East River High

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

East River High

650 EAST RIVER FALCONS WAY, Orlando, FL 32833

https://eastriverhs.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Rebecca Watson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2022

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)	79%
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 (54%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (53%)
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

East River High

650 EAST RIVER FALCONS WAY, Orlando, FL 32833

https://eastriverhs.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	79%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

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.

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

Objectives:
• High Expectations for Student Learning
• Student Social and Emotional Well-Being
• Dedicated and High-Quality Team
• Positive Climate and Safe Environment
• Efficient Operations
• Engaged and Invested Community

Market Differentiators:
• Highest Quality Academic, Arts and Extracurricular Activities
• State-of-the-Art Facilities
• Innovators in Digital Learning
• Recognized for Operational Excellence and Community Support
• Leader in Career and Technical Education
.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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
Fugate, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Oversees master scheduling. Attends weekly PLC meetings to support teachers in ELA, Reading, and electives. Responsible for the progress monitoring of students within those subject areas.
Lewis, Francella	Assistant Principal	Attends weekly PLC meetings to support teachers in Math and electives. Responsible for the progress monitoring of students within those subject areas. Additionally oversees discipline and testing.
Judson, Jamie	Instructional Coach	Participates in weekly content area PLC meetings, provides ongoing professional development to teachers, assists with the creation of unit lesson plans, guides data discussions of classroom/state/district assessments, and will help with the analysis of data to direct instruction.
Laing, Christine	Math Coach	Participates in weekly math PLC meetings, provides ongoing professional development to math teachers, assists with the creation of unit lesson plans, guides data discussions of classroom/state/district assessments, and will help with the analysis of data to direct instruction.
Watson, Rebecca	Principal	The Principal is responsible for all decisions that impact teaching and learning on our campus. She ensures the safety of our students and staff, conducts observations and provides feedback to staff, implements systems and structures for staff to engage in professional learning, monitors student data, as well as works with Curriculum Leaders in each department to ensure a focus on increasing student achievement.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/21/2022, Rebecca Watson

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.*
5

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
120

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,900

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
15

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
17

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	550	533	446	465	1994
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188	236	238	195	857
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	96	61	36	266
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	64	51	16	149
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	31	39	34	150
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141	173	162	0	476
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	84	143	66	416
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141	173	162	148	624

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	158	202	193	89	642

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	2	1	2	2	7

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 7/21/2022

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	501	530	453	455	1939
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	151	107	95	478
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	12	10	7	70
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	131	107	98	435
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	134	64	80	342
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	133	87	86	394
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	132	97	62	392
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152	197	151	142	642

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	145	201	128	126	600

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	6	0	1	10	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	12	22

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	501	530	453	455	1939
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	151	107	95	478
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	12	10	7	70
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	131	107	98	435
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	134	64	80	342
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	133	87	86	394
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	132	97	62	392
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152	197	151	142	642

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	145	201	128	126		600

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	6	0	1	10		17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	12		22

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	43%	49%	51%				52%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	41%						48%	53%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						38%	40%	42%
Math Achievement	33%	36%	38%				32%	43%	51%
Math Learning Gains	43%						41%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						42%	46%	45%
Science Achievement	59%	31%	40%				72%	70%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	69%	43%	48%				73%	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	70%	67%	3%	67%	3%

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	72%	69%	3%	70%	2%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	25%	63%	-38%	61%	-36%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	34%	53%	-19%	57%	-23%

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	10	25	23	13	40	48	19	30		98	46
ELL	13	37	36	23	47	46	30	48		96	74
ASN	67	60		44	36		78	77		95	89
BLK	40	42	35	23	38	42	57	76		98	75
HSP	33	39	30	31	43	46	51	55		99	68
MUL	68	57		8	36		54				
WHT	51	41	33	40	46	39	67	78		100	79
FRL	31	35	29	27	42	52	45	64		99	71

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	11	33	32	14	25	27	23	42		100	21
ELL	19	45	34	24	38	50	43	38		100	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
ASN	78	68		53	33		80	100		100	81
BLK	47	52	55	32	45	50	65	78		100	56
HSP	35	44	34	20	28	28	48	57		99	60
MUL	72	56					80			100	75
WHT	55	48	31	34	29	25	67	72		99	67
FRL	35	45	41	20	27	31	44	60		99	57

					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	30	29	26	33	29	45	61		96	46
ELL	22	33	27	23	47	54	45	28		83	73
ASN	69	56		38			89	94		83	80
BLK	58	50	50	33	37		74	76		97	61
HSP	39	40	35	23	38	42	61	62		95	77
MUL	64	50						80		100	77
WHT	60	54	42	41	49	36	80	80		98	76
FRL	43	43	37	28	40	47	64	65		94	70

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	580
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	45
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	68
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	53
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	49
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	45
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	57
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	49
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?

ELA 9 and 10 had the largest decrease in achievement scores between 2021 and 2022, going from 49% in 2019 to 44% in 2022 for ELA 9 and 45% to 40% for ELA 10. This is a decrease of 4 percentage points. ELA also had the largest achievement gap between total students (60%) and students with disabilities (26%). This is an achievement gap of 34 points. There was also a 33 point achievement gap associated with English Language Learners.

Algebra 1 achievement scores increased between 2021 and 2022, going from 24% to 32%, a increase of 8 percentage points.

Geometry achievement scores increased between 2021 and 2022, going from 28% to 32%, a increase of 4 percentage points.

Biology achievement scores decreased between 2021 and 2022, going from 60% to 58%, a decrease of 2 percentage points.

History achievement scores increased between 2021 and 2022, going from 66% to 67%, an increase of 1 percentage points.

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 2021 and the greatest need for improvement was in ELA achievement, a 5 point decline in both ELA 9 and ELA 10.

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

Contributing factors to this need for improvement were low student attendance and several vacant ELA teaching positions.

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

Algebra 1 achievement scores increased between 2021 and 2022, going from 24% to 32%, a increase of 8 percentage points. Geometry achievement scores increased between 2021 and 2022, going from 28% to 32%, a increase of 4 percentage points.

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

Actions that were taken to achieve this success were a focus on PLC and collaboration time which included a common Instructional Focus Calendar, and dedicated time for data analysis. We hired 3 Interventionist and 5 tutors to assist with students needing extra help. Administration participated in all PLC meetings and an expectation was set for pulling data each week to identify students who would be pulled out for intervention.

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

During the 2022-23 school year, we will implement the following strategies to accelerate learning:
- Targeted push-in/pull out teachers for core content areas.
- Data chats in PLCs
- After School Tutoring

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.

The following professional development opportunities will be provided to support teachers and leaders:
- Impact Professional Development (targeted to specific staff members)
- Mastery learning Professional Development (whole staff PD done during pre-planning then targeted support as needed throughout school year)
- IXL Professional Development for Algebra 1 teachers (trainings during pre-plan and in October)
- SEL Training (required district training for instructional staff on Canvas)
- Culturally Responsive Standards Based Teaching (required district training for instructional staff on Canvas)

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

Additional Services that will be implemented include the following:
- Dedicated, uninterrupted, common planning "Team Time" built in to the culture of the school that involve data driven, student centered discussions.
- Tiering of teachers and targeted coaching cycles for novice teachers.
- Teacher mentoring programs
- Student mentoring programs through UCF Odyssey Ambassadors

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

:

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Area of focus description: Build and establish a culture for Social and Emotional Learning practices at our school with adults and students. Embedded in SEL are strategies to enhance students' engagement through digital tools. Area of focus rationale: Academic learning is enhanced when students feel safe, respected, and feel they contribute to classroom community. Learning is also enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for Social and Emotional Learning and Culturally Responsive Teaching, we will address the following school needs: Increase the achievement scores in Biology and lower the achievement gap of SWD in Biology.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We want to increase the the overall Biology achievement scores by 4% from 2021 to 2022 (from 58% to 62%) We would like to close the achievement gap in Biology achievement for students with disabilities by 5%
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training on SEL, 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.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Evidence-based Strategy: We will use Social and Emotional Learning to strengthen relationships with students, give students a voice, and allow students to feel they are safe and respected members of the learning community. This in turn will increase collaboration, critical thinking, and the overall achievement of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria	Rationale for Strategy Selection: 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. Resources/Criteria: Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to

| **used for selecting this strategy.** | 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
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.

1. Implement professional development for Social and Emotional Learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture

| **Person Responsible** | Francella Lewis (francella.lewis@ocps.net) |

2. Use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and social and emotional learning

| **Person Responsible** | Jamie Judson (jamie.judsonsmith@ocps.net) |

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

| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@ocps.ent) |

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Area of focus description: US History had an increase in achievement from 66% to 67% Our ultimate goal is to positively impact next steps for all students. Increasing student achievement in US History across the board will better prepare students for higher level courses, college, and the job market. We plan to do this through Mastery learning, consistent walkthroughs that provide feedback to teachers, and teacher coaching cycles. Area of focus rationale: It is our intention to create a culture of dedicated, data driven "Team Time" during common planning periods. This collaborative planning time will allow teachers to focus on data and address the needs of specific students. Armed with this data, the ELA team can incorporate mastery learning, an instructional model in which students do not move on to the next lesson until they have mastered the current one. 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 want to increase the US History achievement by 5%, going from 67% to 72%. We would like to see an increase in US History achievement for students with disabilities from 17% to 21% in order to decrease the achievement gap associated with SWD.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome via consistent leadership team member walkthroughs and teacher feedback. We will also monitor PMA data throughout the school year to determine the benchmarks that need to be reviewed/retaught in math classrooms.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@ocps.ent)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Subject specific collaborative planning time is the most effective, affordable, and sustainable way to transform instructional practice and increase student performance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria	In order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, learners must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, the students, and the content.

**used for selecting
this strategy.**

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.

1. Differentiated professional development

Person Responsible   Jamie Judson (jamie.judsonsmith@ocps.net)

2. PLC discussion and analysis of weekly formative assessments as well as quarterly, summative standards-based assessments

Person Responsible   Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@ocps.net)

3. Daily administrative coaching and support within classrooms and Tutoring for standards re-teaching

Person Responsible   Jamie Judson (jamie.judsonsmith@ocps.net)

#3. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Area of focus description: This year, we will utilize our instructional coaches and admin staff to do planned, consistent walkthroughs and provide teachers targeted, actionable feedback on a consistent basis in order to increase ELA achievement scores. Rationale for area of focus: When teachers are monitored, coached, and given feedback, it gives them the opportunity to refine their teaching practices. This in turn increase student achievement.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	As a result of targeted walkthroughs in the ELA department,we would like to increase our ELA achievement scores by 5% in 2022, moving from 44% to 49%. We would also like to decrease the percentage of students that need a concordant score to fulfil the ELA requirements by 1%
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Monitoring for this area of focus will take place via the administrative team. During weekly meetings with the instructional coaches, walkthrough data will be analyzed to see what teachers need additional support. Based on the findings of these meetings, specific goals for teachers will be created and action steps implemented. We will also monitor PMA data and formative assessments for ELA to see what standards need to be reviewed/retaught to students. This data will also be used to drive instruction during extension periods each week in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The evidence based strategy being implemented for this area of focus is classroom walkthroughs. Classroom walk throughs are effective because: - Administrators become more familiar with the school's curriculum and teachers' instructional practices. - Administrators can gauge the climate of a school
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is the following: - A team atmosphere develops as teachers and administrators examine instruction and student motivation and achievement. - Administrators establish themselves as campus leaders and instructional mentors, influencing teaching, learning, and ongoing school renewal. - Students see that both administrators and teachers value instruction and learning (this also goes along with our SEL focus).

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.

1. Tier teachers to determine who needs the highest level of support

Person Responsible	Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@ocps.net)

2. Develop a classroom walkthrough calendar for instructional coaches and administrators. Provide specific, actionable feedback to teachers after each walkthrough.

Person Responsible	Jamie Judson (jamie.judsonsmith@ocps.net)

3. Monitor PMA and formative assessments to determine student outcomes as a result of the feedback.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Fugate (jennifer.fugate@ocps.ent)

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, East River High School engages in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success.
Through a distributive leadership model, East River High School uses social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, East River High School uses the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs.

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

School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.