

Orange County Public Schools

Windermere High



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	14
Planning for Improvement	23
Positive Culture & Environment	27
Budget to Support Goals	28

Windermere High

5523 WINTER GARDEN VINELAND RD, Windermere, FL 34786

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

Demographics

Principal: Andrew Leftakis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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)	26%
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 (60%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: No Grade
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	14
Planning for Improvement	23
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	28

Windermere High

5523 WINTER GARDEN VINELAND RD, Windermere, FL 34786

<https://windermerehs.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	20%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

OCPS Mission: 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.

OCPS Vision: 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
Leftakis, Andrew	Principal	Academic coaches Academic focus Budget and bookkeeping Campus Communication Data Management Faculty meetings Hiring/retention of personnel Iobservation Incident Commander Media relations Professional Development Progress monitoring School Advisory Council PTSO Liason School Improvement Plan School goals and vision Social Emotional Learning and Leadership Leadership Team Performing Arts Visual Arts SGA Assistant Principals Classified Personnel
Murchison, Nancy	Assistant Principal	Social Studies Pre-Majors/CTE Annual Fire Inspection AED Custodial Liason Digital devices Drills Duty assignments Emergency contact forms Environmental Complainece Fire extinguisher Facility Use FSSAT Independent contractors Inventory- fixed assets Key management Project Lead the Way Property manager Radio management Recycling School clinic School Safe Plan Social and Emotional Learning and Leadership Student/Staff IDs Summer IAQ

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Tabletop activities Textbook inventory Work orders Other duties as assigned
Linehan, John	Assistant Principal	Science World Languages Physical Education Athletics/Clubs/ICC CLAW Day CPR Training Discipline FAC Admin representative HOPE Scholarships Level 4 Process MAO Representative Marquee National Academic Signing Day New Teacher Extravaganza OCPS Gives Parking Partners in Education PASS Social Emotional Learning and Leadership Shelter Coordinator Student recognition Teacher Appreciation/TOY/SPOY Threat Assessment Team Vision Screenings Uniformed Security Guards Wellness Rep/Health school team/health hero champion Other duties as assigned
Adkins, Jessica	Assistant Principal	English Language Arts Edgenuity Lab Guidance Counselors SAFE College and Career Specialist Accountability contact Baker Acts College and Career Center College and career readiness Dual enrollment ELL Monitoring FAFSA Financial Aid Night/Info FSA Data review FTE Industry certifications

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Mental Health Social Worker Monitoring students at risk of non-graduation Monitor D and F students National Merit Scholars National Student Clearing House Data SCOIR Project Impact Master schedule School Advisory Committee/SIP Scholarship money Social Emotional Learning and Leadership Super Scholars Tracking non-graduates Other duties as assigned
Stokes, Daniel	Assistant Principal	Math Exceptional Student Education/504 ADDitions volunteers AICE program AP program Gifted Field trips Graduation coordinator Mentor Coordinator- new teachers Mentor coordinator- students Open House PLC coordination Push-in teacher coordinatio Scholar Events Social Emotional Learning and Leadership Staffing Specialists Substitutes Teach-In Teacher leaders and growth Teacher planning days Testing Tutoring Other duties as assigned
Newcomer, Amanda	Other	Advanced Placement AICE Testing
Greene, Stephanie	Reading Coach	Support reading and ELA classes/teachers. Literacy leadership council Monitor level one and two readers

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		MTSS Tier 2/3 reading plan
Hernando, Roxana	ELL Compliance Specialist	Maintain accurate records for ELL students and provide classroom support to teachers and students ESOL Management ESOL Compliance ESOL teacher and classroom support WIDA
Williams, Kelly	Instructional Media	5 Star School Award Device rollout/collection Digital curriculum Student tech support Media Center Management Student IDs Textbook Inventory
Brockmeier, Brittany	Instructional Coach	Character Lab Common Assessments Data monitoring and data chats In-service points/certification Lesson plan/CRM support Pre-Planning Professional Learning Communities Teacher Mentors
Reed, Mary	Administrative Support	Behavior Management/Discipline Detention Social Media Coordinator Threat Assessment Team Website
Cawley, Jacob	Dean	Behavior Management/Discipline Detention Level 4 Process Threat Assessment Team Title IX Coordinator Transportation/Busses
Chance, Torri	Other	SAT/ACT/PSAT State and local testing compliance AP and AICE support

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Andrew Leftakis

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.*

4

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.*

28

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

136

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,971

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

11

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

12

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	0	3	611	729	658	970	2971
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	111	253	249	341	956	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	29	28	31	122	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	30	73	106	245	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	38	89	97	254	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	88	64	102	322	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	85	56	91	293	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	111	111	143	470	

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	84	120	134	191	529

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/20/2021

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	0	1069	1121	1059	929	4178
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	146	165	180	551
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	49	52	47	172
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	143	150	162	500
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	167	127	140	480
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	122	133	107	490
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	111	104	152	494

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	111	207	195	214	727

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	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	10

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	0	1069	1121	1059	929	4178
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	146	165	180	551
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	49	52	47	172
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	143	150	162	500
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	167	127	140	480
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	122	133	107	490
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	111	104	152	494

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	111	207	195	214	727

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	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	10

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				70%	55%	56%	67%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	53%	51%	58%	51%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	40%	42%	47%	40%	44%
Math Achievement				56%	43%	51%	57%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains				52%	49%	48%	47%	44%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	46%	45%	38%	39%	45%
Science Achievement				74%	70%	68%	79%	66%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				79%	73%	73%	74%	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	67%	52%	15%	55%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	65%	50%	15%	53%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

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	73%	67%	6%	67%	6%	

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	76%	69%	7%	70%	6%	

ALGEBRA EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2021						
2019	46%	63%	-17%	61%	-15%	

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	60%	53%	7%	57%	3%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA 9, ELA 10, Algebra I, Geometry, Biology, and U.S. History used county Progress Monitoring Activities (PMA) to monitor grade level data each nine weeks.

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61	68	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	57	61
	Students With Disabilities	31	43	39
	English Language Learners	43	51	58
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students	66	75	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	70	64
	Students With Disabilities	47	55	60
	English Language Learners	69	75	68
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Biology	All Students	90	90	88
	Economically Disadvantaged	87	82	80
	Students With Disabilities	71	64	75
	English Language Learners	96	93	88
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
US History	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53	61	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	56	53
	Students With Disabilities	30	34	36
	English Language Learners	37	42	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41	52	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	50	48
	Students With Disabilities	33	50	43
	English Language Learners	46	55	42
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	67	63	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	65	65	59
	Students With Disabilities	57	52	51
	English Language Learners	58	54	55
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	92	85	89
	Economically Disadvantaged	100	100	75
	Students With Disabilities	100	50	100
	English Language Learners	50	50	100

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39	41	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	32	35
	Students With Disabilities	27	20	28
	English Language Learners	47	59	49
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	64	82	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	75	80	50
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	0
	English Language Learners	67	86	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	76	82	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	66	74	76
	Students With Disabilities	59	69	77
	English Language Learners	60	73	69
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	50	0	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	0	63
	Students With Disabilities	33	0	67
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	71	71	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	67	0	67
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	50
	English Language Learners	80	75	67
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	76	82	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	86	75	83
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	60	80	67

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	30	38	32	24	34	31	52	52		94	31
ELL	41	58	53	30	35	24	50	55		98	60
ASN	77	67	33	53	24		75	90		100	74
BLK	63	58	38	33	27	24	75	67		100	56
HSP	56	57	52	34	33	25	65	65		98	62

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	81	77		54			85			100	75
WHT	70	59	44	49	33	23	77	83		99	72
FRL	55	53	42	33	29	20	61	60		99	59
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	18	25	25	14	30	34	32	36			
ELL	41	52	49	46	53	49	60	57			
ASN	81	69	33	75	58		90	85			
BLK	59	55	38	30	31	43	63	74			
HSP	60	54	45	52	52	41	70	74			
MUL	92	74		71	67		85	67			
WHT	74	61	47	60	54	46	75	83			
FRL	54	49	33	42	44	42	62	71			
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	20	31	30	29	42	43	41	53			
ELL	35	50	46	48	48	37	58	65			
ASN	81	60	33	74	52		90	90			
BLK	69	61	37	52	49	50	67	51			
HSP	55	55	48	49	46	37	67	69			
MUL	68	48		50	29		60	100			
WHT	72	60	52	62	47	39	85	81			
FRL	54	51	44	46	44	40	67	60			

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	58
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	640
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	67
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	54
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 Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	79
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	61
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	51
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?

Students with disabilities are scoring lower than the average across all subject areas and are below 41% are the Federal Index. On 2021 FSA data, all subject areas scored above the district average, with Biology and U.S. History having the least amount of gains on the rest of the district. Biology was 12 points above the district average, while U.S. History was 10 points above the district average. ELA 9 was 18 points above, ELA 10 was 14 points above, and Algebra and Geometry were both 16 points above the district average.

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

Although Windermere scored among the top five high schools in every subject area, U.S History and Biology had the smallest advantage over the high school district average. U.S. History was 10 points above the average and Biology was 12 points over the district average. Additionally, Students with Disabilities are still scoring below the school averages in all content areas.

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

For Biology, factors that contributed to this need for improvement were exponential school growth which lead to the need to hire additional teachers mid year. Some of these teachers were new to the content or to teaching and lacked capacity to adequately prepare students for the End of Course exams. Similarly, three new teachers were hired for U.S. History. The majority of the U.S. History team were new to the content area or teaching. Furthermore, we began the year with approximately 60% of our students participating in courses via the OCPS LaunchEd Innovative Model. As the year continued, we also experienced high rates of student and teacher absences due to the Pandemic. In order to address these concerns, the Windermere Leadership Team has deliberately planned for content area teams to have experienced Professional Learning Community (PLC) leads and has intentionally placed teachers into content areas in which their knowledge and experience is the greatest. We have also grouped SWDs into smaller class periods with the strongest teachers. We have also communicated a system of support for teachers that includes a set of instructional non-negotiables that focus on collaboration, SEL, and instructional best practices.

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

Based on the 2019-2020 Spring Progress Monitoring Data compared to the 2020-2021 Progress Monitoring Data, the subject areas that showed the greatest improvement were Algebra I and Geometry. Algebra increased from 57 to 64% proficiency and Geometry increased from 55-61% proficiency.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement were intentional teacher placement, consistency and experience within members of the PLC. Teachers also held twice weekly, targeted after-school tutoring and weekend intensive boot camps.

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

Maintain positive systems of supports such as after school tutoring, weekend bootcamps, SEL, intentional teacher scheduling, differentiated Professional Development, and targeted student push in support.

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.

Teachers will attend targeted monthly PD to increase the use of high-yield learning strategies in the classroom. Additionally, teachers will attend four SEL PD sessions to increase relationships in the classroom. During pre-planning, teachers will attend PD roundtables with administrators in the area of Safety/Operations, School Climate and Culture, Discipline, ELL, SEL, Mental Health Supports, ESE, and 504 strategies. Teachers teams will also work together to utilize Curriculum Resource Materials (CRMs) in order to backwards plan, standards based instruction. By utilizing the CRMs as a base point, teachers will embed SEL strategies into their daily instruction, which will build cognitive connections to the content.

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

Continued Professional Development, targeted tutoring on weekends and after school, Loss of Skill tutoring, intentional scheduling, a dynamic scheduling model, and to engage the community in the overall success of Windermere High School.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Improve teacher capacity in ELA, Math, Biology, US History Proficiency in order to accelerate Student Performance

Measurable Outcome: By improving teacher capacity, we anticipate student achievement and engagement to increase. Additionally, we anticipate ELA proficiency to improve by 3%, moving from 66% to 69%; Algebra I proficiency to improve by 3%, moving from 35 to 38%, Geometry from 47 to 49%, ELA 9 and 64% to 67%, ELA 10 from 63 to 67%; Biology proficiency to improve by 3%, moving from 77% to 80%; and US History proficiency to improve by 3%, moving from 73% to 76% - as measured by FSA and EOC exams.

Monitoring: We will utilize classroom observation and sweep data to monitor for the use of high-yield instructional strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Andrew Leftakis (andrew.leftakis@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Create a system of continuous feedback for classroom teachers. This 'sweep' system would require instructional coaches and administrators to sweep through every content classroom, everyday, and provide actionable feedback based on observation or instructional practices and student tasks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By providing continuous feedback to teachers, ineffective or non-standards based lessons can be corrected immediately, teachers will be provided with actionable feedback on a daily/weekly basis, and coaching opportunities will be presented to support individual teacher growth.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1). Develop PD calendar during the summer
- 2). Identify teacher leaders who can assist in monitoring of systems and deliver PD
- 3). Restructure Instructional Leadership Team who will monitor instructional systems, conduct classroom sweeps, provide feedback
- 4). Develop meeting schedule - admin team meets every Tuesday and instructional leadership every Thursday. Purpose is to review structures, monitor student achievement via formative assessments, and to plan shifts in instruction and operations. Additionally, these meetings allow coaches and administrators to discuss sweep observations, teacher needs, and coaching opportunities, as well as calibrate feedback.
- 5). PD, which may include formative assessment creation, blended classroom strategies, and engagement strategies.
- 6). Provide on-going, professional development based on classroom walkthrough data and teacher feedback.
- 7). Create a daily sweep schedule to observe classroom instruction and monitor that the schedule is being followed on a daily/weekly basi and weekly actionable feedback

Person Responsible Andrew Leftakis (andrew.leftakis@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Utilize high-yield instructional strategies across content areas in order to accelerate student performance and close achievement gaps. Based on recent ESSA data, students with disabilities was the only subgroup to score below 41 on the federal index. An intense focus on this subgroup of students will provide specific targeted support in order to increase both achievement and learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: By utilizing high-yield instructional strategies, students will be able to interact with complex text on a daily basis and as a result, ELA proficiency will increase by 3%, moving from 64% to 67% in ELA 9 and 63% to 66% in ELA 10. We also anticipate meeting the 41% threshold for the ESE subgroup.

Monitoring: We will utilize PMA data, formative assessment data, and classroom observation data to monitor for the desired effect.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Adkins (jessica.adkins@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will provide intensive standards-based and reading instruction. Students will receive clearly defined learning goals, teachers will use explicit and systematic and well-paced lessons. Students have multiple opportunities to collaborate with peers, practice, respond and receive immediate and corrective feedback from teachers and peers. We are also adding a second Staffing Specialist to help support and monitor IEP implementation and support classroom instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: ESE grouped into smaller classes, highest performing teachers, and coupled with additional push-in support from ESSR funded push-in teachers. Instructional coach and reading coach provide weekly schedule in an effort to support targeted classes and teachers. Monitor through classroom observations and direct report meetings.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1). Identify school based teacher leadership team who will champion this strategy
- 2). Review successes and areas for growth from the previous school year
- 3). Develop team/school specific goals centered around close read strategies
- 4). Identify model classrooms
- 5). Develop system to open up classroom practice utilizing technology in order to signup during planning periods.
- 6). Based on county provided training, provide teachers with monthly updates in order to improve practice, which may include training on how to select complex text, effective lesson planning, and structure close read activities.
- 7). Utilize classroom sweeps in order to identify areas of success and continued areas of growth, and provide actionable feedback to teachers

Person Responsible Jessica Adkins (jessica.adkins@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to the subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: overall discipline referrals, stakeholder perception of the school, school attendance, and observed student interactions.

Measurable Outcome: By building a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students, we hope to see a reduction of overall referrals (total for the 2020-21 school year) for the 2021-22 school year. Additionally, we hope to see an increase in our school improvement survey results, specifically in the category of 'In my school, the building and grounds are safe, clean, and provide a healthy place for learning', which saw 19% of respondents say 'no'.

Monitoring: We will monitor overall discipline data and responses on our Panorama Survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Andrew Leftakis (andrew.leftakis@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive 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

- 1) Understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies
- 2) Establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning at your school with adults and students
- 3) Use a process to examine the current school climate and culture
- 4) Determine relevant strategies to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration across the school
- 5) Implement strategies for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture
- 6) Understand the connections between social and emotional learning and instructional strategies
- 7) Use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and social and emotional learning

8) Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts

Person Responsible Andrew Leftakis (andrew.leftakis@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.

According to Safe Schools for Alex, Windermere High School has an incident rank that is lower than the statewide high school rank. Windermere High School's incident rate is 2.2 incidents per 100 students, while the state average is 3.3 per 100 students.

A primary area of concern is the number of students receiving referrals/suspensions for vaping and/or drug related offenses. Windermere High School will implement cessation programs, Counselor's Corner at lunch, restorative practices, and community outreach to decrease these numbers during the 2021-2022 school year.

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.

Windermere High School will continue to build and improve positive school culture and environment through a school-wide emphasis on Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) and focus on mental health and wellness of our students and staff.

Administration will work closely with the school SAFE Team, guidance, and district resources, in order to provide continuous, relevant professional development that employs SEL strategies daily. Utilizing these strategies is key to student growth and achievement in order to ensure that students have a promising future. Providing a robust SEL education increases student skill levels, improves academic performance, social behaviors, attitudes and levels of distress. Professional Development will establish clear guidelines on how school-employed mental health professionals, administrators, teachers, classified staff, and interns respond to the challenge of youth who are suicidal. The SAFE Team will work with administration to highlight best practices of SEL at our school, and share these with staff and the community. Events will

also be held for teachers to decrease stress and keep morale high.

For students that may need further support, they will be referred by the SAFE Team or administration to the appropriate personnel for intervention.

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

Stakeholders for promoting a positive culture and environment are the
 Principal- Leading the overall shared vision of the school, build trust and buy-in among staff, foster relationships with families and the community to create clear and transparent lines of communication, efficient operations
 Assistant Principals- Student appreciation, model staff expectations, provide actionable, constructive feedback to staff. Foster relationships with families to create clear and transparent lines of communication.
 SAFE Coordinator- Helping students and families find support for social emotional and mental health needs within the school and community.
 Guidance Counselors- Creating a welcoming environment in student services in which students feel comfortable asking questions and discussing their current academic plans, as well as post secondary paths.
 PASS Coordinator- Utilize restorative practices and other strategies that allow students to reflect on and reexamine their thinking so that they do not encounter the same discipline incidents in the future.
 Deans- Fostering Restorative Practices with students, utilizing strategies that help students utilize critical thinking to analyze their own behaviors and make positive choices.
 Teachers- Setting positive expectations and respectful, equitable environments within the classrooms.
 PTSO- Staff appreciation and celebration
 SAC- Support the School Improvement Plan goals by meeting to discuss school needs.

Part V: Budget

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

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