Orange County Public Schools

Universal Education Center



2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|---|----|
| | |
| Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP | 4 |
| | |
| School Information | 5 |
| | |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| | |
| Planning for Improvement | 12 |
| | |
| R.A.I.S.E | 0 |
| | |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 17 |

Universal Education Center

1000 UNIVERSAL STUDIOS PLZ, Orlando, FL 32819

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: William Tovine

Start Date for this Principal: 8/28/2022

| 2021-22 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
|---|-----------------------|
| School Function (per accountability file) | Alternative |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 10-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Alternative Education |
| 2021-22 Title I School | No |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 8% |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | |
| | 2021-22: Commendable |
| | 2020-21: No Rating |
| School Improvement Rating History | 2018-19: Maintaining |
| | 2017-18: Commendable |
| | 2016-17: No Rating |
| 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 that 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.

Orange County Public School's School-to-Work program has a twenty-five year partnership with Universal Orlando, which provides an alternative approach to traditional high school. The Universal Education Center (UEC) is located on the grounds of Universal Orlando Resort (UO), and students work either side of their academic core classes in the morning or afternoon.

A key highlight of UEC is the Mentoring Program, as each student is paired with a successful employee within Universal's management team. Mentors meet weekly with their mentees, and these relationships cultivate further learning beyond the workplace or classroom. With very small class sizes in our brand new learning space, individualized and focused attention can be given to all students from our OCPS teachers to help them reach their graduation & post-secondary goals.

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 |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Tovine, William | Principal | The principal is the head of the administrative team within a school and is responsible for overseeing the daily operations of the institution. The responsibilities of the principal include: coordinate staff schedules, oversee the development of curriculum and enforce school policies relating to discipline, safety and mental health. The principal also coordinates staff training days and works directly with students who need help meeting or setting goals. The principal also serves as the direct liaison between the school and the school board and is responsible for ensuring that the school operates according to school board protocols. |
| Webster- Gardiner, David | Assistant Principal | The role of the assistant principal is to assist the building principal in organizing and fostering a positive, safe environment that is conducive to best meeting the needs of all students, staff and parents. The responsibilities include: leading, directing, counseling, and supervising a variety of personnel and programs; creating effective parent, teacher, and child communications; supporting, encouraging, mentoring, and evaluating staff; fostering teamwork between teachers and among staff and parents; and managing discipline, safety, mental health and budget items. The assistant principal acts in the capacity of the principal during the principal's absence from the school. |

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

Yes

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Orange County Public Schools

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/28/2022, William Tovine

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

25

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

6

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

6

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

0

Number of teachers with ESE certification?

3

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

2

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

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 |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 15 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| 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

Thursday 7/28/2022

2021-22 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| lu dianta u | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | |

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 Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State | | |
| ELA Achievement | | 49% | 51% | | | | | 55% | 56% | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | | | | 53% | 51% | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | 40% | 42% | | |
| Math Achievement | | 36% | 38% | | | | | 43% | 51% | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | | | | 49% | 48% | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | 46% | 45% | | |
| Science Achievement | | 31% | 40% | | | | | 70% | 68% | | |
| Social Studies Achievement | | 43% | 48% | | | | | 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 | | |
|-------|------|---------|---------------|-----------------|-------|------------|
| | | | | School- | | School- |
| Grade | Year | School | District | District | State | State |
| | | | | Comparison | | Comparison |
| | | | | 54 A T 1 1 | | |
| | | | | MATH School- | | School- |
| Grade | Year | School | District | District | State | State |
| Graue | Tear | 3011001 | District | Comparison | State | Comparison |
| | | | | Companison | | Companison |
| | | | | SCIENCE | | |
| | | | | School- | | School- |
| Grade | Year | School | District | District | State | State |
| | | | | Comparison | | Comparison |
| | | | | • | | • |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | BIC | LOGY EOC | | |
| | | | 5 1414 | School | | School |
| Year | S | chool | District | Minus | State | Minus |
| 0000 | | | | District | | State |
| 2022 | | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | 01 | V//CC FOC | | |
| | | | Ci | VICS EOC | | School |
| Year | | chool | District | School Minus | State | Minus |
| rear | 30 | CHOOL | DISTRICT | District | State | State |
| 2022 | | | | DISTRICT | | State |
| 2019 | | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | шс | TORY EOC | | |
| | | | піс | School | | School |
| Year | 9 | chool | District | Minus | State | Minus |
| i cai | 3, | Cilooi | District | District | State | State |
| 2022 | | | | District | + | Otale |
| 2019 | | 87% | 69% | 18% | 70% | 17% |
| | 1 | | | SEBRA EOC | 1 | 11.75 |
| | | | | School | | School |
| Year | S | chool | District | Minus | State | Minus |
| | | | | District | | State |
| 2022 | | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | | |
| | | | GEO | METRY EOC | | |
| | | | | School | | School |
| Year | S | chool | District | Minus | State | Minus |
| | | | | District | | State |
| 2022 | | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| | | 2022 | SCHO | DL GRAD | E COMP | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 |
| | | 2021 | SCHO | DL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 |
| | | 2019 | SCHO | DL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 |

ESSA Data Review

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

| This data has been updated for the 2016-19 school year as of 7716/2019. | | |
|---|------|--|
| ESSA Federal Index | | |
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 60 | |
| 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 | | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 60 | |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 1 | |
| Percent Tested | 100% | |
| Subgroup Data | | |
| Studente With Dischilities | | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | |
|--|-----|
| 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 |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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?

To increase learning gains and narrow the achievement gap with our ESE and ELL subgroups, we utilized the following high yield strategies:

- Helping Students Interact with New Knowledge- Teachers grouped students to process new information and establish group norms.
- Help Students Practice and Deepen Knowledge- Teachers incorporated cooperative learning into their lessons, use think-pair-share, and error analysis, and peer feedback
- Helping Students Review Content- Teachers presented previously learned information to students; students wrote summaries, and the teachers asked students to remember and apply previously learned information.

We provided the following professional development opportunities to support teachers and leaders:

- Coaches provided content area professional development trainings through our Professional Learning Communities with a focus on effective High Yield strategies.
- Professional development trainings assisted teachers with how to align student tasks to Standards-Based Instruction.
- Teachers were trained in how to use Common Assessment and Progress Monitoring data to drive instruction.
- Coaches provided MTSS Professional Development trainings with a focus on Tiered Interventions for our bottom 25% students.
- Teachers were provided with targeted progress-monitoring trainings to assist them in working with ESE and ELL students.

We also provided after school tutoring, targeted interventions to assist students in need of additional remediation, academic support, and conducted parent engagement events to solicit support of family and community stakeholders with achieving our school improvement goals.

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

According to the data, the component that showed the most improvement was the FSA/ELA 1 assessment. 50% percent, (2/4), of students passed the assessment. Alternative Education Instructional Coaches applied strategies from Professional Learning Community professional development trainings to assist teachers with instructional strategies while working with students in intervention groups.

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?

Universal Education Center had 67% (2/3) of students in grades 9-12 score a level 1 or 2 on the Florida Standards Assessment in Algebra 1 and 33% (1/3) of students score a level 3 or higher. In grades 9-12, students showed the lowest performance in exponential functions, quadratic modeling, and statistics and probability.

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

According to the FSA data, the trends that emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content area is that over 58% of students in grades eleven through twelve did not perform at proficiency level of 3 or higher in math and ELA retakes for the Spring of 2022.

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

We will use the following strategies to assist with accelerating learning:

Summarizing and note taking-Teachers will model summarization techniques and use quick writes, graphic organizers, column notes, affinity diagrams.

Cooperative Learning- Teachers will Integrate content and language through group engagement. Focused Practice- Teachers will focus practice on their instructional delivery regarding the students lowest performing components: vocabulary, comprehension and fluency.

Activating Prior Knowledge- Teachers will help students make connections between new information and information they already know.

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.

We will provide the following professional development opportunities to support teachers and leaders:

- Coaches will provide content area professional development trainings through our Professional Learning Communities with a focus on effective High Yield strategies.
- Professional development trainings assisting teachers with how to align student tasks to Standards-Based

Instruction.

- How to use Common Assessment and Progress Monitoring data to drive instruction.
- Coaches will provide MTSS Professional Development trainings with a focus on Tiered Interventions for our bottom 25% students.
- Targeted progress-monitoring teacher trainings to assist teachers in working with ESE and ELL students.

Areas of Focus:

#1. 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.

The percentage of students for 2021-2022 making learning gains in ELA was 50%. Based on the 2021-2022 school data, 50% (2/4) students scored a level 3 or higher on the FSA ELA assessment. Additional support is needed to increase proficiency in this area. Improving ELA achievement will improve student attendance, graduation, and learning gains on the common assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2022-2023 school year, the percent of students making learning gains in ELA/Reading on the 2022-23 FAST PM3 in order to improve student postsecondary readiness will increase by 3% (From 50% to 53%).

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs and observations, coaching logs, data discussions with students, professional development trainings through professional learning communities, progress monitoring of assessment data with action steps for Tiered intervention groups and bi-weekly site-based data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Tovine (william.tovine@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Summarizing and note taking-Teachers will model summarization techniques and use quick writes,

graphic organizers, column notes, affinity diagrams.

Cooperative Learning- Teachers will Integrate content and language through group engagement.

Focused Practice- Teachers will focus practice on their instructional delivery regarding the students lowest performing components: vocabulary, comprehension and fluency.

Activating Prior Knowledge- Teachers will help students make connections between new information and information they already know.

The leadership team and coaches will attend professional learning community trainings to assist teachers with evidence-based strategies and interventions to enhance instruction across curricula content. Administrators and coaches will conduct weekly classroom walk throughs, provide actionable feedback to teachers and monitor student learning strengths and weaknesses. Teachers will address areas of concern utilizing progress monitoring and common assessment data.

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

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

The following strategies will be implemented to improve student performance:

- Build a culture of collaboration between professionals to increase student success
- Activate or build background knowledge.
- · Use Concept Maps and Graphic Organizers.

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. Increase proficiency in reading and responding to complex text-based writing through evidence-based writing across curricula to improve writing skills.

Last Modified: 5/6/2024 Page 14 of 18 https://www.floridacims.org

- 2. Students will cite evidence and analyze themes and author's choices from various texts and project.
- 3. Monitor quarterly progress monitoring assessments and common assessments to track students progress. 4. Academic data will be collected and reviewed during weekly site meetings and a strategic plan will be created to improve targeted outcomes.
- 5. Collaboration with guidance counselors to monitor the course failure rate. Address the students lack of progress and administer additional resources such as tutoring, or paraprofessional support.
- 6. Intervention groups will provide remediation and targeted interventions services with Reading coaches and teachers.

Person Responsible

William Tovine (william.tovine@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.

No subgroups were identified and the area of focus will be implemented for all students.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

The percentage of students in 2021-2022 making learning gains in math was 33%. Based on 2021-2022 school data, 67% (2/3) of the students who took the Algebra 1 EOC scored below proficiency (level 3 or above). Additional support is needed to increase proficiency in this area. Improving math achievement will improve student attendance, graduation, and learning gains on the common assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2022-2023 school year, the percent of students showing proficiency in Math will increase by 3%. (From 33% to 36%).

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs and observations, coaching logs, data discussions with students, professional development trainings through professional learning communities, progress monitoring of assessment data with action steps for Tiered intervention groups, and bi-weekly site-based data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Tovine (william.tovine@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

We will use the following strategies to assist in accelerating learning: Summarizing and note taking-Teachers will model summarization techniques and use quick writes,

graphic organizers, column notes, affinity diagrams.

Cooperative Learning- Teachers will Integrate content and language through group engagement.

Focused Practice- Teachers will focus practice on their instructional delivery regarding the students lowest performing components: quadratic functions, exponential functions, and data and statistics. Activating Prior Knowledge- Teachers will help students make connections between new information and information they already know.

The leadership team and coaches will attend professional learning community trainings to assist teachers with evidence-based strategies and interventions to enhance instruction across curricula content. Administrators and coaches will conduct weekly classroom walk throughs, provide actionable feedback to teachers and monitor student learning strengths and weaknesses. Teachers will address areas of concern utilizing progress monitoring and common assessment data.

The following strategies will be implemented to improve student performance:

- Build a culture of collaboration between professionals to increase student success
- Activate or build prior knowledge.
- Use Concept Maps and Graphic Organizers.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria 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. Monitor quarterly progress monitoring assessments and common assessments.
- 2. Academic data will be collected and reviewed during weekly site meetings.
- 3. Collaboration with guidance counselors to monitor the course failure rate.
- 4. Intervention groups will provide remediation and targeted interventions with math coaches.

Person Responsible

William Tovine (william.tovine@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.

No subgroups were identified and the area of focus will be implemented for all students.

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.

Teachers use Skyward to take attendance by class period on a daily basis. The school attendance clerk monitors student daily absences and communicates with parents to verify the absences. Repeated absences will result in continual parent and/or student contact by the attendance clerk, lead teacher, and administration.

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

School staff will contact parents whenever a student is absent. Parents/guardians will be notified by phone, email, letter sent home, or Connect Orange.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

The students will review and sign off on the Orange County Public Schools Attendance Policy quarterly. Attendance issues will be discussed at site meetings. The attendance data will be reviewed and appropriate actions will be taken to address any issues.

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

- 1. Teachers will take daily period attendance.
- 2. Attendance clerk monitors student daily absences and communicates with parents to verify.
- 3. Repeated absences will result in a parent contact/conference to determine the cause of the absences.
- 4. Monitor how absences impact student achievement and create an academic improvement plan.
- 5. Administration will create a student attendance contract.
- 6. Lead teacher will conduct weekly check ins with students to ensure the compliance of the student contract.
- 7. If attendance issues continue the student and family will be provided additional resources of support (e.g. social worker or mental health counselor).

Tovine, William, william.tovine@ocps.net