

Orange County Public Schools

Cypress Creek High



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cypress Creek High

1101 BEAR CROSSING DR, Orlando, FL 32824

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

Demographics

Principal: Maricarmen Aponte

Start Date for this Principal: 5/31/2022

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)	87%
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* Pacific Islander Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (56%)
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 was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cypress Creek High

1101 BEAR CROSSING DR, Orlando, FL 32824

<https://cypresscreekhs.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	87%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

School Board Approval

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

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.

With the support of families and the community we will foster a whole student approach to learning and lead our students to success as inquiring, knowledgeable, and caring global citizens.

With the support of families in 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.

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
Chappetta, Bethany	Assistant Principal	Works on master schedule and with CTE & Counseling staff.
Mendez, Marisol	Principal	Runs the school. Manages all personnel and community needs.
Beasley, Gale	Assistant Principal	Works with pre-school and social studies.
Hoffman, James	Assistant Principal	Works with ESE, Science, and Performing Arts.
Wagner, Karl	Assistant Principal	Works with discipline, math, and PE.
Zambrano, Angela	Assistant Principal	Works with ELA and Reading.
Scanlon, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	Works with ELA and Reading teachers.
Castro, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Math coach
Quinones-Santana, Magda	Instructional Coach	Works with science
Valente, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	Works with Social Studies and new teachers
Root, Caleb	Dean	Works with discipline
Colon, Yizzette	Staffing Specialist	Works with ESE and 504 students
Reyes, Joann	Staffing Specialist	Works with ESE students
Roviaro, Krystin	Graduation Coach	Testing Coordinator & works with SS and Business department

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 5/31/2022, Maricarmen Aponte

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.*

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

177

Total number of students enrolled at the school

3,435

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

44

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

44

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	827	847	871	804	3349	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239	386	463	457	1545	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	114	127	71	348	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	28	49	39	130	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	77	78	50	230	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272	281	287	0	840	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	273	394	318	119	1104	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	255	378	371	176	1180	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	4	14

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/27/2022

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	805	769	688	661	2923	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176	236	217	210	839	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	53	34	28	135	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	117	143	112	478	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	161	191	179	662	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	201	139	120	608	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	212	139	88	583	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185	239	212	253	889	

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	201	274	239	202	916

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	3	0	0	0	0	3	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	10	

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	805	769	688	661	2923
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176	236	217	210	839
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	53	34	28	135
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	117	143	112	478
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	161	191	179	662
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	201	139	120	608
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	212	139	88	583
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185	239	212	253	889

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	201	274	239	202	916

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	3	0	0	0	0	3	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	2	10	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	41%	49%	51%				51%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	41%						49%	53%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%						43%	40%	42%
Math Achievement	23%	36%	38%				32%	43%	51%
Math Learning Gains	38%						46%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						53%	46%	45%
Science Achievement	53%	31%	40%				65%	70%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	61%	43%	48%				64%	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	62%	67%	-5%	67%	-5%
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	62%	69%	-7%	70%	-8%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	31%	63%	-32%	61%	-30%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	31%	53%	-22%	57%	-26%

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	14	24	19	10	31	35	19	32		97	27
ELL	19	32	28	19	36	48	41	40		100	64
ASN	72	54		57	60		82	75		100	85
BLK	43	43	36	21	34	39	59	62		99	57
HSP	38	39	29	22	38	50	48	58		99	66
MUL	33	17						55			
WHT	42	43	31	29	38	18	64	69		99	65
FRL	38	40	33	20	34	41	47	58		99	67
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	9	19	23	14	23	28	27	33		100	27
ELL	18	37	37	19	24	22	35	34		100	61
AMI										100	83
ASN	76	65		30	9		80	78		100	87
BLK	42	45	42	14	19	19	54	51		100	53
HSP	41	43	39	20	21	24	53	53		99	62
MUL	43	50		38	25		64			94	73
WHT	53	54	48	25	22	18	75	60		99	66
FRL	42	47	36	19	20	23	52	54		99	64
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	20	38	36	21	41	48	37	40		96	31
ELL	23	44	47	24	48	61	42	47		98	69
ASN	79	59	54	62	55		84	75		100	90
BLK	47	48	41	22	38	44	56	66		99	62
HSP	46	47	43	31	46	55	61	60		98	70
MUL	69	38		10				79		100	64
WHT	64	54	40	40	47	42	79	71		99	70
FRL	46	47	39	28	45	53	57	58		99	71

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	536
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	72
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	48
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	48
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	26
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	50
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	46
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?

In analyzing the school data, our students with disabilities (SWD) are not at a proficient level yet. Though we just made our ESSA goal for our ELL students, it's clear we need to focus on both subgroups in order to have all students meet proficiency or increase our learning gains with our lowest 25% on the exams.

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

As a school, we need to focus on seeing greater improvements in math. While our 2021-2022 focus on math saw an increase in proficiency and learning gains, only 23% met proficiency and 38% had learning gains. In ELA, we saw dips in all categories, with a decrease of 4% in proficiency and 5% in learning gains, and 10% in our lowest 25%.

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

Attendance was a huge issue last year, with students still trying to do their classes from home. In math and in English, we had multiple teacher vacancies throughout the year which contributed to lower

achievement levels and learning gains. This year we will focus on teacher retention through building culture and establishing community within the school. For students, we will monitor attendance and address tardies.

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

In the 2021-2022 school year, we saw improvement in our math scores, where our learning gains improved by 17% and our lowest 25% learning gains improved by 23%. US History also improved in proficiency by 6%.

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

Last year, we increased the number of tutors in our math classrooms to assist with our teacher shortage. We also held regular data chats and professional learning opportunities for our teachers. Our struggling teachers received side-by-side coaching from our instructional coaches.

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

This year we added an additional instructional coach to assist our science department. We also hired interventionists to push in to our ELA, Math, Biology, and US History classes. We will be meeting with our Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) twice a week to discuss data, common assessments, lesson planning, and instructional strategies for student interventions and enrichment.

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.

Twice a month we will have Professional Development (PD) opportunities for our teachers. PD will be designed based on teacher needs, data, district expectations, and new state standards. Our professional learning is differentiated at times to scaffold for new and experienced teachers.

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

We will offer peer tutoring, Saturday enrichment/intervention opportunities, and teacher-led after school remediation. Teachers will be given trainings on instructional strategies to grow achievement across our subgroups. As a school, we are committed to establishing common values to create a safe and supportive learning environment at Cypress Creek High School.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Based on our 2021-2022 school data, only 31% of SWD met the state ESSA goal in state assessments.

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

In the 2022-2023 school year, at least 42% of SWD will meet proficiency levels on state assessments.

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

We will monitor this Area of Focus through Progress Monitoring Assessments, formative classroom common assessments, and a regular evaluation of classroom-based accommodations for SWD.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Hoffman (james.hoffman@ocps.net)

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

SWD are regularly supported and monitored by our Staffing Specialist and Learning Strategies teachers. Teachers are provided with ESE accommodations for their students and receive regular professional development in how to apply those accommodations in the classroom. This year, we will provide professional development on engagement strategies to enhance classroom learning and cognitive engagement from all students. As a school, we will be focusing on Identifying Critical Content as a Deliberate Practice element.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

When teachers are equipped with proper engagement strategies and best practices, they feel more confident in developing lessons which aim to enhance learning through meaningful activities. Through learning about how to identify the critical content, students can focus on learning the content instead of being distracted by additional information. This year we hired a new Staffing Specialist who will be offering professional development on how to use accommodations.

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.

- Subgroup training for all teachers
- Training PLCs to work with subgroup data
- Culturally Responsive training for all teachers
- Assistant Principals attending ESE training with the district
- School-wide Deliberate Practice element of Identifying Critical Content

Person Responsible Joann Reyes (joann.reyesojea@ocps.net)

#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.

During the 2021-2022 school year, only 41% of student were proficient on the FSA ELA. This was a 4% decrease from the previous year. In learning gains, we decreased 5% from the 20-21 school year to the 21-22 school year (46% to 41%). Our bottom quartile saw a 10% decrease from 20-21 to 21-22 (40% to 30%).

Our 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.

For the 2022-2023 school year, our goal is increase proficiency from 41% to 47%. We will increase our learning gains from 41% to 47%. Our bottom quartile will increase from 30% to 41%.

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

We will monitor this through Progress Monitoring Assessments, common assessments, and classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Scanlon (elizabeth.scanlon@ocps.net)

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

As a school, we will focus on identifying critical content in the classroom. With new standards, teachers will be attending professional learning throughout the year in order to learn best practices for the new content. professional learning communities will focus on literacy strategies within the classroom, including elements of close reading and student data conferences.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Close reading strategies, such as annotation, serve students in all content areas as they process critical content. Student learning will be shared and documented through data collection and student led conferencing.

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.

- ELA teachers received comprehensive professional development on the new standards
- Teacher leads will attend district IMPACT training
- Professional Learning Communities will meet twice a week to discuss data and instructional strategies

Person Responsible

Angela Zambrano (angela.zambrano@ocps.net)

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.

This year, we have embraced a new set of Core Values that we are using to drive decision-making on our campus. Students and staff are learning that our CLAWS (core values) embrace Collaboration, Leadership, Academic Excellence, Whole Person, & Strengths Minded focus. Throughout the year, we will have regular staff fellowship activities to drive partnership, teamwork, and positive culture. We are empowering our students to connect to the campus with leadership opportunities.

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

Members of our staff are collaborating on three teams: Positive Culture, Academic Excellence, and School Spirit. Krystin Roviato (Testing Coordinator) and Regan Stapleton (SGA teacher) are leading the School Spirit team. Magda Quinones (Science Coach) and Rebecca Valente (Instructional Coach) are leading the Academic Excellence team. Caleb Root (Dean) and Erin Stutz (Dean) are leading the Positive Culture team. Within each team are administrators, teacher and student leaders, and community members.