Cypress Creek High School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Cypress Creek High

1101 BEAR CROSSING DR, Orlando, FL 32824

https://cypresscreekhs.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 in the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team, 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
Scanlon, Elizabeth	Reading Coach	Collaborates with ELA and Reading teachers; facilitates Literacy intergration across all disciplines
Mendez, Marisol	Principal	School leader; directs daily operations, school mission and vision; Manages all personnel and addresses community needs
Root, Caleb	Assistant Principal	Coordinates master schedule; collaborates with our Biology, Counseling and CTE staff members
Valente, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	Collaborates with Social Studies and new teachers
Quinones-Santana, Magda	Instructional Coach	Collaborates with Science Department; support for Algebra and Geometry courses
Beasley, Gale	Assistant Principal	Collaborates ESE Department, 504s, support facilitation, and Physical Education
Cecere, Michael	Assistant Principal	Collaborates with US History, ELA 11-12, Economics/Government and Advanced Studies
Wagner, Karl	Assistant Principal	Collaborates with Math, Discipline, Digital Arts & Physics Departments
Zambrano, Angela	Assistant Principal	Collaborates with ELA 9-10, Reading, Anatomy & Fine Arts, Science PLCs

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 will be reviewed at our first School Advisory Council meeting, scheduled for the end of August 2023. During this meeting, our Instructional Coaches and Assistant Principals will present the information relating to our areas of focus, and describe the action steps to meet our 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 SIP will be regularly monitored through our weekly Instructional Coaches meeting, with meaningful checkpoints on data boards. Work samples, specific monitoring of our ESE and ELL students from our content courses will provide insight as to how our plan will be revised to ensure continuous improvement. The evaluation and feedback during these coaches meetings will be taken to our PLCs to modify and improve our interventions, again, to ensure continuous improvement and achievement of our goals.

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	90%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	87%
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	2021-22: C

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	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	0	1545
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	348
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	230
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	840
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1104
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	1180

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	14

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
					Grade Level					
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*	43	49	50	41	49	51	45		
ELA Learning Gains				41			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			40		
Math Achievement*	24	34	38	23	36	38	20		
Math Learning Gains				38			21		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			22		
Science Achievement*	64	66	64	53	31	40	57		
Social Studies Achievement*	52	66	66	61	43	48	55		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	96	87	89	99	62	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	65	65	65	66	70	67	64		
ELP Progress	41	45	45	39			47		

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	385
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	536
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	99

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	35	Yes	2	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	55			
HSP	53			
MUL	22	Yes	2	2
PAC	40	Yes	1	
WHT	62			

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%
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	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	48			
HSP	48			
MUL	26	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	50			
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	43			24			64	52		96	65	41
SWD	18			13			29	23		30	6	
ELL	26			18			46	34		65	7	41
AMI												
ASN	68			59			89	83		86	6	
BLK	40			23			54	58		55	6	
HSP	40			23			64	47		64	7	40
MUL	36			8							2	

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
PAC	40										1	
WHT	45			28			72	62		72	6	
FRL	39			22			62	47		67	7	45

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	41	41	30	23	38	45	53	61		99	66	39
SWD	14	24	19	10	31	35	19	32		97	27	
ELL	19	32	28	19	36	48	41	40		100	64	39
AMI												
ASN	72	54		57	60		82	75		100	85	60
BLK	43	43	36	21	34	39	59	62		99	57	30
HSP	38	39	29	22	38	50	48	58		99	66	38
MUL	33	17		0				55				
PAC												
WHT	42	43	31	29	38	18	64	69		99	65	
FRL	38	40	33	20	34	41	47	58		99	67	33

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	45	46	40	20	21	22	57	55		99	64	47
SWD	9	19	23	14	23	28	27	33		100	27	
ELL	18	37	37	19	24	22	35	34		100	61	47
AMI										100	83	
ASN	76	65		30	9		80	78		100	87	30
BLK	42	45	42	14	19	19	54	51		100	53	54
HSP	41	43	39	20	21	24	53	53		99	62	48
MUL	43	50		38	25		64			94	73	
PAC												
WHT	53	54	48	25	22	18	75	60		99	66	
FRL	42	47	36	19	20	23	52	54		99	64	26

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	43%	49%	-6%	50%	-7%
09	2023 - Spring	40%	46%	-6%	48%	-8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	15%	47%	-32%	50%	-35%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	30%	45%	-15%	48%	-18%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	63%	-3%	63%	-3%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	49%	62%	-13%	63%	-14%

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.

Our 2022-2023 school data showed that the lowest performance area was mathematics achievement data at 24%. Although this was our lowest indicator, our math achievement rate increased slightly from 23% to 24%, mostly in our Algebra gains from 14% to 17%. Some contributing factors to last year's low performance included new teacher and vacant math department teacher positions, low foundational background knowledge of key mathematical concepts, and low student engagement and attendance in intervention programs such as tutoring.

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

In analyzing our 2022-2023 school data, the most significant decline from the previous year occurred in our achievement rate for US History, from 59% in 2022 to 50% in 2023. Contributing factors relating to the decline in US History include teacher absenteeism, limited student engagement, and student absenteeism.

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.

In the 2022-2023 school year, the area with the most significant gap compared to the state average was our Math achievement rate, specifically in Algebra. The district average was 47%, compared to our school average of 15%. Some contributing factors to last year's low performance included new teacher and vacant math department teacher positions, low foundational background knowledge of key mathematical concepts, and low student engagement and attendance in intervention programs such as tutoring.

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

In the 2022-2023 school year, we saw the most improvement in our biology and math scores. Biology proficiency improved from 53% to 61%. Algebra 1 improved from 9% to 15%. We implemented Saturday Academies, added tutors, identified critical content as a deliberate practice element, and integrated a classroom review protocol before assessments.

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

Based on our 2022-2023 school data, only 31% of SWD met the state ESSA goal in state assessments. Further, only 26% of our Multiracial students met the state ESSA goal in state assessments.

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

1. SWD ESSA subgroup
2. Multiracial ESSA subgroup
3. Student Belonging
4. Graduation Rate

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Based on our 2022-2023 school data, only 31% of SWD met the state ESSA goal on state assessments.

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

In the 2023-2024 school year, at least 42% of SWD will meet proficiency levels on state assessments.

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

We will monitor this Area of Focus through the following: Progress Monitoring Assessments in US History and Biology, Performance Monitoring assessments in ELA 9 & 10, Algebra and Geometry and formative classroom common assessments. We will evaluate classroom based accommodations for SWD and monitor Learning Strategies class supports. Data analysis of SWD students will occur in PLCs and our leadership coaches meeting.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gale Beasley (gale.beasley@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.)

SWD are regularly supported and monitored by our Staffing Specialist and Learning Strategies teachers. Teachers are provided with ESE accommodations for their students and receive regular professional development in how to apply those accommodations in the classroom. Content-area teachers monitor SWD student progress as a part of their PLC data review process. This year, we will provide professional development on literacy strategies such explicit vocabulary instruction and the use of visuals to support learners to enhance classroom learning and cognitive engagement from all students. As a school, we will be focusing on Element 8, Helping Students Process New Content as a Deliberate Practice element. Our SWD classrooms will be encouraged to summarize and actively restate new information to improve academic understanding.

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

When teachers implement appropriate adolescent literacy classroom intervention practices such as providing explicit vocabulary instruction and direct and explicit comprehension strategies, students develop the skills they need to become more confident as learners and improve their proficiency as readers.

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.

-Subgroup training for all teachers
-Training PLCs to work with subgroup data
-Culturally Responsive training for all teachers
-Assistant Principals attending ESE training with the district
-School-wide Deliberate Practice element 8-Helping students process new content

Person Responsible: Gale Beasley (gale.beasley@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly monitoring/update; professional development began during planning week in August

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial

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.

Based on our 2022-2023 school data, only 26% of our multiracial students met the state ESSA goal on state assessments.

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

In the 2023-2024 school year, at least 42% of multiracial students will meet proficiency levels on state assessments.

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

We will monitor this Area of Focus through the following: Progress Monitoring Assessments in US History and Biology, Performance Monitoring assessments in ELA 9 & 10, Algebra and Geometry and formative classroom common assessments. We will evaluate the data for our multiracial students and monitor their attendance and participation in supports. Data analysis of multiracial students will occur during PLCs and our leadership coaches meeting.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Magda Quinones-Santana (magda.quinones-santana@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.)

Of our 26 multiracial students who did not meet ESSA, 3 of them are also SWD and 3 are also LEP. These students have accommodations and are regularly supported and monitored by our Staffing Specialist, ESOL Compliance Specialist and Learning Strategies teachers. Teachers are provided with accommodations for their students and receive regular professional development on applying those accommodations and scaffolding instruction in the classrooms. Content-area teachers monitor all student progress as a part of their PLC data review process, and we will also be specifically monitoring our multiracial students' progress. As a school, we are focusing on reading and will provide professional development on literacy strategies such as explicit vocabulary instruction and the use of visuals to support learners to enhance classroom learning and cognitive engagement from all students. As a school, we will be focusing on Element 8, Helping Students Process New Content as a Deliberate Practice element.

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

When teachers implement appropriate adolescent literacy classroom intervention practices such as providing explicit vocabulary instruction and direct and explicit comprehension strategies, students develop the skills they need to become more confident as learners and improve their proficiency as readers which is good for all 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.

-Subgroup training for all teachers
-Training PLCs to work with subgroup data
-Culturally Responsive training for all teachers
-School wide engagement training
-School-wide Deliberate Practice element of 8-Helping Students Process New Content

Person Responsible: Magda Quinones-Santana (magda.quinones-santana@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly monitoring/update; professional development began during planning week in August

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

This year, we have continued to embrace our CLAWS Core Values that we are using to drive positive decision-making on our campus. Students, teachers and staff are connecting our CLAWS core values to action, embracing Collaboration, Leadership, Academic Excellence, Whole Person, & Strengths Minded focus. Throughout the year, we will have regular staff fellowship activities to build partnerships, teamwork, and positive culture. We are empowering our students to connect to the campus with leadership opportunities, positive feedback through our Bear Brags Celebrations and positive behavior systems to drive positive decision making and connections to our school community. Deans will recognize and celebrate students who demonstrate the CLAWS values.

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

Based on our 22-23 Panorama data, our area of growth for students relates to a sense of belonging and social climate. Approximately thirty percent of our students feel a sense of belonging and reporting that we have a positive school climate. For the 2023-2024 school year, our Synergy Squad was formed to strategize on ways to create a positive culture. This Synergy Squad will report weekly in our Leadership Team meetings the number of students engaged in athletics, student organizations, and volunteer hours. A student interest survey will be given during our first week of school, and the aggregate data will be shared with teachers and staff to adapt our offerings to student wants.

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

We will monitor this Area of Focus through our Student Government which will monitor student engagement in clubs, rosters and athletic participation, attendance at events, recognition events and volunteer hours monitored through our student services team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Caleb Root (caleb.root@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 provide professional development on engagement strategies in the classroom, deescalation training and positive mindset developing to encourage students to attend and remain in their classrooms. We will create student ownership of their grades through positive academic conversations and support in mentoring and engagement with Quizizz.

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

When students feel connected to a community, they will participate in activities to increase the level of belonging to the school. This year, we will monitor attendance and participation in activities to accurately reflect the interests of our students, empowering them to build a connection to a community they build in accordance to our CLAWS values.

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.

- professional development for all teachers on engagement strategies
- training PLCs for reflective data-based conversations
- monitoring of student participation in activities and events
- debrief of events, student survey on interest after the event

Person Responsible: Caleb Root (caleb.root@ocps.net)

By When: monthly, ongoing; first report to begin in September

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).

School improvement funding allocations will be part of a collaborative process with all stakeholders, including teacher committees, Leadership Team members, and School Advisory Council participants to address allocations based on need.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Multi-Racial	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$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