Orange County Public Schools

East River High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

East River High

650 EAST RIVER FALCONS WAY, Orlando, FL 32833

https://eastriverhs.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.

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

Objectives:
• High Expectations for Student Learning
• Student Social and Emotional Well-Being
• Dedicated and High-Quality Team
• Positive Climate and Safe Environment
• Efficient Operations
• Engaged and Invested Community

Market Differentiators:
• Highest Quality Academic, Arts and Extracurricular Activities
• State-of-the-Art Facilities
• Innovators in Digital Learning
• Recognized for Operational Excellence and Community Support
• Leader in Career and Technical Education
.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: 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
Watson, Rebecca	Principal	The Principal is responsible for all decisions that impact teaching and learning on our campus. She ensures the safety of our students and staff, conducts observations and provides feedback to staff, implements systems and structures for staff to engage in professional learning, monitors student data, as well as works with Curriculum Leaders in each department to ensure a focus on increasing student achievement.
DiMura, Maria	Assistant Principal	Attends weekly PLC meetings to support teachers in Reading, ELA, and electives. Responsible for the progress monitoring of students within those subject areas. Additionally oversees testing, writing the SIP and leading school-wide literacy (ERHS Literacy) to promote success and learning with all students through the use of vocabulary. As well as meeting the needs of our demographics of ELL and SWD students as well as providing instructional leadership on ERHS's campus.
Bowmer, Sean	Assistant Principal	Attends weekly PLC meetings to support teachers in Science, ESE, and electives. Responsible for the progress monitoring of students within those subject areas. Additionally oversees discipline and facilities. Focusing on supporting and leading our ESE department to success. Goals include learning gains for all SWD students as well as supporting teachers in their instruction.
Lewis, Francella	Assistant Principal	Oversees master scheduling. Attends weekly PLC meetings to support teachers in Math, and electives. Responsible for the progress monitoring of students within those subject areas.
Murfee, Samuel	Instructional Coach	Participates in weekly content area PLC meetings, provides ongoing professional development to teachers, facilitates coaching cycles, assists with the creation of unit lesson plans, guides data discussions of classroom/state/district assessments, and will help with the analysis of data to direct instruction.
Laing, Christine	Other	Participates in weekly PLCs to track MTSS and intervention, as well as provide ongoing support and information in regard to the MTSS process.

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 SIP has been developed involving our school leadership team, teachers, staff, parents, and students, as well as those who attend SAC. We used input from all stakeholders when analyzing student

data to create our goals for the school that we will be implementing and having success with for the 2023-2024 school year. Feedback was collected verbally in meetings, through anonymous Google Form surveys, and in various emails about obtaining more constructive feedback.

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 monitored monthly through a variety of items. We will analyze student data from various formative assessments, implement teacher instructional walk-through data, and give instructional coaching feedback for improvement so that as teachers improve instruction, students will also be successful in learning. As we complete these tasks and see the need to make changes, we will continue to make these revisions to ensure continuous improvement. We believe if we monitor this monthly, we will meet our goal.

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	65%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	79%
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: C
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	857
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	266
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	476
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	416
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	624

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	642

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	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	41	49	50	43	49	51	47		
ELA Learning Gains				41			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			35		
Math Achievement*	34	34	38	33	36	38	27		
Math Learning Gains				43			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			31		
Science Achievement*	59	66	64	59	31	40	60		
Social Studies Achievement*	66	66	66	69	43	48	66		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	99	87	89	99	62	61	100		
College and Career Acceleration	70	65	65	75	70	67	64		
ELP Progress	41	45	45	44			43		

** 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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	580
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
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	41			
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	61			
HSP	54			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	65			

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	51			

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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	53			
HSP	49			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	49			

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	41			34			59	66		99	70	41
SWD	16			20			31	36		43	6	
ELL	12			25			32	44		66	7	41
AMI												
ASN	53			47			75	75		90	6	
BLK	44			29			57	66		73	6	
HSP	35			34			54	62		61	7	35
MUL	62			60			71	64			4	

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												
WHT	44			32			65	71		77	6	
FRL	29			27			47	53		65	7	35

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	43	41	31	33	43	43	59	69		99	75	44
SWD	10	25	23	13	40	48	19	30		98	46	
ELL	13	37	36	23	47	46	30	48		96	74	44
AMI												
ASN	67	60		44	36		78	77		95	89	
BLK	40	42	35	23	38	42	57	76		98	75	
HSP	33	39	30	31	43	46	51	55		99	68	48
MUL	68	57		8	36		54					
PAC												
WHT	51	41	33	40	46	39	67	78		100	79	
FRL	31	35	29	27	42	52	45	64		99	71	43

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	35	27	31	31	60	66		100	64	43
SWD	11	33	32	14	25	27	23	42		100	21	
ELL	19	45	34	24	38	50	43	38		100	57	43
AMI												
ASN	78	68		53	33		80	100		100	81	
BLK	47	52	55	32	45	50	65	78		100	56	
HSP	35	44	34	20	28	28	48	57		99	60	44
MUL	72	56					80			100	75	
PAC												
WHT	55	48	31	34	29	25	67	72		99	67	
FRL	35	45	41	20	27	31	44	60		99	57	47

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	39%	49%	-10%	50%	-11%
09	2023 - Spring	41%	46%	-5%	48%	-7%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	25%	47%	-22%	50%	-25%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	42%	45%	-3%	48%	-6%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	57%	63%	-6%	63%	-6%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	62%	2%	63%	1%

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.

Algebra I was our lowest-performing area. A significant contributing factor to last year's low performance was our students' lack of attendance and teacher support with instruction and instructional strategies.

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

Algebra I showed the most significant decline from the prior year. Attendance was the major contributing factor to last year's decline, and our teachers needed additional support with mathematics instruction and engagement strategies. This trend is across the math department.

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.

Our SWD data component had the most significant gap when compared to the state average. We have been below the 41% threshold for the last two years. Our teachers need additional support in engaging our students with disabilities. This trend is school-wide.

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

Geometry showed the most improvement. Actions that were taken to achieve this success were a focus on PLC and collaboration time, including a common Instructional Focus Calendar and dedicated time for data analysis. We hired three interventionists and five tutors to assist students needing extra help. The administration participated in all PLC meetings, and an expectation was set for pulling data each week to identify students who would be pulled out for intervention.

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

Attendance and instructional engagement are our two areas of greatest concern.

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

1. School-Wide Literacy
2. SWD
3. ELL
4. Algebra I
5. ELA

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

ELA had a decrease in achievement from 43% to 40%. Our goal is to impact our students positively by increasing student achievement in ELA across the board will better prepare students for higher-level courses, college, and the job market. We plan to do this through mastery learning, consistent walkthroughs that provide feedback to teachers, and teacher coaching cycles; as well as, having an emphasis on our school-wide literacy team and plan. It is our intention to create a culture of dedicated, data-driven "Team Time" during common planning periods. This collaborative planning time will allow teachers to focus on data and address the needs of specific students. By having our teachers analyze their student data, the ELA team can incorporate mastery learning, an instructional model in which students do not move on to the next lesson until they have mastered the current one. Our overarching goal is to improve student readiness.

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

We want to increase the ELA achievement by 6%, going from 40% to 46%. We would like to see a 5% increase in ELA achievement for students with disabilities in order to decrease the achievement gap associated with SWD.

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

This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome via consistent leadership team member walkthroughs and teacher feedback. We will also monitor PMA data throughout the school year to determine the benchmarks that need to be reviewed/retaught in all classrooms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maria DiMura (maria.dimura@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.)

Subject specific collaborative planning time is the most effective, affordable, and sustainable way to transform instructional practice and increase student performance.

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

In order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, learners must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, the students, and the content.

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.

Differentiated Professional Development

Person Responsible: Samuel Murfee (samuel.murfee@ocps.net)

By When:

PLC discussion, analysis of weekly formative assessments as well as quarterly, and summative standards-based assessments.

Person Responsible: Maria DiMura (maria.dimura@ocps.net)

By When:

Daily administrative coaching and support within classrooms.

Person Responsible: Samuel Murfee (samuel.murfee@ocps.net)

By When:

#2. 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.

Build and establish a culture for resiliency practices at our school with adults and students. Embedded in resiliency are strategies to enhance students' engagement through digital tools. Academic learning is enhanced when students feel safe, respected, and feel they contribute to classroom community. Learning is also enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a positive culture for resiliency we will help lead our school to success.

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

We want to increase the the overall ELA achievement scores by 6% from 2022 to 2023 (from 40% to 46%) We would like to close the achievement gap in ELA achievement for students with disabilities by 5%.

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

Our school will plan and implement professional learning to provide training on literacy and resilencency, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maria DiMura (maria.dimura@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 will use resiliencency to strengthen relationships with students, give students a voice, and allow students to feel they are safe and respected members of the learning community. This in turn will increase collaboration, critical thinking, and the overall achievement of students.

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

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of resiliencency with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change.

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.

Implement professional development for resiliency with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture

Person Responsible: Francella Lewis (francella.lewis@ocps.net)

By When:

Use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and resilencency.

Person Responsible: Samuel Murfee (samuel.murfee@ocps.net)

By When:

Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts.

Person Responsible: Maria DiMura (maria.dimura@ocps.net)

By When:

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).

After reviewing school improvement funding allocations with stakeholders we discussed school and student needs. During our discussion, it was ensured that students needing Algebra 1 tutoring would receive tier 2 and tier 3 instruction, as well as, students in grades 9 and 10 ELA would receive intervention push-in for additional support.