

Orange County Public Schools

West Orange High



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

West Orange High

1625 BEULAH RD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

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

Demographics

Principal: Mathew Turner

Start Date for this Principal: 6/6/2020

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	37%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (58%)
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	ATSI
* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

West Orange High

1625 BEULAH RD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	37%
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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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.

District: To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

West Orange High School: Graduate all students with the skills to be college or career ready and life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

District: With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

West Orange High School: Our goal is to see West Orange become a place of high student academic achievement, a place where all students feel safe to become the best versions of themselves, a place where extracurricular activities are second to none, and a place where our faculty and staff can truly call home.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Turner, Matthew	Principal	Overall operations and oversight of the school: budget, graduation athletics, evaluations, supplements, administrator meetings, technology, pre-planning, PD Calendar, EOC, EOY Data, Credit Recovery, Community Relations, Advanced Placement Date.
Shuler, Timothy	Assistant Principal	Facilities, Social Studies, Emergency Preparedness
DiMarzo, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Guidance, Transcripts, graduation, scholarships, masters scheduling
Howell, Randall	Dean	Title IX, code of conduct, parking, supervision
Naso, Jerome	Instructional Coach	School data and progress monitoring, ACA, certification renewal, mentorships

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 6/6/2020, Mathew Turner

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

17

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,805

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

12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	630	706	760	706	2802
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201	192	209	213	815
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	69	60	42	216
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	64	66	200
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	44	84	80	210
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	131	135	0	393
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	171	162	39	497
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	4	2	0	3	9

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Wednesday 8/31/2022

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	659	623	579	549	2410
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	136	138	124	520
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	7	8	6	60
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	112	145	117	494
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	57	156	164	472
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	123	77	66	348
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	124	86	63	377
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	135	122	117	536

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	143	155	162	160	620

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	5	0	0	0	1	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	7	2	19

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	659	623	579	549	2410
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	136	138	124	520
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	7	8	6	60
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	112	145	117	494
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	57	156	164	472
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	123	77	66	348
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	124	86	63	377
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	135	122	117	536

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	143	155	162	160	620

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	5	0	0	0	1	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	7	2	19

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	61%	49%	51%				65%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						57%	53%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						42%	40%	42%
Math Achievement	35%	36%	38%				47%	43%	51%
Math Learning Gains	40%						52%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						45%	46%	45%
Science Achievement	70%	31%	40%				69%	70%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	43%	48%				77%	73%	73%

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

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
2022					
2019	69%	67%	2%	67%	2%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	74%	69%	5%	70%	4%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	30%	63%	-33%	61%	-31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	52%	53%	-1%	57%	-5%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	20	40	34	16	38	47	28	50		100	20
ELL	32	38	31	16	32	30	40	29		96	68
ASN	85	68		64	45		87	87		97	74
BLK	45	47	28	21	41	47	52	68		94	48
HSP	50	46	34	30	38	38	61	66		99	66
MUL	73	49		42	44		78	92		100	76
WHT	69	55	44	43	41	39	79	82		97	70
FRL	46	42	26	20	33	39	50	67		95	57
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	27	37	35	21	27	25	39	24		88	28
ELL	25	56	55	23	28	20	37	38		92	54
ASN	76	63	60	61	44		97	90		97	76
BLK	46	48	34	16	20	17	54	60		96	40
HSP	46	49	46	24	27	27	65	66		93	64
MUL	77	54		36			89	75		100	61
WHT	72	57	37	40	22	25	87	88		95	72
FRL	47	49	40	23	24	20	68	63		92	48
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	31	30	23	37	30	30	48		89	16
ELL	31	48	40	29	45	42	49	50		90	51
ASN	84	72		69	60		79	80		100	69
BLK	47	51	43	29	41	33	43	58		92	44
HSP	54	52	40	37	44	41	65	69		94	53
MUL	74	63		37	38		64	77		96	69
WHT	75	60	44	62	62	57	80	88		96	61
FRL	49	51	38	34	45	36	57	64		91	49

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	626
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	76
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	69
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Our most fragile component and the one that showed the lowest performance is our learning gains of the bottom 25% in ELA. This goes hand in hand with our low ELA performance of our ESE students and we must work to correct intervention models for ESE and the lowest 25%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was our math achievement data. Whereas we experienced an achievement decline in math by 12 percentage points from 2018 to 2019, our math gains increased by 10 points and performance of our lowest 25% increased by 8 points.

In 2018, we experienced a stellar success rate in Geometry of 67%. We could not sustain that performance the following year. Part of the decline can be attributed to a course progression change involving geometry and algebra 2 which led to an increase in class sizes and sections offered. I believe most OCPS schools experienced a decline in this category for the reason noted. The retirement of a key veteran teacher also factored in.

In algebra 1, we shuffled teachers to put in a more established crew. This pulled teachers away from

sections of geometry. We modestly increased from 29 to 30% but are expecting different results long term. We were anxious to see results from last year since I believe we delivered a better product than the year prior due to an additional year of experience and a common planning period which allowed us to better stay on pace with the CRM's.

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 component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is our math achievement. We experienced a stellar success rate in Geometry of 67%. We could not sustain that performance the following year. Part of the decline can be attributed to a course progression change involving geometry and algebra 2 which led to an increase in class sizes and sections offered. I believe most OCPS schools experienced a decline in this category for the reason noted. The retirement of a key veteran teacher also factored in. In algebra 1, we shuffled teachers to put in a more established crew. This pulled teachers away from sections of geometry. We modestly increased from 29 to 30% but are expecting different results long term. We were anxious to see results from last year since I believe we delivered a better product than the year prior due to an additional year of experience and a common planning period which allowed us to better stay on pace with the CRM's.

Actions taken to combat this need for improvement include more dedicated common planning time with the team, PD to address monitoring needs, and consistent trend walks to identify needs of individual teachers.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Oddly enough the component with the most improvement was our math learning gains. Achievement dropped which pushed the learning gains, as more emphasis was put on our bottom 25% and not necessarily among all learners or our bubble students.

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

I believe a heavier emphasis on intervention:

1. More small group instruction
2. Push-in support
3. Pull out support
4. Emphasis on common planning

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

1. Preview days
2. Acceleration emphasis in planning
3. Involvement of parents and the community.

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. Monitoring for learning
2. Better use of digital tools
3. SEL in the classroom
4. Rotational Model
5. Flipped classroom initiatives

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

Presence of intervention support through additional allocations.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Overall improvement in differentiated instruction with a specific focus on increased proficiency in ELA and math in an effort to reduce course failures in these subjects and collaterally improve attendance.

Our overarching goal is to improve student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on an annual analysis of the postsecondary feedback report data.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We expect to see an overall increase in learning gains and proficiency for all students in ELA and math by 15% measured through FSA data and concordant scores achieved through SAT/ACT and other approved means.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through (1) teacher observation data, (2) formative and summative assessments, (3) trend data among all content areas

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Turner (matthew.turner@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Our implementation will come in two parts: (1) instructional walks with targeted feedback to improve instructional strategies for all students, and (2) strategy based PD on differentiated instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

In order to increase proficiency and learning gains (reducing course failures), teachers must be more prepared in differentiated instruction. We plan to use iObservation to hone classroom strategies to increase pedagogical skillsets.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

West Orange High School has taken affirmative steps to build a positive school culture and environment:

1. Open door policy for guidance and administration.
2. Teacher training on de-escalation.
3. Promulgation of a bevy of clubs for students to get involved
4. Teacher celebrations to boost morale
5. Internal Speak Out form for immediate access to the Principal
6. PTSO celebrations and recognitions for teachers and staff
7. Student of the Month celebrations
8. Community events such as parades and tailgates

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

Principal - drive the work of SELL and look for ways to keep morale high.

Leadership Team - drive the work of the principal and constantly gauge the progress and culture at the school.

Teachers - create positive environments in the classroom and continue to build meaningful and supportive relationships with students.

Parents/PTSO - Support through initiatives and help school personnel with outside events designed to develop culture.

Students - enter with an open mind and provide authentic feedback.