41 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The data indicates an achievement gap between our students with disabilities and the overall proficiency rate in all subjects except mathematics. The largest gap is in English Language Arts with only 15% of student with disabilities demonstrating proficiency. The data also shows a steady decline in our US history scores over the past years with a 7% drop from the 2019 EOC to the spring progress monitoring activity in 2021. Finally the data shows a constant proficiency rate below our expectations in mathematics. Although Algebra increased by 8% from 2019 EOC to 2021 PMA it is still at 41%. Geometry remained low with proficiency rate only increasing by 2% from 34% in 2019 to 36% in 2021.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The 2019 state assessment and Progress monitoring activity from 2021 indicate our greatest need is mathematics. The data shows that the majority of our students are not performing at a level considered proficient. The latest algebra data shows a proficiency rate 41% and geometry at 36% according to 2021 spring progress monitoring activity.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors to the drop in proficiency is the process in which teaching and learning has taken place the past year. The students require time to process and apply the information using different methods in the classroom. Due to LaunchEd the resources to teachers and students were limited and many students struggled to process and apply the content in the setting.

The new actions will be the implementation of rotational model teaching. The rotations in math class will allow the students to receive, process and apply the content to reach the level of the standards. The teachers will also implement interactive notebooks to get the students writing and creating reference guides of their own to increase retention of the content.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The algebra scores indicate the greatest improvement with an increase of 8% proficiency. The subgroup that showed the most improvement is our ELL students in mathematics.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The improvements are the result of the development of young teachers through observations and professional development. Two of the teachers went through a full coaching cycle to improve their skills and the results are beginning to show in the data. The teams also incorporated interactive notebooks in their classrooms. This strategy allows the students to create their own resource and process material more effectively.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The focus for the 21-22 school year will be utilizing the Marzano Framework to ensure the high yield strategies are being utilized in every classroom everyday. The observation data indicates growth needed in activates such as students examining their own reasoning and revising knowledge. PLC's will meet at a minimum of twice a week to plan and identify the strategies called for on each standard in order to deliver high quality instruction. Student activities like interactive notebooks will be utilized to promote students examining their reasoning throughout each lesson. Administrators and coaches will visit classrooms daily and provided feedback to coach teachers to reach their highest potential.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

1. Teacher leaders will come in over the summer to receive in depth training on the instructional framework. The focus will be aligning the teaching strategy planned for and used with the level of the standard being taught.
2. Teachers will be provided professional development twice a month. One professional development will be campus wide and strategies beneficial to all teachers. The second will be differentiated based on the need of the teacher.
3. Administrators and coaches will observe classrooms and provide feedback daily to improve teaching strategies each day.
4. Administrators will collect the data form the observations and provide individual teachers Professional Development based on the observation data.
5. Teachers will have opportunity to complete individual training through canvas.
6. Teacher leaders have been identified to attend impact training in their content area with district coaches. Teachers will attend and bring back strategies to the rest of the PLC.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The teachers will be implementing rotational model in Math and English classes to support students and provide interventions when needed. The teams will utilize current data to provide small group instruction to raise the level of the students to proficiency. Administration will observe and provide the teachers with feedback to continuously improve the teaching model and sustain growth for the year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

By modifying the districts' social and emotional learning model, we will curate and implement a school-wide social and emotional learning curriculum that will focus on providing continued support for our students and faculty that increases their overall social and emotional well-being.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

By strengthening and improving students' social and emotional status, there should be a positive correlation in student academic achievement. Hence, shifting the culture and climate of the school, the students and staff will have a stronger sense of belonging as well as be more culturally aware and embracing the differences of others on campus.

Inclusive of all ethnicities, we will create a parent and family engagement committee that consist of faculty, parents and stakeholders. This committee will oversee quarterly events aimed at strengthening the culture of the school by building positive relationships between the school, families and the community.

Measurable Outcome:

After analyzing the results of the panorama and character lab surveys, we will implement a quarterly school-created climate survey that will be used to monitor and gauge social and emotional status. As a result of the quarterly surveys, we hope to see an increase in the following areas:

- an increase in our school's culture & climate by 20%. For students, it is currently at 39% and teachers are at 52%.
- an increase the student's sense of belonging by 30%. It is currently at 29%.
- an increase our school's awareness & action by 20%. It is currently at 30% for teachers and 48% for students.
- an increase teacher-student relationships by 35%. It is currently at 49%.

Monitoring:

We will host quarterly data chats with random students and staff based on the following data points listed below:

- school-generated climate surveys
- character lab surveys
- district-wide panorama survey
- CWT surveys
- iObservation data

During the chats, we will analyze the results and make the necessary adjustments, as needed, in order to improve and strengthen our schools' social and emotional awareness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lyle Heinz (lyle.heinz@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The school leaders will use SEL guidelines to measure and monitor for on-going implementation of the school-developed SEL curriculum based on significant-systematic evidence.

We will build and maintain a cohesive and continuous professional development plan designed to address the needs of our students, staff and families that would have a direct impact on student learning as well as family and community engagement.

In order to shift the schools' culture, it is imperative to take into consideration all stakeholders. Building teacher's capacity and cultivating leadership capabilities will help to strengthen the social and emotional learning taking place within the school.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change.

Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

- Create an SEL school-based team (school leaders, students, staff, parents and stakeholders)
- responsible for creating the SEL school curriculum/initiatives
- all staff members participating on a committee to increase the number of stakeholders in decision making processes (campus beautification, community outreach, attendance and tardies, student recognition, hospitality, faculty handbook, and grading practices)
- reoccurring professional development aimed at integrating aligned instructional and SEL strategies utilizing the streamlined instructional framework as a model
- finding the correlation between the standard, depth of knowledge, and element called for within the streamlined instructional framework to meet student academic and social emotional needs
- responsible for engaging in quarterly data chats
- analyzing and integrating data results and implementing necessary responsive practices
- responsible for implementing quarterly school-based family/community communication(s) and events
- hosting school-wide events that focuses on growing a strong family/community relationship (parent workshops, parent resources center, Darter Opening, meet-the-principal evening)
- creating a communication hub that encompasses all ethnicities/languages

Person Responsible Lyle Heinz (lyle.heinz@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Apopka High School will understand, plan, and deliver rigorous standards-based instruction by creating, monitoring, and supporting consistent and high quality common planning and collaboration opportunities for all teachers with an intense focus on the instructional framework.

-If teachers are provided with continued support in utilizing the scope and sequence and Curriculum Resource Materials, then we will be able to build teacher capacity in planning and lesson delivery that demonstrates the full extent of the standard.

-If teachers are given the opportunity to common plan, then teachers will be able to ensure consistency and effectiveness across all standards.
-If the coaching cycle is utilized, then high quality, rigorous standards-based instruction will occur.

Measurable Outcome:

Teachers will use strategies and tools to transfer knowledge into delivery of high quality, rigorous instruction. Apopka High School will see achievement growth in our students, especially in the ESE and ELL subgroups. With the training provided to teachers and the interventions put into place, students will show positive performance growth in the tested subjects: Algebra I, Geometry, ELA 9, ELA 10, Biology, and U.S. History.

Monitoring:

Desired outcome data will be monitored using trend data from the Classroom Walkthrough Tool (CWT) and evaluative and coaching Instructional and Leadership Practice observational data via iObservation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lyle Heinz (lyle.heinz@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will systematically engage in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) within their content area to deliver high quality, rigorous instruction with an intense focus on the instructional framework.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

“Educators in a PLC benefit from clarity regarding their shared purpose, a common understanding of the school they are trying to create, collective communities to help move the school in the desired direction, and specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time-bound (SMART) goals to mark their progress. In a PLC, educators work together interdependently in collaborative teams to achieve common goals for which they are mutually accountable. The structure of the school is aligned to ensure teams are provided the time and support essential to adult learning.” (DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, Many, & Mattos, 2016)

Action Steps to Implement

- Intentional scheduling to ensure common planning within all content areas.
- Teachers will receive ongoing professional development and training on the utilization of standards-based instruction and high quality, rigorous instruction with an intense focus on the streamlined instructional framework.
- Interventions will be provided to teachers using trend data from the Classroom Walkthrough Tool and observation data collected by leadership

Person Responsible

Lyle Heinz (lyle.heinz@ocps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with Disabilities scored at 19% proficient in ELA, 22% proficient in math, 34% proficient in science, and 37% proficient in social studies. The subgroup earned 38 points in the federal index with is below the 41 point threshold to meet minimum requirements under ESSA. The data is a strong indicator that this needs to be an area of focus for APopka High School

Measurable Outcome: The use of high yield strategies will increase the percentage of students proficient.

Monitoring: The progress monitoring data will be monitored and analyzed to provide supports identified in the data. The use of the continuous improvement model will drive the instruction for the students with disabilities. Administration will observe classrooms and collect data on the strategies be used by the teachers to meet the needs of the students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lyle Heinz (lyle.heinz@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The teachers will develop and implement flexible grouping to improve mastery of standards by students with disabilities. Teachers will use small group instruction to accommodate learning differences, promote in-depth academic related interactions and teach students to work collaboratively. Teachers will also increase the systematic use of explicit instruction. They will strategically choose examples and language to facilitate student understanding with a focus on the students with disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The strategies are research based and high yield strategies for ESE students.

Action Steps to Implement

The teacher will receive ongoing professional development in the instructional framework with a focus on explicit instruction and collaborative structures. Administration will walk classrooms and collect observation data on the strategies being used and their effectiveness with the students in the subgroup.

Person Responsible Janet Herskovitz (janet.herskovitz@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Based on 2019-2020 data from SafeSchoolsforAlex.com, Apopka High School was listed in the moderate range, ranking 216 out of 505 high school across the state and 10 out of 26 high schools in Orange County. The data indicates that we are below the statewide average, with 2.6 incidents per 100 students compared to the state score of 3.3.

The total reported suspensions ranked Apopka High School at 292 out of 505 high schools across the state, with 352 in-school and 105 out-of-school suspensions during the 2019-2020 school year. The overall number of suspensions decreased by 27% compared to 582 total suspensions in 2018-2019.

Our primary discipline goal is to not inhibit or interfere with student learning by removing them from the classroom for disciplinary action. Apopka High School will continue to incorporate Social Emotional Learning strategies across our campus by providing teacher training and ongoing support, particularly during PLC planning meetings, to ensure SEL strategies are utilized. Our continued implementation of SEL strategies builds relationships between students, as well as enhancing teacher and student interaction and reduces and deescalates disruptive, negative behaviors. Restorative Programs will also be instituted to help identify the root cause of negative behaviors, resolve conflicts and teach improved decision making skills. Ultimately, our goal is to limit academic losses by remediating and returning students to the classroom while keeping relationships intact.

Discipline data will be monitored weekly by the Discipline PLC to identify trends and address or modify current protocols and procedures based on school needs.

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, Apopka High School will engage in district wide training on social and emotional well being. A core team of teachers and administrators from Apopka High School, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on Apopka High School and it's community

needs. The professional learning at Apopka High School will use the CASEL Core Competencies and instructional framework as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. Apopka High Schools leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council and Parent, Teacher, Student Association to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Apopka High School will strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our current SEL team consists of Abby Kish an art teacher, Kimberly Green an Exceptional Education teacher, Anna Freemole a World History teacher, Edward Carmen the SAFE coordinator, Cecilio Fowler a character lab coordinator, Emily Rash a U.S. History teacher, Ramon Reyes a science teacher and Lyle Heinz the Principal.

This team attends trainings and creates plans to distribute information and best practices to the staff.