
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
R.A.I.S.E	0
Positive Culture & Environment	16

Hospital Homebound

12301 WARRIOR RD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://ocps.net/cms/one.aspx?portalid=54703&pageid=90565>

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Theis

Start Date for this Principal: 4/10/2017

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	ESE
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	4%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Maintaining
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

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 to lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

We serve students confined to their homes or hospital for an extended period of time due to an illness, accident, injury, or other medical reasons. Eligibility for the Hospital/Homebound program is determined by an IEP Team Meeting held at each student's zoned school. After eligibility is determined, appropriate supports are provided to meet the needs of each individual student. We provide instruction designed to help the students continue progressing academically in the core curriculum while away from their regular school program. These may include teleclasses, one-to-one instruction, Instructional Support services, or a combination of these supports.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Theis, Elizabeth	Principal	Dr. Elizabeth Theis serves as principal and maintains a balanced focus on safety/community combined with the use of standards-based instruction, Marzano's Instructional Framework, and data-based decision making; models the problem-solving process; develops a culture of high expectations and high-quality instruction with the school staff; oversees the implementation of best practices associated with social emotional learning. The focus of the Hospital/Homebound Program also considers the medical and/or psychiatric needs of the students, while attending to the academic needs of the students.
Callaway, Mari	Assistant Principal	Mari Callaway serves as the assistant principal and assists the principal in providing a common vision of standards based instruction and of data-based decision-making ; coordinates the implementation of intervention support, data analysis, and progress monitoring. Mrs. Callaway is the primary contact for creating, maintaining, and modifying student schedules, and coordinates communication between families and staff, including IEP Team meetings and related matters.
Rauch, Tiffany	School Counselor	Ms . Rauch supports student scheduling and counsels with struggling students. She supports each student in maintaining focus on on-time graduation, by reviewing credits, courses, and transcripts. She is the Mental Health Designee and coordinates all Threat Assessment Activities for the program.
Hines, Gregory	Instructional Technology	Mr. Hines provides professional development in digital platforms and applications. He provides support for digital curriculum to teachers, students, and their families in order for students to be successful.
Maloney, Rachel	Instructional Coach	Rachel Maloney supports the 1:1 teachers with instruction and assessment. She provides coaching and feedback to enhance instruction. As a leadership team member, she supports the school's vision and mission and support data-based decision making in order to improve the school's improvement rating.
Smith, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	Kimberly Smith coordinates testing for HH secondary students. As a part of the leadership team, she is involved in data based decision making and progress monitoring to improve student proficiency. She uses assessment data to develop interventions needed that will support student learning gains in order to improve the school improvement rating.

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

n/a

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 4/10/2017, Elizabeth Theis

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

63

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

59

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

59

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

0

Number of teachers with ESE certification?

22

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

5

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

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

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	2	8	3	3	5	8	12	12	13	11	14	8	9	108
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	0	1	0	3	6	7	4	7	5	7	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	0	11
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	11

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	1	0	3	3	2	2	2	1	14

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/15/2022

2021-22 - 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	1	4	5	3	8	9	11	10	14	16	12	5	98
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	3	1	0	2	5	5	3	6	4	8	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	1	0	1	1	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	2	5	0	1	1	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	5	1	1	2	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	1	0	0	3	0	0	11

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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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		57%	55%					62%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								60%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								55%	54%
Math Achievement		41%	42%					61%	62%
Math Learning Gains								60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								54%	52%
Science Achievement		57%	54%					56%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		63%	59%					74%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	40%	48%	-8%	52%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	25%	54%	-29%	56%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	0%	63%	-63%	64%	-64%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019	0%	57%	-57%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	43%	-43%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	49%	-49%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	15%	36%	-21%	46%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	27%	49%	-22%	48%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	60%	67%	-7%	67%	-7%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	73%	66%	7%	71%	2%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	69%	-69%	70%	-70%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	63%	-63%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%

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	24	50		22	55		16				
BLK	38			21							
HSP	15	17		21	58						
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	39	31		32	50		46				
HSP	33			31							
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	27	52		26	35		16				

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
HSP	25	64		29							
WHT	45			42							
FRL	30										

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	183
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	80%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	28
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?

Progress monitoring was in place for all students every 4-6 weeks, using the problem-solving process of MTSS. Student performance was analyzed by the teachers and by the leadership team so that action plans were developed. Intensifying interventions were provided for students who were identified in the monitoring process. Additional time was added when students were performing below expectations. Attendance conferences were held when excessive absences.

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

Not applicable - cell size was too small for analysis.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Based on 2022 assessment data, our greatest need for improvement is in English Language Arts. There was a 6 percentage point decrease when compared to 2021 assessment data.

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

Overall, 50% of the students demonstrated learning gains in English Language Arts. There are fewer than 5 students in each grade level or course, so it is difficult to draw accurate conclusions about the groups, beyond individual performance.

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

1. Review scores with students
2. Determine individual areas of need
3. Set individual student goals based on areas of need
4. Provide interventions in those discrete areas
5. Maintain current focus on progress monitoring
6. Continue to use Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports and progress monitoring

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

Data analysis will continue to be an intentional focus during PLCs. Goal setting and interventions will be strengthened this year to align with the specific needs of the teachers and students. Several teachers have developed effective goal setting, and they will model the strategies for other teachers so they can be replicated.

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

We can empower our students to be in charge of their own learning by enabling students to make choices and then measure and also reflect on their progress.

Measurable Outcome:

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

85% of students will attain their academic goal by the end of the school year based on summative, district, and/or state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will collaborate with students quarterly to analyze progress and develop next steps as needed. Progress will be monitored and recorded for PLCs and for the leadership team to analyze.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Theis (elizabeth.theis@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teachers will collaborate with students quarterly to analyze progress and develop next steps as needed. Progress will be monitored and recorded for PLCs and the leadership team to analyze.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

We want students to have the desire and the drive to perform well and be in control of their learning. When students set their own academic goals they experience greater achievement and motivation.

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.

Data will be collected for teachers to analyze and in order to assist in the development of student goals.

Person Responsible

Mari Callaway (maritere.gaymer-callaway@ocps.net)

Progress of goals will be monitored and if warranted adjustments will be made.

Person Responsible

Mari Callaway (maritere.gaymer-callaway@ocps.net)

Achievement of goals will be acknowledged.

Person Responsible

Mari Callaway (maritere.gaymer-callaway@ocps.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

All of our students belong to the SWD subgroup, and therefore, we will continue to intensely focus their progress, relative to their illness and treatment.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

End of year data from 2022 assessments in English Language Arts (ELA) showed 50% of students made learning gains in comparison to end of year 2021 assessment results.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The 2022 state assessments will show an increase of 10 percent from 50% to 60% in learning gains.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through PMAs, unit assessments, iReady diagnostics, Growth Monitoring, and SIPPS Mastery Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Theis (elizabeth.theis@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

We will increase the intensity of instruction on word decoding, word analysis, and word recognition. This will allow students to focus more on meaning, which ultimately supports reading comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teaching students to decode and recognize words and word parts was one of the effective instructional techniques identified by the National Reading Panel (NRP). Recent compelling evidence reviewed for this practice guide supports the NRP's conclusions.

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.

Provide targeted professional development on ELA, based on teacher needs.

Person Responsible

Elizabeth Theis (elizabeth.theis@ocps.net)

MTSS Problem Solving Teams meet regularly to ensure students are identified and are receiving the appropriate interventions.

Person Responsible

Mari Callaway (maritere.gaymer-callaway@ocps.net)

Teacher and teacher teams will strategically monitor student progress twice per quarter.

Person Responsible

Rachel Maloney (rachel.maloney@ocps.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

All of our students belong to the SWD subgroup, and therefore, we will continue to intensely focus their progress, relative to their illness and treatment.

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

Student Attendance

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

Student attendance will be monitored monthly. Students known to have poor attendance will be monitored weekly.

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

Teachers will be asked to report any concerns regarding student attendance immediately. Reminders of the importance of being present for instructional sessions will be reiterated by administration, school counselor, and registrar, as well as teachers.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

Administration, school counselor, and registrar will have monthly meetings and will keep electronic documentation of who has been identified with poor attendance and the steps taken to rectify the issue.

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.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Run Skyward attendance reports.	Callaway, Mari, maritere.gaymer-callaway@ocps.net
Monitor student attendance.	Rauch, Tiffany, tiffany.rauch@ocps.net
Hold Meetings with Parents.	Rauch, Tiffany, tiffany.rauch@ocps.net