

Orange County Public Schools

West Orange High School



mission Florida college and career
family and community involvement
needs assessment
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
supportive environment
resources
achievement
ambitious
analysis
leadership
students
school improvement
teaching
relationships
areas of focus
instruction
growth
success
learning
relationships

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	18

West Orange High

1625 BEULAH RD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://westorangehs.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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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
Turner, Matthew	Principal	Overall operations and oversight of the school: budget, graduation athletics, evaluations, supplements, administrator meetings, technology, pre-planning, PD Calendar, EOC, EOY Data, Credit Recovery, Community Relations, Advanced Placement Date.
Howell, Randall	Dean	Title IX, code of conduct, parking, supervision
Conyers, Rochelle	Assistant Principal	Facilities, Social Studies, Emergency Preparedness
DiMarzo, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Guidance, Transcripts, graduation, scholarships, masters scheduling

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 School Improvement Plan is developed by evaluating student assessment data, stakeholder survey data, and open format conversations. The leadership team then meets and includes the SAC in the construction of 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))

The School Improvement Plan is monitored through monthly and quarterly student assessments and continuous stakeholder feedback. We utilize PMA data from all tested subjects, data obtained from SBUA's and other district initiated assessments along side teacher created checks for understanding. We also rely heavily on the use of stakeholder feedback such as formal surveys and informal conferences.

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	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	37%
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: B 2018-19: B 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	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	815
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	216
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
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

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	9

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) 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	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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

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	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*	56	49	50	61	49	51	61		
ELA Learning Gains				52			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			41		
Math Achievement*	40	34	38	35	36	38	30		
Math Learning Gains				40			25		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			23		
Science Achievement*	74	66	64	70	31	40	77		
Social Studies Achievement*	72	66	66	76	43	48	76		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	96	87	89	97	62	61	95		
College and Career Acceleration	71	65	65	67	70	67	65		
ELP Progress	53	45	45	51			68		

** 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	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	462
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	626
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	97

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	44			
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	53			
HSP	59			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	53			

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	3	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	49			
HSP	53			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	48			

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	56			40			74	72		96	71	53
SWD	23			22			45	39		40	6	
ELL	24			20			48	58		58	7	53
AMI												
ASN	81			52			92	78		90	6	
BLK	36			27			51	54		56	6	
HSP	49			30			65	64		62	7	51
MUL	63			41			81	94		73	6	
PAC												
WHT	65			53			84	84		80	6	
FRL	39			24			59	56		59	7	43

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	61	52	36	35	40	41	70	76		97	67	51
SWD	20	40	34	16	38	47	28	50		100	20	
ELL	32	38	31	16	32	30	40	29		96	68	51
AMI												
ASN	85	68		64	45		87	87		97	74	
BLK	45	47	28	21	41	47	52	68		94	48	
HSP	50	46	34	30	38	38	61	66		99	66	51
MUL	73	49		42	44		78	92		100	76	
PAC												
WHT	69	55	44	43	41	39	79	82		97	70	
FRL	46	42	26	20	33	39	50	67		95	57	54

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	61	54	41	30	25	23	77	76		95	65	68
SWD	27	37	35	21	27	25	39	24		88	28	
ELL	25	56	55	23	28	20	37	38		92	54	68
AMI												
ASN	76	63	60	61	44		97	90		97	76	
BLK	46	48	34	16	20	17	54	60		96	40	
HSP	46	49	46	24	27	27	65	66		93	64	68
MUL	77	54		36			89	75		100	61	
PAC												
WHT	72	57	37	40	22	25	87	88		95	72	
FRL	47	49	40	23	24	20	68	63		92	48	66

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	61%	49%	12%	50%	11%
09	2023 - Spring	51%	46%	5%	48%	3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	23%	47%	-24%	50%	-27%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	52%	45%	7%	48%	4%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	63%	10%	63%	10%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	62%	8%	63%	7%

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.

The data component that showed our lowest performance was our math achievement data. In 2018, we experienced a stellar success rate in Geometry of 67%. We could not sustain that performance the following year. Part of the decline can be attributed to a course progression change involving geometry and algebra 2 which led to an increase in class sizes and sections offered. I believe most OCPS schools experienced a decline in this category for the reason noted. The retirement of a key veteran teacher also factored in.

In algebra 1, we shuffled teachers to ensure our teacher core was more suited for the content and to

provide interventions. This pulled teachers away from sections of geometry. We modestly increased from 29 to 30% but are expecting different results long term. We were anxious to see results from last year since I believe we delivered a better product than the year prior due to an additional year of experience and a common planning period which allowed us to better stay on pace with the CRM's.

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

Our biggest decline was seen in grade 9 ELA. Our teacher core remained steady and instruction seemed to remain consistent but the proficiency level of the students coming in from the middle school had been a bit lower than previous years. Another factor that could have led to the decline was the change in standards and structure in terms of how the teachers planned and executed 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 largest gap when compared to state averages can be seen in Algebra 1. Our Algebra 1 denominator is very low meaning most of our students taking Algebra 1 have shown low performance in math in previous years. This is a consistent trend at West Orange High School.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in Geometry. The PLC worked very well together to ensure proper pacing and more importantly, triage systems for data trends with low performance on unit assessments.

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

Two areas of concern are math assessment data and student absenteeism.

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

1. Algebra proficiency
2. ESE progress
3. ELL engagement
4. 9th ELA
5. SEL strategies

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Overall improvement in differentiated instruction with a specific focus on increased proficiency in ELA and math in an effort to reduce course failures in these subjects and collaterally improve attendance.

Our overarching goal is to improve student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on an annual analysis of the postsecondary feedback report data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect to see an overall increase in proficiency for all students in ELA and math by 15% measured through FAST/BEST data and concordant scores achieved through SAT/ACT and other approved means.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through (1) teacher observation data, (2) formative and summative assessments, (3) trend data among all content areas

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Turner (matthew.turner@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 intervention plan utilized is that of small group instruction throughout all avenues including tier 1 instruction and tier 2 and tier 3 interventions through push in and pull out support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We have seen great success at West Orange but also through research that small group instruction can improve proficiency by up to 30% using high yield strategies.

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.

We have 3 sessions of targeted professional development through the year to address these concerns.

Person Responsible: Matthew Turner (matthew.turner@ocps.net)

By When: PD 1 - August, 2023 PD 2 - October, 2023 PD 3 - January 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Keeping teacher morale high with the hopes of retaining all effective instructional staff is of the utmost importance in this climate in education.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our outcome would be 100% teacher retention of all effective instructional staff.

Monitoring:

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

We conduct exit interviews with teachers at the end of the year and gauge improvements that need to be made.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Turner (matthew.turner@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.)

More teacher incentives, teacher celebrations, and positive support systems, etc.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Through survey data and conversations, our teachers want to feel supported in the classroom and valued at work.

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.

We are implementing teacher reward and acknowledgement programs to retain and support teachers and staff, including:

Teacher of the Month

Warrior Shout-Outs

Warrior Teacher Spirit Weeks

Giveaways

Holiday Party

End of the Year celebration

Person Responsible: Matthew Turner (matthew.turner@ocps.net)

By When: ongoing all year!

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).

West Orange High School is identified as an ATSI school, with our primary focus of intervention being our students with disabilities. We are reviewing the improvement funding allocations with our leadership team and with our School Advisory Council to decide how resources will be utilized, primarily contingent on student data when determining the most pressing needs.

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: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$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