

Orange County Public Schools

Freedom High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Freedom High

2500 TAFT VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32837

<https://freedomhs.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
France, Charles	Principal	Overseeing the daily operations of Freedom High School: Budget, Contracts, Emergency Shelter, Operations, Marketing & Recognition, Media Contact, Personnel Decisions, Professional Development, SAC/PTSA, School and District Assessments, Foundation, Performing Arts, PE, SAFE, Athletics. Supervises and evaluates Assistant Principals and the Instructional Leadership team.
Aguado Caliri, Maria	Assistant Principal	Monitors and supports acceleration and graduation outcomes. Advanced Placement Data, Biology department, AVID, Data Corrections, Diplomas, Dual Enrollment, First day/week logistics, Grades, Industry Certifications, Master Schedule, Website, FTE State reporting, Compass Scholar Academy, Progress Reports and Report Cards, Supervises and evaluates Student Services team including: School Counselors, College and Career.
Cox, Trevor	Assistant Principal	Discipline, Social Studies department, ESE, Fine Arts, clubs and organizations, Facilities, Drills, Safety, Summer School, Emergency management
Duarte, Alicia	Assistant Principal	ELA/Reading department, ESOL, Academies, Media Center, Technology, Industry Certifications, PTSA/SAC, TV Production, Weekly newsletter, Yearbook, World Heart Day.
Louisjean, Grisel	Assistant Principal	Math and Science Department, Naval Science, Attendance, AICE Cambridge, MAO initiatives, MTSS, Substitutes, and School Improvement Plan.
Tarantino, Maria	Instructional Coach	Testing coordinator for all EOCs FAST, ACT, SAT, PSAT assessments. Supports teacher use and professional development in Performance Matters data analysis and assessments. Data collection and tracking for all assessments including ACT/SAT opportunities.
Boujaber-Diederichs, Nicolle	Dean	Student discipline, student academic progress, PIE, ADDitions, and Field Trips.
Bush, David	Dean	Student discipline, student academic progress, school safety plan, drills and facilities
Youtz, Charles	Dean	Student Discipline, student academic progress, Senior class advisor, Clubs coordinator, Transportation coordinator
Lopez Nieves, Yadira	ELL Compliance Specialist	ESOL department operations which include: coordinating ESOL program meetings that determine eligibility, progress, and exit status of ELL students;

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		maintain records/documents in accordance with district and state policies; communicate with school staff, students, parents, and other stakeholders regarding student status; ensure compliance with state laws.
Goodwin, Christopher		Monitors functional behavior assessments and behavior intervention programs. Conducts one-on-one social skills lessons with ESE students. Participates in a cooperative effort with faculty and staff to plan, implement and evaluate school wide ESE programs. Participates in Florida Department of Education required workshops and other trainings. Maintains contact with teachers and parents in conjunction with administrative team (i.e. ESE teacher, assistant principal and principal) through teacher/parent conferences and IEP team meetings. Determines the appropriate methods to use in resolving student behavior problems.

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.

Stakeholders, including the school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, students, families, and business or community leaders, were actively involved in the School Improvement Plan (SIP) development process. Their input was gathered through various methods such as surveys, meetings, and feedback sessions. This input, in cooperation with the relevant data, was carefully considered and used to inform and shape the development of the SIP, ensuring that it reflects the needs, perspectives, and aspirations of all stakeholders involved.

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 will regularly monitor the implementation and impact of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) on student achievement, especially for those with the greatest achievement gap. This will involve collecting and analyzing data, conducting progress monitoring, providing feedback, and fostering collaboration. Based on the findings, the school will revise the SIP as needed to ensure continuous improvement. Professional development opportunities, coaching models, and specialized planning sessions will be offered when the data supports the need for increased attention to identified demographics. The revised plan will be implemented, and the monitoring and evaluation process will continue to track progress and make data-driven decisions.

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	82%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	61%
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	

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	0	1002
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	435
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	603

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	7

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	

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*	47	49	50	52	49	51	46		
ELA Learning Gains				55			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			50		
Math Achievement*	43	34	38	39	36	38	29		
Math Learning Gains				48			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			31		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	78	66	64	54	31	40	52		
Social Studies Achievement*	70	66	66	71	43	48	67		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	94	87	89	100	62	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	64	65	65	69	70	67	66		
ELP Progress	49	45	45	65			51		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	94

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	649
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	100

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	42			
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	55			
HSP	61			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	60			

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	46			
HSP	57			
MUL	82			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	56			

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	47			43			78	70		94	64	49
SWD	23			21			36	43		31	6	
ELL	27			34			67	51		71	7	49
AMI												
ASN	78			67			88	76		79	6	
BLK	36			33			70	66		32	6	
HSP	41			40			75	65		65	7	47
MUL	48			58			83			58	5	
PAC												
WHT	60			55			87	87		71	7	77
FRL	42			40			76	64		60	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	52	55	42	39	48	54	54	71		100	69	65
SWD	18	36	31	17	33	38	25	33		100	29	
ELL	30	48	45	33	46	53	39	44		100	69	65
AMI												
ASN	78	73		76	62		84	87		100	84	
BLK	39	47	20	23	36	38	41	67		100	48	
HSP	45	51	41	37	47	53	50	65		99	70	65
MUL	60	70						92		96	91	
PAC												
WHT	68	62	60	50	53	63	62	82		100	73	
FRL	46	52	40	36	46	50	50	66		100	66	59

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	46	53	50	29	32	31	52	67		99	66	51
SWD	14	34	39	19	31	28	35	41		96	19	
ELL	25	53	52	26	38	33	36	47		97	66	51

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
AMI												
ASN	78	69		48	14		83	89		100	79	
BLK	38	44	44	18	33	32	43	57		100	48	
HSP	40	52	51	27	33	31	46	62		98	66	51
MUL	71	35						86		100	62	
PAC												
WHT	60	55	50	45	26	30	68	78		100	74	
FRL	41	51	50	25	31	32	47	61		98	63	50

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	48%	49%	-1%	50%	-2%
09	2023 - Spring	40%	46%	-6%	48%	-8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	35%	47%	-12%	50%	-15%

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

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	63%	5%	63%	5%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	62%	3%	63%	2%

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.

After analyzing the data, it is evident that ELA 9 and math proficiency demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. Last year, only 40% of students achieved Level 3 or above in Algebra 1, and only 40% achieved level 3 or above in ELA 9. Examining the trends, we observed that our math achievement was relatively stable at 41% in 2019. However, with the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, our math achievement drastically decreased to 29%. While we made learning gains in 2021, increasing math achievement to 39%, the prolonged absence from the traditional classroom setting had lingering effects on our student population. These effects continue to impact their math skills and overall academic performance. We must address these challenges and implement targeted strategies to support our students in regaining their mathematical proficiency.

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

The decline in the ELA school grade component from 52% in 2022 to 49% in 2023 can be attributed to various factors, including changes in teaching methods, disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, individual student factors, and a significant decline in proficiency among the English Language Learner (ELL) subgroup. Specifically, the ELL subgroup experienced the most significant decline, with proficiency in ELA dropping from 30% in 2022 to a concerning 10% in 2023. This decline highlights the challenges ELL students face, who may be grappling with language acquisition and comprehension difficulties in a non-native language.

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.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

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

Our science school grade component has improved significantly from 62% to 78% this year. This progress is due to the dedicated efforts of our science teachers, investments in a specialized Biology Coach, collaborative learning, and the hard work of our students. Notably, students with disabilities showed the highest gains in biology, increasing from 26% to 75% in 2023. Our teachers have done an exceptional job in supporting this subgroup of students, tailoring their instruction and creating an inclusive learning environment. This success reflects the effectiveness of our teaching methods and our commitment to excellence in science education.

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

No Early Warning Signs provided.

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

Providing targeted support and resources specifically tailored to the needs of ELL students can help address the overall ELA performance. We will create an inclusive and supportive learning environment that fosters language development and ensures equitable opportunities for all students to succeed in ELA and math. Whole school Literacy Goals were defined and all teachers trained during Pre-planning on our chosen high efficacy literacy strategies which will be supported and monitored throughout the school year.

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 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.

Teacher retention and recruitment are critical to the academic success of students and feeling of accomplishment and productivity.

Measurable Outcome:

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

No fewer than 90% of our 120 instructors will be retained and the recruitment of new teachers will be 100% early as possible in the summer session.

Monitoring:

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

Teacher retention and recruitment will be monitored at all times with specific attention near the end of the school year to quantify the retained teachers and the number need to be recruited.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charles France (charles.france@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 Principal and the Leadership Team will provide teacher supports, teacher collaborations, teacher professional developments, teacher recognitions, and teacher celebrations will be planned and monitored.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers is crucial in addressing many schools' ongoing teacher shortage crisis. The rationale for selecting teacher retention is based on the understanding that investing in the professional growth, job satisfaction, and well-being of teachers ultimately leads to improved student outcomes and the school's overall success.

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.

Principal will have prompt and open communication with teachers and appropriately provide supports and assistance to teachers in need while encouraging and supporting lead teachers and mentoring teachers to build the professional development skills needed by teachers to be successful and confident in their professional abilities

Person Responsible: Charles France (charles.france@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly department chair meetings, weekly collaborative teams meetings, professional developments, lesson feedbacks, professional celebrations, and individualized meetings will all support teacher retention.

Principal will have prompt and open communication with teachers and appropriately provide supports and assistance to teachers in need while encouraging and supporting lead teachers and mentoring teachers to build the professional development skills needed by teachers to be successful and confident in their professional abilities

Person Responsible: Charles France (charles.france@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly department chair meetings, weekly collaborative teams meetings, professional developments, lesson feedbacks, professional celebrations, and individualized meetings will all support teacher retention.

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).

A continual study throughout the school year will be focused on the ESSA Subgroup of Students with Disabilities (SWD) to monitor the student performances on the standardized test scores as well as contributing factors to the academic success of our SWD such as attendance, behavior, in class lesson strategies, and revision of knowledge practices through pull-outs and small groups with academic coaches, tutors, and tutoring sessions. these processes with be monitored in cooperation from the testing coordinator, guidance staff, Assistant Principal, Principal, ESE Staffing Specialist, and Behavior Specialist. The data reviews will be shared with the teachers, academic coaches, Assistant Principals and Principal for proper student identification and strategy implementation. Funding and time will be invested into the tutors and materials need to meet the need of our SWD students.