University High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

University High

2450 COUGAR WAY, Orlando, FL 32817

https://universityhs.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.

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.

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
Ott, Thomas	Principal	Overall Operations of School, Safety & Security, Admin and Leadership Team, SIP, SAC, Budget, Performing Arts Magnet, IB Magnet, Budget, Recruitment, Connect Orange and Community Outreach, SRO Liaison, Graduation, New to the U, Principal Advisory Council, Athletics, Testing, Sunday Start-Up, Field Trips, Fundraisers
Langston, Sherry	Assistant Principal	Safety and Security, Curriculum and Instruction, Professional Development, CTE, Vet Assisting and Agriculture, Physical Education and Wellness, OCVS/Credit Recovery Labs, Testing/College Board, Master Schedule, Data Lead, FTE Survey completions, EOY and PY processing, CCRC/Bright Futures/FAFSA/S.S., College and Career DE, Golden Ticket, Open House, Mastery Prep, OSP Online Practice Plan, Guidance Services, PLC Facilitation, MTSS Team member, Staff Celebrations, Student Celebrations, At-Risk Senior Interventions, and Sunday Start-Up
Mezger, Michael	Assistant Principal	Safety & Security, Curriculum & Instruction, Advanced Placement, Math, World Languages, Keys, Staffulty Learning, SEL Implementation, Facilities/Fixed Asset Inventory, Facility Rentals/Facilitron, Master School Calendar, Technology/Digital Devices, Custodial, MCJROTC, PLC Facilitation, STAT Member, Transportation, Equity & Access Mentor Coordinator, Parent/Family Engagement, Itinerants, Sunday Start-Up, Title IX Secondary Investigator
	Assistant Principal	Safety & Security, Curriculum & Instruction, ELL/Multilingual Student Support, Media Center, Cougar Culture Club, Science, Advanced Placement, PLC Facilitation, Intervention Programs, Cougar Express Card Program, School Wide Literacy Plan, Social Studies, Volunteers/Interns/Tutors, Student Assistants, Teach-In Coordinator, Staffulty Celebrations, Pre-IB Inquiry Skills, Early Intervention Program/Tutoring, Sunday Start-Up
Tomasi, Courtney	Assistant Principal	Safety & Security, Curriculum & Instruction, School Improvement Plan (SIP), Student Services Program, Substitutes, Attendance, PASS and SAFE, Summer School/ESY, Supervision Roster, ELA, ESE, School Safety Plan, Student Parking/Hang Tags, Cougar Credit System, PLC Facilitation, FSSAT Assessment, Threat Assessment Team Chair, Title IX Coordinator, Emergency Drills, Red Carpet Customer Service, Sunday Start-Up, Designated CAS Expert, PTSA
Schmitt, Cindy	Instructional Coach	The Math Instructional Coach will provide instructional support and coaching to University High School as it works to ensure every student is able to reach his or her academic potential. The MIC's primary role is to work with math teachers to support best practices in using data, provide analysis of school-wide trends in instruction, and make recommendations about potential next steps to address areas of need. The MIC is an advisor to math teachers and administration. The MIC will work collaboratively with the instructional team to advise leads and teachers on developing

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		research-based instructional strategies and standards-based intervention programs for struggling students.
Nieves, Kaylin	Dean	Safety and Security, ACHIEVE, Instructional Feedback/Observations, ELA 9 PLC Support, Process Referrals, Student Parking, Manage Student Discipline Program, TATM, Home Visits, Staff/Student Recognition, Facilitate Cougar Credit Program, Truancy Co-Lead, Student Code of Conduct Lead, Class Meeting Presentations Lead, Staffulty PD, Restorative Practices, MTSS Team Member, Partners in Ed Co-Coordinator, Participate in 504/IEP Meetings, Safety Plan Co-Lead, Supervision Plan/Duty Roster, Emergency Drills Lead, SmartPass Program Lead, Roster (Evening) Lead
Washington, Doyle	Dean	Safety and Security, ACHIEVE, Instructional Feedback/Observations, Algebra 1 PLC Support, Process Referrals, Manage Student Discipline Program, TATM, Home Visits, Staff/Student Recognitions, Facilitate Cougar Credit Program, Cougar Credit Program Lead, Truancy Co-Lead, Student Code of Conduct, Class Meeting Presentations, Staffulty PD, Restorative Practices, MTSS Team Member, Participate in 504/IEP, Meetings, Sunday Start-Up Lead, Safety Plan Co-Lead, Supervision Plan/ Duty Roster Lead, Emergency Drills, SmartPass Program, Cougar Express cards, Career/College Bootcamps.
Alvarado, Wanda	Magnet Coordinator	University High School's IB Coordinator will communicate effectively and present exceptional written and oral presentations. The coordinator will be a motivating leader with a standards-driven approach; who is passionate about student learning and student achievement. The IB Coordinator will lead IB/pre-IB staff to exemplary professionalism even under stressful situations. With 80 percent of their time dedicated directly to the IB program, the IBC will promote a supportive and like-minded collaboration among content and program peers and administration. The coordinator will promote an immersive, student-centered culture via self-reflection thereby establishing a sense of community within their department. Observing instructional delivery and providing feedback to enhance and support the development of each teacher's content area, supporting IB/pre-IB teachers in the design of units and lessons for the development of their yearlong curriculum, analyzing data in order to modify curriculum, instruction, and forms of assessment to meet students' needs, working with the academic staff in the school to support sharing of best practices, model lessons in classrooms, help teachers plan instruction, advise and create school-wide policies and procedures, facilitate professional development, track and adjust the IFC of the IB PLC, maintain accurate list of juniors and seniors requiring extended essay and IB exam scores to obtain the IB diploma designation, facilitate PSAT/SAT/ACT/PERT bootcamps, facilitate IB PLC meetings, lead consultancy protocol for IB department, track summative data for accountability students (achievement, learning gains),

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		attend MTSS meetings and participate in interventions, facilitate small-group and 1 on 1 interventions, advise the deconstruction of standards to identify necessary prerequisite skills and rigorous intent, lead coaching cycles, inform IB department of available professional development opportunities and ensure attendance as defined to IBO parameters, school IB representative at mandatory curriculum office training and meetings, ensure that an Extended Essay Coordinator and CAS Coordinator are in place and functioning at the highest levels, work with testing coordinator to ensure 95% of accountability students participate in required testing, coordinate external tutor schedule for push-in and pull-out support, co-coordinate support facilitator schedules for push-in and pull-out ESE support, provide data analysis of summative assessments by standard, teacher, period, and subgroup, advise PLCs on instructional decisions based on data analysis of summative and formative assessments, participate in instructional walks with the administration, provide teacher support in understanding the Marzano Instructional Framework, serve as the project lead for grants geared toward the improvement of the IB program, administrative duty coverage, report outs given at administrative meetings, ensure IB unit plans meet IBO and local specifications.
O'donal, Patrick	School Counselor	University High School's Career Counselor is the lead for all things related to postsecondary education, military placement, and other such initiatives. The Career Counselor will allocate 80% of their time working directly with students with the remaining time being allocated to administrative tasks necessary and relevant to the tasks below to best support students. This includes but is not limited to: FAFSA Completion, Advisement, Tracking, and Reporting Super Scholars Advisement, Tracking, and Reporting Scholarship Applications and Awards College Admissions Advisement, Tracking and Reporting Organize and facilitate Bridges to Success scholarship assistance Promote and facilitate Valencia application assistance to include both graduate and dual enrollment opportunities General Postsecondary Advisement Creating and Facilitating College Admissions Visits Creating and Facilitating College Information Sessions Coordinates annual Top 50 orientation and breakfast Ensuring that military recruiters have a consistent presence on campus Coordinates ASVAB testing Organize and facilitate QuestBridge Scholarship program Organize and facilitate Financial Aid assistance opportunities Assisting Guidance with Bright Futures applications and procedures Host students individually, in small groups, and in large groups weekly to assist with above items. Communicate with parents via phone, email, and other communication platforms Work in collaboration with Guidance on a daily basis to support College

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		and Career initiatives Sponsor Minority Leadership Scholars and associated scholarship opportunities Facilitate Senior Survey Maintain the College and Career Resource Center as a fully functional and inviting space for students to explore postsecondary opportunities Tracking longitudinal data related to all above items.

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.

The University School Improvement Plan is a collaborative effort. The plan is formed by incorporating the input of all required stakeholders, including the school's Professional Learning Communities and School Advisory Council. The School Advisory Council reviews the plan, provides input, and approves the School Improvement Plan before finalization. Members of the UHS extended leadership team contribute input to data aggregation and analysis leading to a collaborative effort in determining the most appropriate strategies to implement under each are of focus. This approach also includes the consideration of feedback from the International Baccalaureate Organization as UHS is considered an IB World School. After the SIP is initially reviewed by our Principal Leader, edits are made as needed and it is then taken to our School Advisory Council for review and approval during our September meeting. Each member of our leadership team covers their assigned areas of focus per our organizational chart and feedback is taken from the SAC. This feedback is then implemented into the final draft of the SIP.

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))

The School Improvement Plan is a living document that is the pivotal focus of all Professional Learning Community meetings. The SIP goals are embedded within the consistent systems put in place at University such as Professional Learning Community alignment across curriculum areas, a focus on mastery grading, and consistent data disaggregation amongst PLCs to plan for individual student achievement. The academic areas of focus are chiefly monitored through schoolwide systems found within our professional learning communities. Each PLC features a student tracker that includes student demographics, their baseline scores, and their proficiency goals for the year. Each students scores on each SBUA, PM, PMA, and STAR assessment are added as instruction occurs for progress monitoring and to guide instructional decision making. UHS's early intervention program also includes strategies to help combat early warning indicators that prohibit academic achievement which is monitored through our Class Cohort Sheets.

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	81%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	82%
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: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	940
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	533
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	486
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	684

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	51	49	50	49	49	51	59		
ELA Learning Gains				47			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			44		
Math Achievement*	41	34	38	34	36	38	24		
Math Learning Gains				55			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			25		
Science Achievement*	66	66	64	62	31	40	65		
Social Studies Achievement*	79	66	66	80	43	48	72		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	96	87	89	98	62	61	100		
College and Career Acceleration	70	65	65	75	70	67	70		
ELP Progress	44	45	45	54			59		

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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	641
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
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	43			
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	62			
HSP	60			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	70			
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	49			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	55			
HSP	56			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	53			

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	51			41			66	79		96	70	44
SWD	18			23			30	55		34	6	
ELL	31			41			48	49		62	7	44
AMI												
ASN	79			79			90	84		83	6	
BLK	40			39			63	89		49	6	
HSP	44			33			59	75		71	7	40
MUL	63			82			77			73	5	
PAC												
WHT	59			51			74	85		73	7	50
FRL	41			31			58	76		64	7	39

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	49	47	31	34	55	56	62	80		98	75	54
SWD	14	31	25	14	50	52	20	46		92	48	
ELL	21	38	35	23	52	46	33	68		98	70	54
AMI												
ASN	76	67	50	70	70		92	95		100	89	
BLK	48	41	22	36	53	53	51	78		99	72	
HSP	41	44	30	31	57	53	56	77		98	71	56
MUL	50	30		46	42		69	92		95	78	
PAC												
WHT	59	51	32	31	46	64	68	82		97	78	
FRL	38	41	28	30	50	49	53	74		98	71	47

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	57	44	24	30	25	65	72		100	70	59
SWD	18	44	41	13	32	38	35	47		98	27	
ELL	27	48	34	13	31	33	43	36		100	57	59
AMI												
ASN	81	71	62	47	44		88	82		100	88	
BLK	53	52	41	26	33	10	61	62		99	61	
HSP	51	53	43	19	25	22	56	68		99	65	58
MUL	63	50		35	23		69			100	93	
PAC												
WHT	72	63	50	32	43	46	86	87		100	77	
FRL	48	48	38	15	18	17	51	66		100	64	49

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	53%	49%	4%	50%	3%
09	2023 - Spring	47%	46%	1%	48%	-1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	32%	47%	-15%	50%	-18%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	45%	5%	48%	2%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	63%	1%	63%	1%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	62%	16%	63%	15%

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.

Based on the Spring 2023 Best Algebra EOC Exam, the data component showing the lowest performance for the 2022-2023 school year was Algebra 1, with 33% proficiency. This was an increase from the 2022 score of 24% proficiency. Achievement score increases are attributable to strong collaboration within Professional Learning Communities, disaggregating data to meet individual student needs, and strong intervention programs such as tutoring, small group instruction, and targeted intervention boot camp programs. All focus areas, including ELA 9 and 10, Biology, Algebra, and

Geometry demonstrated growth from the Spring 2022 scores. US History maintained a proficiency level of 79% from 2022 to 2023.

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

Based on the Spring 2023 performance data, no area showed a decline in proficiency from the prior school year. University High School experienced consistent ELA 9 proficiency at 47%, a 9% growth in ELA 10, a 9% growth in Algebra 1, an 11% growth in Geometry, a 6% growth in Biology, and a 0% growth in US History, which maintained a proficiency level of 79%.

In examining subgroup data, the areas with the largest decline include ELA 9 and 10 proficiency levels for African-American students. ELA 9 had an 8% decline in proficiency levels from 47% to 39%. ELA 10 had a 7% decline in proficiency from 45% to 38%. ELL students also declined in proficiency levels in ELA 9 and ELA 10. In ELA 9, ELL student proficiency levels dropped from 5% to 3%, and in ELA 10, proficiency levels dropped from 6% to 2%. African-American students also saw a decline in Geometry proficiency, from 64% to 48%, a 16% decline in proficiency. The largest decline for Asian students occurred in US History proficiency, with a drop of 11% from 95% proficiency to 84% proficiency. All other subgroups stayed consistent or improved proficiency levels across the tested areas of ELA 9, ELA 10, Algebra, Geometry, Biology, and US History.

The African-American subgroup declined in Geometry, ELA 9, and ELA 10 proficiency. This can be attributed to a lack of emphasis on culturally responsive teaching practices to ensure instruction meets the needs of the diverse learners present in the classroom. The decline in proficiency levels for ELL students can be attributed to the growing population of ELL students in the area, the transient population of this subgroup, and the need to plan scaffolds intentionally to provide support for second language learners within the lessons.

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.

The school proficiency level for Algebra 1 was 33%. This is 17% below the state average of 50%. Even though the Algebra proficiency levels were below the state by 17%, this is a marked improvement from the 2022 scores in which University was 25% below the state proficiency level of 49% with only 24% proficiency at the school level. As we continue to experience a gap in proficiency between the school level of proficiency and the state, we continue to focus on essential skills that our students lack entering Algebra 1, including language barriers. Through an emphasis on academic vocabulary and cross-curricular literacy skills, as well as the intentionality of planning for universal design within our Professional Learning Communities, we will continue to bridge the gap as we move our students to higher levels of proficiency.

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

The data component area that demonstrated the most growth was Geometry. The Geometry proficiency level in the 22-23 school year was 53%, a 14% growth from the 21-22 proficiency level of 39%. Through the alignment of Professional Learning Communities and the emphasis on data utilization, there is a more targeted intention behind lesson planning to meet the needs of individual students. Teachers' pedagogical skills were strengthened through consistent coaching and feedback to improve practice. An emphasis on mastery grading allowed for opportunities for students to revise their knowledge, set goals for improvement, and allowed teachers to differentiate instruction to meet individual needs. University places an emphasis on student voice, which was implemented within classrooms, and allowed students to demonstrate mastery through collaborative learning practices and processing strategies.

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

One of the areas of concern in the Early Warning Indicator System is the students with attendance below 90%, which is 938 students. In order to improve attendance, University is implementing a consistent approach to truant students, including ACST meetings, regular home visits, SAFE referrals to determine the root cause of attendance issues, and providing resources to families.

Another area of concern is the 619 students that failed the ELA assessment, and 460 students failing the state math assessment. Through the promotion of cross-curricular literacy skills, consistent instructional coaching and feedback, an emphasis on mastery grading and student voice, and targeted approaches to proficiency, there will be an increase in students demonstrating proficiency in ELA and Math. It is interesting to note that our overall ELA and Math proficiency increased from the previous year yet so did this early warning indicator.

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

The highest priorities for University are to continue to make significant growth in proficiency levels in ELA 9, 10, Algebra 1, and Geometry in addition to improving attendance and reducing the number of students with attendance below 90%.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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.

Early Warning Indicator data represents an overall picture of the school conditions as it relates to the school climate and culture. UHS has demonstrated marked improvement in reducing the number of students with math course failure and math assessment failure, as well as reducing the number of students with attendance below 90%. Continued focus on mastery grading, student voice, and individual student data tracking, as well as consistent attendance interventions, will enable a greater reduction in EWI numbers. Additional emphasis will be given to EWI's that increased from the previous year including students with one of more suspensions (increase of 68 students), students scoring a level 1 on their ELA assessment (increase of 86 students), and students with two or more indicators (increase of 31 students) which is likely tied to the two indicators referenced previously.

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

University High School will decrease the number of students in each early warning indicator category by 10%.

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

Comprehensive monitoring will take place through parent/student forums, consistent ACST meetings, home visits, consultancy protocols for course failures conducted after each report card, individual student data tracking, and an emphasis on socially responsive discipline practices. ELA assessment progression will be monitored using our student tracking forms within both the ELA 9 and ELA 10 PLCs that track student progress towards proficiency throughout each PM assessment and SBUA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Ott (thomas.ott@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 main focus will be on attendance, behavior, and course performance. The selected indicators will ensure that administrators, deans, MTSS coordinators, counselors, SAFE coordinator, teachers, and families play an active role in building a culture that promotes students to be college and career ready. PLCs will implement structures for cross-curricular literacy, including a greater emphasis on academic vocabulary and text annotations. In addition, PLC alignment across curriculum areas will place a greater emphasis on individual student success through the use of student data trackers in all subject areas. In addition, consultancy protocols, home visits, consistent ACST meetings, and Restorative Practices will help all students reach success. The revitalization of our Cougar Credits program to give rise to positive interventions and our U CAN mentoring program as proactive approaches to meeting this goal as well.

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

Due to the variety of components in the early warning systems, multiple stakeholder involvement, and a whole-student approach is essential. Behavioral and academic concerns will be addressed by a variety of stakeholders to best meet individual student needs. Collective actions and collection of qualitative and quantitative achievement data will enable targeted interventions, which will be monitored for effectiveness, and continually evaluated.

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.

Parent-Student Forums
Parent-Student forums will occur after each report card. Students with one or more Ds or Fs on their report card will be invited via email and a Connect Orange call-out to a forum meeting where they can meet with a member of the leadership team to review student transcripts, attendance records, graduation track, and behavioral concerns. A graduation action plan is completed at the meeting to set students up for success.

Person Responsible: Sherry Langston (sherry.langston@ocps.net)

By When: Two weeks after each grading period ends, scheduled by grade level.

Home Visits
As soon as a student becomes truant, a home visit will be conducted by members of the administration in order to make contact with families and identify the root cause of the attendance issues, and create a plan of action for improvement.

Person Responsible: Courtney Tomasi (courtney.tomasi@ocps.net)

By When: Home visits begin on the 10th day of school and will be continual throughout the year.

Truancy Letters
Each Tuesday, our attendance clerk will pull truant students and produce truancy letters for 5, 10, and 15 day notifications. These letters are then mailed home to parents in conjunction with our home visits.

Person Responsible: Thomas Ott (thomas.ott@ocps.net)

By When: Begins on the fifth day of school and continues with 10 day and 15 day truancy letters.

Truancy Meetings
Each dean is responsible for monitoring the weekly truancy report for 5 and 10 day truancy reports. Parents will be contacted and an Attendance Child Study Team meeting will be scheduled to create an attendance action plan for students. The School Social Worker will provide family and student support as needed.

Person Responsible: Courtney Tomasi (courtney.tomasi@ocps.net)

By When: Continual throughout the year.

ACST Meetings
Attendance Child Study Team meetings taking place with school social workers and district support for habitually truant students.

Person Responsible: Courtney Tomasi (courtney.tomasi@ocps.net)

By When: Will begin as soon as truancy hits students per interents schedules.

Feedback and Coaching of Teachers
Regular feedback practices focusing on the rigor of the standard and associated instructional strategies will occur daily in multiple iterations. Side by side coaching, modeling, peer observations, and coaching cycles will take place based on the level of support each individual teacher needs.

Person Responsible: Courtney Tomasi (courtney.tomasi@ocps.net)

By When: This process begins on the first day of school as classroom walks begin.

PLC Systems
Each PLC utilizes individual student tracking documents, internal focus calendars, lowest item analysis, data chat protocols, and common agendas

Person Responsible: Courtney Tomasi (courtney.tomasi@ocps.net)

By When: This was implemented during common planning over June and July.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

ELA 9 maintained proficiency at 47% and ELA 10 increased proficiency levels from 47% to 53%. Even with significant improvements, ELA proficiency continues to be an area of focus with an emphasis on academic vocabulary, collaborative Professional Learning Community structures, and student data tracking to inform instruction. Our students literacy is crucial in ensuring success amongst all subject areas and will continue to be a major area of focus.

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

University High School will increase ELA proficiency levels by 3% to 50% for ELA 9 and 56% for ELA 10.

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

School administration and coaches will conduct daily observation of instruction to ensure the effective use of evidence-based pedagogical strategies that reinforce mastery learning. Actionable feedback will be provided to teachers with follow-up during the planning process. Individual student data trackers will allow for targeted data analysis based on individual student needs to inform instruction decisions during PLC meetings. Individual student tracking of formative and summative assessment data will be used to define and target students needing Tier II and Tier III interventions. Parent/student forums will also continue after each report card and consultancy protocols will occur based on percentage of students with Ds and Fs in class grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Courtney Tomasi (courtney.tomasi@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.)

Small-group, explicit instruction will be implemented within the ELA classrooms through the use of TAP, Targeted Approach to Proficiency, lessons. These lessons will focus on the weakest areas for each student as identified by the results of formative and summative data analysis.

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

Small-group, explicit instruction allows for students to receive the targeted instruction based on their needs as identified through the disaggregation of data. This small group instruction utilizes mastery paths in Canvas and the Targeted Approach to Proficiency (TAP) model to provide differentiated mediation and enrichment to students.

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.

Teachers will participate in weekly PLC meetings to collaborate on instruction and analyze formative and summative data to inform instructional decisions. During the common planning process, teachers will focus on instructional and engagement strategies to ensure standards-based instruction. Achievement level descriptors will be utilized as part of the planning process to ensure that the instruction and outcomes are at the level of rigor needed to ensure students reach their individual proficiency goals.

Person Responsible: Courtney Tomasi (courtney.tomasi@ocps.net)

By When: Continual throughout the year. This began during common planning in June and July.

An individual student data tracker will be implemented to track student data towards a proficiency goal. Student goals will be set to the minimum level of proficiency for students who did not meet proficiency on the prior year assessment and at a 10% growth goal for other students.

Person Responsible: Courtney Tomasi (courtney.tomasi@ocps.net)

By When: Continual throughout the year. This began during common planning in June and July.

Through the process of common planning during Professional Learning Community meetings, teachers will ensure intentionally planned differentiation of instruction for all ELL, ESE, and 504 students.

Person Responsible: Courtney Tomasi (courtney.tomasi@ocps.net)

By When: Continual throughout the year. This began during common planning in June and July.

Provide weekly, actionable feedback to teachers based on consistent classroom observations. The feedback will be targeted towards the school pillars of mastery grading, student voice, celebrations, and faculty and student relationships as well as pedagogical practices that lend to effective instruction and student success. Regular feedback practices focusing on the rigor of the standard and associated instructional strategies will occur daily in multiple iterations. Side by side coaching, modeling, peer observations, and coaching cycles will take place based on the level of support each individual teacher needs.

Person Responsible: Courtney Tomasi (courtney.tomasi@ocps.net)

By When: Continually throughout the year and will begin on the first day of class as classroom walks begin.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

University High School saw a 9% growth in Algebra 1 proficiency levels from 24% to 33% and a 11% growth in Geometry proficiency from 42% to 53%. While both areas showed significant growth in proficiency due to the instructional practices, PLC alignment, and mastery grading structures that were in place in the 2022-2023 school year, the Algebra 1 proficiency level is still 17% below the state proficiency level of 50%. Algebra 1 and Geometry will continue to be an instructional focus to ensure consistent growth continues as more students reach proficiency.

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

University High School will increase math proficiency levels by 3% to 36% for Algebra 1 and 56% for Geometry.

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

School administration and coaches will conduct daily observation of instruction to ensure the effective use of evidence-based pedagogical strategies that reinforce mastery learning. Actionable feedback will be provided to teachers with follow-up during the planning process. Individual student data trackers will allow for targeted data analysis based on individual student needs to inform instruction decisions during PLC meetings. The analysis of common assessment and STAR data trends will be used to reflect on implemented instructional strategies and determine progress towards benchmark mastery. Individual student tracking of formative and summative assessment data will be used to define and target students needing Tier II and Tier III interventions. Parent/student forums will also continue after each report card and consultancy protocols will occur based on percentage of students with Ds and Fs in class grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Mezger (michael.mezger@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.)

Small-group, targeted instruction will take place in accordance with student needs based on formative and summative data. Support facilitators and instructional coaches will provide small-group instructional support for remediation of students that are below proficiency levels. Small-group instruction will be implemented for introduction of concepts, guided practice, revision of knowledge, and remediation.

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

Small-group, explicit instruction allows for students to receive the targeted instruction based on their needs as identified through the disaggregation of data. Research has indicated that using explicit instruction in mathematics is highly effective and can significantly improve a student's ability to perform mathematical operations and solve word problems. This strategy is effective for all students, including ELLs and SWDs. The use of rotational stations, alternative teaching, and pull-out interventions will ensure students are receiving the targeted instruction needed.

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.

Develop a student data tracker with measurable goals for each student. Student goals will be established at the baseline of proficiency for students below level and at a 10% growth for students approaching or at proficiency levels. Student data will be tracked after each unit assessment and progress monitoring of the BEST assessment to ensure progress towards proficiency goals and inform instructional decisions at the student level.

Person Responsible: Michael Mezger (michael.mezger@ocps.net)

By When: Continual throughout the year. This is a continuation of processes that began in the prior school year and put in place again during common planning this past summer.

Teachers will participate in weekly PLC meetings to collaborate on instruction and analyze formative and summative data to inform instructional decisions. During the common planning process, teachers will focus on instructional and engagement strategies to ensure standards-based instruction. Achievement level descriptors will be utilized as part of the planning process to ensure that the instruction and outcomes are at the level of rigor needed to ensure students reach their individual proficiency goals.

Person Responsible: Michael Mezger (michael.mezger@ocps.net)

By When: Continual throughout the year. This is a continuation of processes that began in the prior school year and put in place again during common planning this past summer.

Through the process of common planning during Professional Learning Community meetings, teachers will ensure intentionally planned differentiation of instruction for all ELL, ESE, and 504 students.

Person Responsible: Michael Mezger (michael.mezger@ocps.net)

By When: Continual throughout the year.

Provide weekly, actionable feedback to teachers based on consistent classroom observations. The feedback will be targeted towards the school pillars of mastery grading, student voice, celebrations, and faculty and student relationships as well as pedagogical practices that lend to effective instruction and student success. Regular feedback practices focusing on the rigor of the standard and associated instructional strategies will occur daily in multiple iterations. Side by side coaching, modeling, peer observations, and coaching cycles will take place based on the level of support each individual teacher needs.

Person Responsible: Michael Mezger (michael.mezger@ocps.net)

By When: This process begins on the first day of school as classroom walks begin.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

One area of focus for University High School is Biology. Biology proficiency levels rose 2% from 62% proficiency to 64% proficiency. University High School's level of proficiency was 1% above the state proficiency level of 63%. While the school made growth in proficiency level, continuation of strong systems of collaborative PLCs, mastery grading, and the integration of literacy skills across different curriculum areas will work to increase student proficiency levels.

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

University's level of proficiency in Biology will increase 3% from 64% to 67%.

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

School administration and coaches will conduct daily observation of instruction to ensure the effective use of evidence-based pedagogical strategies that reinforce mastery learning. Actionable feedback will be provided to teachers with follow-up during the planning process. Individual student data trackers will allow for targeted data analysis based on individual student needs to inform instruction decisions during PLC meetings. Individual student tracking of formative and summative assessment data will be used to define and target students needing Tier II and Tier III interventions. Parent/student forums will also continue after each report card and consultancy protocols will occur based on percentage of students with Ds and Fs in class grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Small-group, targeted instruction based on student formative and summative assessment data will be implemented to ensure that students are receiving the necessary remediation and enrichment necessary to reach proficiency based on individual deficit standards.

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

Small-group, explicit instruction is an evidence-based intervention that targets individual student needs as identified by summative and formative data. Using data to drive decision making regarding where students need more time and support is a highly effective strategy that allows for real time support for students.

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.

An individual student data tracker will be implemented to track student data towards a proficiency goal. Student goals will be set to the minimum level of proficiency for students who did not meet proficiency on the prior year assessment and at a 10% growth goal for other students.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Continually throughout the year. This is a continuation of what occured last year with this PLC and began during common planning in June and July.

Teachers will participate in weekly PLC meetings to collaborate on instruction and analyze formative and summative data to inform instructional decisions. During the common planning process, teachers will focus on instructional and engagement strategies to ensure standards-based instruction. Achievement level descriptors will be utilized as part of the planning process to ensure that the instruction and outcomes are at the level of rigor needed to ensure students reach their individual proficiency goals.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Continually throughout the year. This is a continuation of what occured last year with this PLC and began during common planning in June and July.

Provide weekly, actionable feedback to teachers based on consistent classroom observations. The feedback will be targeted towards the school pillars of mastery grading, student voice, celebrations, and faculty and student relationships as well as pedagogical practices that lend to effective instruction and student success. Regular feedback practices focusing on the rigor of the standard and associated instructional strategies will occur daily in multiple iterations. Side by side coaching, modeling, peer observations, and coaching cycles will take place based on the level of support each individual teacher needs.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Continually throughout the year. This process begins on the first day of school as classroom walks begin.

Through the process of common planning during Professional Learning Community meetings, teachers will ensure intentionally planned differentiation of instruction for all ELL, ESE, and 504 students.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Continually throughout the year.

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

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.

Another area of focus for overall school improvement is US History. The US History proficiency level was 79% in both 2021-2022 and 2022-2023. This proficiency level is 16% above the state level of proficiency of 63%. Despite the high level of proficiency for students in US History, the goal is continually to move students to a higher level, which will be obtained through the continuation of strong collaborative Professional Learning Community structures aimed at the intentional planning of instructional activities that meet the depth and rigor of the standards.

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

University High School will show a 3% growth in students reaching proficiency in US History, from 79% to 82%.

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

School administration and coaches will conduct daily observation of instruction to ensure the effective use of evidence-based pedagogical strategies that reinforce mastery learning. Actionable feedback will be provided to teachers with follow-up during the planning process. Individual student data trackers will allow for targeted data analysis based on individual student needs to inform instruction decisions during PLC meetings. Individual student tracking of formative and summative assessment data will be used to define and target students needing Tier II and Tier III interventions. Parent/student forums will also continue after each report card and consultancy protocols will occur based on percentage of students with Ds and Fs in class grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Targeted, small-group instruction for students based on levels of achievement will be implemented using formative and summative data tracking towards the goal of proficiency on established standards. Small-group instruction will allow for differentiated remediation and enrichment opportunities for students.

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

Small-group, explicit instruction is an evidence-based intervention that targets individual student needs as identified by summative and formative data. Using data to drive decision making regarding where students need more time and support is a highly effective strategy that allows for real time support for students.

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.

An individual student data tracker will be implemented to track student data towards a proficiency goal. Student goals will be set to the minimum level of proficiency for students who did not meet proficiency on the prior year assessment and at a 10% growth goal for other students.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Continually throughout the year. USH has done this for years and we will continue to support this level of student tracking.

Teachers will participate in weekly PLC meetings to collaborate on instruction and analyze formative and summative data to inform instructional decisions. During the common planning process, teachers will focus on instructional and engagement strategies to ensure standards-based instruction. Achievement level descriptors will be utilized as part of the planning process to ensure that the instruction and outcomes are at the level of rigor needed to ensure students reach their individual proficiency goals.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Continually throughout the year.

Provide weekly, actionable feedback to teachers based on consistent classroom observations. The feedback will be targeted towards the school pillars of mastery grading, student voice, celebrations, and faculty and student relationships as well as pedagogical practices that lend to effective instruction and student success. Regular feedback practices focusing on the rigor of the standard and associated instructional strategies will occur daily in multiple iterations. Side by side coaching, modeling, peer observations, and coaching cycles will take place based on the level of support each individual teacher needs.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Continually throughout the year. This process begins on the first day of school as classroom walks begin.

Through the process of common planning during Professional Learning Community meetings, teachers will ensure intentionally planned differentiation of instruction for all ELL, ESE, and 504 students.

Person Responsible: Courtney Tomasi (courtney.tomasi@ocps.net)

By When: Continually throughout the year.

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

One area of focus for the 23-24 school year is the advanced programs of Advanced Placement courses, International Baccalaureate courses, and Cambridge AICE courses. University offers a wide variety of higher-level courses to meet the enrichment needs of high achieving students and assist these students to preparation for post secondary success.

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

University High School will increase proficiency rates on all Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate Exams by 3%.

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

School administration and coaches will conduct daily observation of instruction to ensure the effective use of evidence-based pedagogical strategies that reinforce mastery learning. Actionable feedback will be provided to teachers with follow-up during the planning process. Individual student data trackers will allow for targeted data analysis based on individual student needs to inform instruction decisions during PLC meetings. Professional Learning Communities will focus on implementation of instructional strategies and questioning to ensure instruction is as the adequate level of rigor for the standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wanda Alvarado (wanda.alvarado@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.)

Through the use of small-group, targeted instruction, teachers will be able to enrich students thinking while helping them to reach proficiency on advanced studies exams. Student data tracking will enable the planning of small group interventions and targeted support towards proficiency goals by disaggregating formative and summative assessment data towards the mastery of standards. Additional coaching and professional learning will focus on how to apply differing high level rigor to these classrooms to support our highest level learners.

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

By targeting students based on their level of proficiency, teachers are better able to discern the instructional needs present within the classroom. Small-group, targeted instruction allows more individualization within instruction to help lead students to proficiency.

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.

More formalized and consistent PLC alignment across all advanced studies areas, including a set agenda with action items, and a focus on data driven instructional planning be implemented weekly throughout the year. An emphasis on instructional strategies and questioning within PLC collaboration will strengthen the pedagogical skills of teachers within the PLC.

Person Responsible: Wanda Alvarado (wanda.alvarado@ocps.net)

By When: Continually throughout the year with the first occurring in August and then monthly thereafter.

All advanced studies programs will implement the use of supplemental support materials including IBO materials, AP Classroom, and Cambridge AICE resources. PLC collaboration will incorporate the use of these supplemental resources with intentional planning for their use to supplement and enrich instruction.

Person Responsible: Wanda Alvarado (wanda.alvarado@ocps.net)

By When: Continually throughout the year.

Consistent instructional feedback will take place through observations by administration and instructional coaches with the intent on monitoring for student voice, mastery grading, small-group instruction, and effective pedagogical practices. Actionable feedback will be given in a timely manner consistent with the focus of the observations and aimed at improving classroom instruction. Regular feedback practices focusing on the rigor of the standard and associated instructional strategies will occur daily in multiple iterations. Side by side coaching, modeling, peer observations, and coaching cycles will take place based on the level of support each individual teacher needs.

Person Responsible: Wanda Alvarado (wanda.alvarado@ocps.net)

By When: Continually throughout the year. This process begins on the first day of school as classroom walks begin.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	**Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System**	$0.00
2	III.B.	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
3	III.B.	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	$0.00
4	III.B.	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**	$0.00
5	III.B.	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies**	$0.00
6	III.B.	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No