William R Boone High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

William R Boone High

1000 E KALEY ST, Orlando, FL 32806

https://boonehs.ocps.net/

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

OCPS Mission - 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.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Maestre, Hector	Principal	Oversee all of school choices that lead to accomplishing SIP
Hance, Cameron	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Instruction plans for master schedule and student needs
Mixson, Candice	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of science, CTE, and ESE; works to develop plans to help our SWD
Abalo, Daniel	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal that ensures safe campus and learning environments
Flynn, Timothy	Assistant Principal	Ensures technology resources are available and other curriculum to support student learning
Yelensky, Sarah	Instructional Coach	Responsible for professional development and coaching cycles to ensure strong instructional practices
Bals, Jennifer	Other	
Abreu, Laura	Graduation Coach	Works with our students at risk for graduation
Torres, Susan	Staffing Specialist	Develops and manages IEPs

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our school leadership team consists of the principal, 4 APs, 3 deans, 1 instructional coach, 1 staffing specialist, and 1 graduation coach. These individuals are pertinent to student learning and results. In addition we have an instructional leadership team that includes department and PLC chairs. This team has approximately 35 members. These members are selected based on their years of experience, student performance data, and willingness to drive student results forward.
Our SAC team is voluntary and includes our SGA president.
All of these individuals review data and vet our SIP goals for the upcoming school year. They help guide our PLC meetings and professional development opportunities that help us reach our SIP goals.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

In addition to regular data chats across PLCs, our teachers are purposefully planning for literacy strategies on a weekly basis to support all students, as well as monitoring and talking about SWD performance on Standard Based Unit Assessments and Performance Monitoring Assessments.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	50%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	57	49	50	59	49	51	59		
ELA Learning Gains				57			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			44		
Math Achievement*	43	34	38	39	36	38	36		
Math Learning Gains				51			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			27		
Science Achievement*	71	66	64	68	31	40	70		
Social Studies Achievement*	78	66	66	76	43	48	75		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	96	87	89	98	62	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	69	65	65	71	70	67	69		
ELP Progress	48	45	45	46			60		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	462
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	659
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	98

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	2	
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	55			
HSP	59			
MUL	72			
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	**Federal Percent of Points Index**	**Subgroup Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%**
WHT	77			
FRL	58			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	**Federal Percent of Points Index**	**Subgroup Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%**
SWD	39	Yes	1	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	55			
HSP	55			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22**	**C & C Accel 2021-22**	**ELP Progress**
All Students	57			43			71	78		96	69	48
SWD	17			15			26	42		30	7	36
ELL	31			34			50	58		44	7	48
AMI												
ASN	84			47			74	76		94	6	
BLK	37			24			52	66		53	6	
HSP	46			39			65	70		58	7	47

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL	60			41			68	80		80	6	
PAC												
WHT	71			55			83	87		77	7	69
FRL	45			33			61	68		56	7	51

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	59	57	45	39	51	49	68	76		98	71	46
SWD	16	36	31	18	44	50	38	37		88	29	
ELL	23	53	49	28	47	41	47	32		96	59	46
AMI												
ASN	59	62		55			69	93		100	58	
BLK	40	55	48	33	54	61	54	63		96	50	
HSP	50	54	47	33	48	45	59	60		98	68	46
MUL	63	58		41	58		74	100		91	76	
PAC												
WHT	70	61	43	50	54	49	80	90		98	77	
FRL	48	55	44	32	45	44	58	62		95	65	49

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	59	55	44	36	30	27	70	75		99	69	60
SWD	12	26	24	16	20	17	35	46		94	26	67
ELL	24	52	53	28	35	36	45	29		100	55	60
AMI												
ASN	70	76					82	100		100	78	
BLK	42	50	46	28	24	29	58	73		99	47	
HSP	46	50	41	28	32	31	57	59		99	63	61
MUL	71	62		31	8		72	91		100	69	
PAC												
WHT	73	60	49	49	33	19	83	85		98	79	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
FRL	45	50	41	28	27	29	56	63		98	58	62

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	57%	49%	8%	50%	7%
09	2023 - Spring	54%	46%	8%	48%	6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	38%	47%	-9%	50%	-12%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	48%	45%	3%	48%	0%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	63%	4%	63%	4%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	76%	62%	14%	63%	13%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Even though the percentage of students proficient in math improved by 9%, this continues to be our lowest-performing area.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

ELA percent proficient was the only tested area that did not improve. This area decreased by 2%

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Although we perform higher than the state and district high school averages in all areas except Geometry EOC, our students with disabilities remain our lowest-performing students. There is a significant gap in proficiency within this population of students.

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

Our math proficiency improved the most, especially our Algebra EOC proficiency. This department received a new assessing administrator that was consistent from the beginning to the end of the school year. This administrator implemented multiple data chats, facilitated common planning time, monitored tutoring schedules, and conducted frequent walk-thrus with feedback. Additionally, the math team participated in professional development specific to ELL instructional strategies. All of these things improved instruction in the classroom and overall student performance.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Our ESSA data shows the subgroups that performed the lowest were SWD(39%) and ELL (47%). Our other subgroups in comparison are Black and Hispanic (55%), White (67%), Economically Disadvantaged (54%), Multiracial (70%), and Asian (71%).

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

SWD
ELL
ELA proficiency because it decreased
Math proficiency because it is still the lowest performing area

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to the ESSA Federal Index report, our students with disabilities continue to perform lower than any other subgroup; currently performing at 39%. Consistently our school grade is between an "A" or "B" while the school grade for our SWD are between a "D" or "F".

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

Currently our SWD score a 39% on the ESSA Federal Index, we would like to see this improve to 42% next school year.

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

- Data chats with Support Facilitators and core subject area teachers with a focus on our SWD performance on SBUAs and PMAs
- Frequent walkthrough and feedback of support facilitated english and math classes and learning strategies courses

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Candice Mixson (candice.mixson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented is a collaborative teaching model with opportunities for small groups based on performance. We will begin this school year with a cooperative teaching training for all support facilitators and core teachers that have SWD. With the assistance of the instructional coach, we will plan additional PD opportunities to grow in this strategy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidence has shown setting up a rotational model that allows for targeted interventions in small group setting is impactful on student growth and learning

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We would like to improve the culture and environment at our school by focusing on our student population, specifically their sense of belonging to the school. The Panorama data from the 22-23 school year showed that 40% of our student respondents felt a sense of belonging at Boone HS.

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

We would like to see a 10% increase in students' sense of belonging

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

We will use district approved survey data to compare our results from this school year to end of next school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hector Maestre (hector.maestre@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We have 339 students that are under a 2.0 GPA. If we can not reduce this number we will see a decrease in our graduation rate. At the start of the 23-24 school year:
9th - 25
10th - 130
11th - 111
12th - 72

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

We would like to see the number of students under a 2.0 GPA reduced by 40%.

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

- Seek teacher mentors to encourage students to attend school and participate in their learning
- Share with teachers which of their students are under a 2.0 so they can focus on those students for intervention
- Data chats with our instructional leadership team to monitor the number of students, which subjects seem to be causing our students the most issues, and develop cyclical plans to continue to support students throughout the school year
- Educating students on their progress by providing graduation checklist and check-ins to at risk students so they can see their progress towards graduation and getting back on track
- Continue to provide professional development to our instructional leaders on the impact of grading practices and grading for equity

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cameron Hance (cameron.hance@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Administrators met to review the master schedule and teacher allotment. During this time it was discovered that funding priority should be placed on providing support for our students with disabilities. With this adjustment, we were able to add two additional support facilitators.
Boone was provided funding to hire additional Algebra teachers allowing each Algebra class will be at student to teacher ratio of 15:1 or lower. This will increase student achievement in math.