Orange County Public Schools

Apopka High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Apopka High

555 W MARTIN ST, Apopka, FL 32712

https://apopkahs.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
Heinz, Lyle	Principal	Supervise and evaluate the Assistant Principals and Instructional Support Personnel. Supervise student behavior. Supervise and lead the US. History team. Liaison for Alumni foundation and School Resource Officers. Responsible for school budget and resources.
Korkes, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Supervise and lead the Biology team. Supervise Guidance and Student Services.
Morris , Carol	Assistant Principal	Supervise and lead the Geometry team and Upper Level Math teams. Maintain the facilities. Supervise custodial crew.
Pickels, Katherine	Assistant Principal	Supervise and lead the Algebra team. Supervise and evaluate the exceptional student education department. Supervise and evaluate the Reading Department. Liaison for SAC/PTSA.
West, Kanishia	Assistant Principal	Supervise and lead the English Language Arts Department. Administrator over the inventory of the school. Title IX Coordinator.
Richard, Demetria	Instructional Coach	Develop PD for staff, coach individual teachers and assist faculty members in pulling and analyzing data.
Jenkins, Eddie	Dean	Monitor and assist with student behavior.
Herskovitz, Janet	Staffing Specialist	All IEP's including meetings and implementation of student accommodations.
Willard, April	Instructional Media	Digital learning lead. Assist students and teachers in providing resources for all students with a focus on digital devices.

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.

Apopka High School's SIP was built using feedback obtained from Parent Teacher Student Association and School Advisory Committees that included businesses, community members and staff. Staff was able to help in developing the SIP by utilizing roundtable discussions during preplanning sessions.

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))

Apopka High School's SIP will be revisited on a monthly basis during meetings held with all stakeholders (i.e. leadership, faculty, SAC and PTSA meetings). During meetings we will collect feedback from stakeholders to revisit and revise SIP as needed.

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	73%
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: C 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	
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	

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	10	1210
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	459
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	210
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	190
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	735
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	909
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	2	711

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	9	1048

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	1	24

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	10	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
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	2	2

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	9	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	1	1

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*	52	49	50	45	49	51	47		
ELA Learning Gains				47			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			34		
Math Achievement*	31	34	38	26	36	38	19		
Math Learning Gains				37			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			30		
Science Achievement*	69	66	64	58	31	40	59		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	66	66	71	43	48	52		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	96	87	89	98	62	61	94		
College and Career Acceleration	64	65	65	55	70	67	51		
ELP Progress	47	45	45	45			38		

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	428
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	564
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96
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	40	Yes	4	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	59			
HSP	55			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	54			

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	48			
HSP	47			

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%
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	46			

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	52			31			69	69		96	64	47
SWD	19			14			36	39		34	6	
ELL	17			12			47	50		59	7	47
AMI												
ASN	72			61			88			100	5	
BLK	48			26			64	63		55	6	
HSP	44			27			63	61		53	7	42
MUL	70			42			95	86		84	6	
PAC												
WHT	63			42			79	84		80	6	
FRL	40			23			61	61		59	7	38

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	45	47	35	26	37	47	58	71		98	55	45
SWD	11	28	29	9	27	38	20	44		89	25	
ELL	8	32	29	10	28	36	32	60		95	43	45
AMI												
ASN	78	74		62	75		94	88		100	89	

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
BLK	38	45	40	21	35	47	53	68		97	39	
HSP	36	42	28	22	34	44	49	70		97	57	43
MUL	69	57		29	38		67	64		100	62	
PAC												
WHT	60	53	45	40	42	57	73	78		98	64	
FRL	32	41	34	18	32	47	42	63		96	48	52

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	47	48	34	19	22	30	59	52		94	51	38
SWD	11	35	33	5	17	23	30	24		90	26	
ELL	15	37	35	14	33	50	30	28		88	37	38
AMI												
ASN	80	64					64			100	89	
BLK	41	44	30	13	23	33	48	51		94	44	
HSP	38	44	34	17	21	26	54	41		91	48	40
MUL	58	47		21	17		78	42		93	43	
PAC												
WHT	61	56	42	31	26	31	72	65		96	58	
FRL	37	43	33	14	22	30	49	45		93	45	43

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	54%	49%	5%	50%	4%
09	2023 - Spring	49%	46%	3%	48%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	24%	47%	-23%	50%	-26%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	33%	45%	-12%	48%	-15%

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

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	62%	5%	63%	4%

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.

During the 2022-2023 school year, the mathematics department showed the lowest performance. Contributing factors to last year's low performance in mathematics is low attendance. Attendance at Apopka High School has decreased during the 2022-2023 school year to an average of 88 percent on a daily basis. Another contributing factor is lack of student engagement in these mathematic classes. Lastly, teachers are still working on mastering their craft of remediation strategies for underperforming students. Although mathematics was the department with the lowest performance, there was still a nine percent increase in proficiency.

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

The greatest decline for the 2022-2023 school year was in social studies with a four percent decrease in proficiency. Contributing factors to last year's decrease in performance in social studies is low attendance. Attendance at Apopka High School has decreased during the 2022-2023 school year to an average of 88 percent on a daily basis. Another contributing factor of the decrease in performance was having a team of four teachers that included one new teacher to the team.

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.

Apopka High Schools greatest gap compared to the state average was in mathematics. During the 2022-2023 school year, although there was in increase in student proficiency it was still our lowest performing group. Factors that contributed to this gap were student attendance, student engagement and teachers are still working on mastering their craft of remediation strategies for underperforming students.

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

Apopka High School's greatest area of improvement was in science with a ten percent increase in proficiency. Actions that contributed to this major improvement were reorganizing the professional learning community so that our school collaborated with other science professional learning communities at other schools. Apopka High School also focused on the scope and sequence in a sense that we ensured the standards built appropriately on prior knowledge.

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

When reflecting on this data as a whole team and community, we see that different subgroups on our campus have struggled more than others. The first subgroup that was identified as an area of concern and focus for the 2023-2024 school year was our exceptional education students. The second subgroup of students that were identified as an area of concern and focus for the 2023-2024 school year was our English Language Learners. After reflecting with staff and administration, our focus with these subgroups will be to ensure all teachers and support staff are providing appropriate accommodations to promote successful lifelong learners.

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

1.Panorama Survey (Student Sense of belonging)
2.ESE
3.ELL
4.Reading Proficiency
5.Math Proficiency

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.

After reviewing Apopka High School's panorama survey it was evident that ten percent of our students felt that they did not belong or did not feel that there was a positive school culture and/or environment on campus. This is evident as there has been a decrease in daily attendance at Apopka High School. The current average daily attendance rate is currently eighty-eight percent, which is below the districts ninety-five percent threshold.

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

Apopka High School would like to see the daily attendance rate increase to 92 percent due to the students sense of belonging as well as positive school culture and/or environment on campus.

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

Apopka High School will monitor this goal by hiring additional support clerks to help monitor attendance for all students enrolled. The additional support clerk will run daily attendance reports for students not attending school. These reports will be utilized in implementing more truancy/child study team meetings where parents and school social workers become involved in the students' learning. The desired outcome from these meetings is to help students buy into their education and find more ways to connect them with their school. Apopka High School will also be implementing a positive behavior and intervention support system.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carol Morris (carol.morris@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.)

PBIS
Child Study Meetings
Apopka High School will be utilizing two evidence-based interventions for this area of focus, the first being a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and the second being child study meetings. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports is a framework that supports schools with social, emotional and behavioral needs. Child Study Meetings are held to help find solutions for students' lack of attendance at school. These meetings help build the students' and families' plan for success for the remaining time during the school year.

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

Both strategies help promote and enforce a positive school climate and culture among students and staff. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports help students buy in to their school by doing the right thing and Child Study Meetings help build plans for students who may have fallen off the path to success and bring them back up to speed.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Positive Behavior Intervention through the use of Darter Dollar program. Darter Dollars can be redeemed at the school store on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible: Lyle Heinz (lyle.heinz@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023 through remainder of 2023-2024 school year.

Quarterly celebrations for students who are identified as "on track" with the specific selected focused behavior for the quarter.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Korkes (jennifer.korkes@ocps.net)

By When: Quarterly throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Monthly staff recognition

Person Responsible: Kanishia West (kanishia.west@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly at faculty meetings throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Students with disabilities have been a low performing subgroup at Apopka High School. In the 2022-2023 school year they were the lowest performing subgroup in all the subject areas. In mathematics the percentage of students with disabilities that showed proficiency was nine percent. In language arts the percentage of students with disabilities that showed proficiency was fifteen percent. In science the percentage of students with disabilities that showed proficiency was thirty percent. In social studies the percentage of students with disabilities that showed proficiency was thirty-nine percent.

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

Apopka High School will increase the percentage of students with disabilities that are proficient in all subject areas. With newly implemented strategies, Apopka High School would like to see the proficiency for students with disabilities increase to a minimum of 40 percent in all subject areas.

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

Student data will be monitored throughout the year using multiple outlets such as Performance Matters, IXL, Khan academy and state progress monitoring assessments. While monitoring data, weekly meetings to discuss new data points and strategies to support and/or adjust for the students will take place. The MTSS team will meet regarding students and discuss Tier 2 and 3 interventions being provided for success. The MTSS team will also meet with PLCs to provide the appropriate supports to each team and provide them with more strategies on a regular basis. Administration will monitor and provide feedback to continuously improve the teaching model and sustain growth for the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katherine Pickels (katherine.pickels@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.)

This year we will pinpoint critical strategies to guide students in examining reasoning. This will help students by giving them different opportunities to revise their knowledge, examine similarities and differences and help them produce and defend claims. The teachers will be trained in the specific instructional strategy of examining reasoning. The element within the Marzano framework has been identified through research to be a high yield strategy. The teachers will implement the strategy within their instruction to increase student achievement. Support facilitators will provide additional support in implementing the strategy and assisting students to examine their reasoning to better understand the standard.

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

We will be utilizing the Marzano elements identified by the state as high yields on having students examine their reasoning. Through previous years classroom observations and implementation of the instructional strategy of processing information it was determined the next step in students deepening their knowledge of the standard is to examine reasoning. During the 2022-2023 school year the focus was processing and student achievement increased school wide. The observations of classrooms showed the teachers had implemented and showed proficiency in utilizing the strategy so we will continue to build the skills of the teachers to increase student achievement through examining reasoning.

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.

Regular monitoring of student achievement data on assessments in both reading (English 9 and 10) and math (Algebra 1 and Geometry).

Person Responsible: Katherine Pickels (katherine.pickels@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Continuous improvement on students Academic Goals on their Individualized Educational Plans and Section 504 Plans.

Person Responsible: Janet Herskovitz (janet.herskovitz@ocps.net)

By When: As needed when annual renewal of student plans are due during the 2023-2024 school year.

Professional development providing strategies for students with disabilities for teachers.

Person Responsible: Demetria Richard (demetria.richard@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly during the 2023-2024 school year

Classroom observations of support facilitation to measure effectiveness and determine where additional support is needed.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Korkes (jennifer.korkes@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly during the 2023-2024 school year

#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.

Apopka High School's proficiency for mathematics during the 2022-2023 school year was thirty-two percent. Although this is an increase from the 2021-2022 school year, it is the lowest performing subject area on campus. Subgroups such as English Language Learners, Exceptional Educational Students and minorities within mathematics are the lowest performing groups in all areas of mathematics.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year Apopka High School would like to see the average proficiency for mathematics increase to forty percent. To increase the proficiency level throughout our classes, teachers will continue to build on incorporating processing, monitoring strategies, develop an understanding for examining reasoning and what these strategies look like in their classrooms.

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

Student data will be monitored throughout the year using multiple outlets such as exit tickets, summative assessments, formative assessments, IXL, Khan Academy and state progress monitoring assessments. While monitoring data, weekly meetings to discuss new data points and strategies to support and/or adjust for the students will take place. Administration will monitor and provide feedback to continuously improve the teaching model and sustain growth for the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katherine Pickels (katherine.pickels@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.)

We were focused on the overall, but now we will pinpoint critical strategies to guide students in examining reasoning. This will help students by giving different opportunities to them to revise their knowledge, examine similarities and differences and help them produce and defend claims. The teachers will be trained in the specific instructional strategy of examining reasoning. The element within the Marzano framework has been identified through research to be a high yield strategy. The teachers will implement the strategy within their instruction to increase student achievement.

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

Through previous years classroom observations and implementation of the instructional strategy of processing information it was determined the next step in students deepening their knowledge of the standard is to examine reasoning. During the 2022-2023 school year the focus was processing and student achievement increased school wide. The observations of classrooms showed the teachers had implemented and showed proficiency in utilizing the strategy so we will continue to build the skills of the teachers to increase student achievement through examining reasoning.

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.

Monthly data chats regarding assessment results from Standards Based Assessments, F.A.S.T, PMAs and/or STAR that result in strategic grouping of students for small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Demetria Richard (demetria.richard@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly throughout the 2023-2024 school year

Continuous observation of classroom instruction to provide feedback on best practices.

Person Responsible: Carol Morris (carol.morris@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

General and special education teachers will use regularly scheduled collaborative planning time to plan effective instruction and assessment for all students.

Person Responsible: Janet Herskovitz (janet.herskovitz@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly throughout the 2023-2024 school 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).

The Funding will be utilized to fund a paraprofessional to to assist ELL students by pushing into classrooms. The ESOL compliance specialist will work closely with guidance and the paraprofessional to identify the students needing direct support to create a schedule for the paraprofessional to assist ELL students in the classroom.