

Orange County Public Schools

Windermere 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Windermere High

5523 WINTER GARDEN VINELAND RD, Windermere, FL 34786

<https://windermerehs.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.

OCPS Mission: 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.

OCPS 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
Leftakis, Andrew	Principal	Oversee all aspects of the school.
Adkins, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal of instruction, master schedule creation, at-risk student monitoring, and oversees the ELA department.
Bresk, Bridget	Assistant Principal	Responsible for school wide discipline response systems, testing, and oversees the social studies department
Murchison, Nancy	Assistant Principal	Responsible for school facilities, campus security, and oversees the science department
Stokes, Danielle	Assistant Principal	Responsible for the ESE and ESOL departments, oversees math and reading, and student support plans
Brockmeier, Brittany	Instructional Coach	Teacher mentor program, professional development, teacher support, testing team, and student push-in support
Hernando, Roxana	ELL Compliance Specialist	Oversees the ELL department and all compliance related materials. Supports classroom strategies for ELL students.
Mitchell, Tagiya	Reading Coach	Works directly with the reading department, push-in/pull out support, testing team, and data monitoring.

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 leadership team gathers stakeholder feedback using various methods, such as meetings and surveys. We also utilize Panorama data completed by students, staff, and community members. Teacher focus groups are used to discuss school-wide concerns and improvement areas; previous year data is analyzed, and parent groups are included.

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))

Weekly admin team meetings, department and PLC meetings, and SAC meetings will all review SIP goals. Formative assessment data and progress monitoring tasks will be utilized within these teams of individuals to determine progress toward goals. School survey responses and end-of-the-year achievement data will be the final indicator of goal completion.

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	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	26%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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: A

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1245
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	244
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	368
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	405
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	569

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	66	49	50	66	49	51	65		
ELA Learning Gains				58			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			47		
Math Achievement*	58	34	38	52	36	38	41		
Math Learning Gains				54			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			24		
Science Achievement*	81	66	64	74	31	40	72		
Social Studies Achievement*	75	66	66	68	43	48	75		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	97	87	89	98	62	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	71	65	65	71	70	67	67		
ELP Progress	65	45	45	56			59		

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	513
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	97

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	690
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	98

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	1	
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	67			
HSP	70			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	76			

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	68			

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	42			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	59			
HSP	60			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	55			

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	66			58			81	75		97	71	65
SWD	26			21			27	47		21	6	
ELL	49			49			69	53		60	7	65
AMI												
ASN	76			72			96	89		88	6	
BLK	51			43			68	82		59	6	
HSP	61			57			79	67		66	7	65
MUL	67			56			83	80		77	6	

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	71			60			81	80		74	7	67
FRL	58			54			74	64		60	7	69

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	66	58	45	52	54	48	74	68		98	71	56
SWD	28	43	32	24	45	40	45	38		89	37	
ELL	49	59	55	45	53	44	56	39		100	65	56
AMI												
ASN	80	63	30	74	63		88	88		99	74	
BLK	59	49	34	43	58	39	67	75		100	63	
HSP	58	59	50	48	52	49	64	61		98	68	57
MUL	75	67		27	45		90			100	67	
PAC												
WHT	72	57	43	58	56	48	82	70		97	74	50
FRL	54	53	51	40	46	32	62	69		97	69	36

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	65	59	47	41	32	24	72	75		99	67	59
SWD	30	38	32	24	34	31	52	52		94	31	
ELL	41	58	53	30	35	24	50	55		98	60	59
AMI												
ASN	77	67	33	53	24		75	90		100	74	80
BLK	63	58	38	33	27	24	75	67		100	56	
HSP	56	57	52	34	33	25	65	65		98	62	57
MUL	81	77		54			85			100	75	
PAC												
WHT	70	59	44	49	33	23	77	83		99	72	59
FRL	55	53	42	33	29	20	61	60		99	59	53

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	64%	49%	15%	50%	14%
09	2023 - Spring	65%	46%	19%	48%	17%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	49%	47%	2%	50%	-1%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	45%	15%	48%	12%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	63%	15%	63%	15%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	62%	9%	63%	8%

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.

Students with disabilities was our lowest-performing subgroup at 42% in reading proficiency. However, this category has increased in the past two years, increasing from 29% proficiency. Some contributing factors are teacher capacity when working with students with disabilities, lack of high-yield instructional strategies, and lack of effective monitoring strategies to ensure students understand the concepts and can show mastery.

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

The only category that showed a decline was science achievement, moving down one percentage point from the previous year. Several teachers decided to teach out of the scope and sequence this past year, believing their pacing provided a better foundation for students as they learned the standards. This was not an issue. However, there may have been a lack of monitoring as our performance measurement assessments did not measure this pacing plan.

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.

State trend data is not available at this time.

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

Students classified as ELL moved from 49% proficiency to 56% proficiency. This can be attributed to increased support in English Language Arts classes using a combination of push-in/pull-out support. The school utilized several tier 1 interventionists to support classroom instruction, manage small groups, and track progress.

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

Two potential areas of concern are students with ten or more absences and students who received a level one on the final reading assessment.

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

Literacy across the content area, closing achievement gaps, increasing social studies proficiency, and continuing to increase proficiency with our students with disabilities.

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 Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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.

Improve teacher capacity in ELA, Math, Biology, US History Proficiency in order to accelerate Student Performance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By improving teacher capacity, we anticipate student achievement and engagement to increase. Additionally, we anticipate ELA proficiency to improve by 3%, moving from 65% to 68%; Algebra I proficiency to improve by 3%, moving from 57 to 60%, Geometry from 61 to 64%, ELA 9 from 65% to 68%, ELA 10 from 64 to 67%; Biology proficiency to improve by 3%, moving from 78% to 81%; and US History proficiency to improve by 3%, moving from 71% to 74% - as measured by FAST, BEST, and EOC exams.

Monitoring:

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

Create a system of continuous feedback for classroom teachers. This 'sweep' system would require instructional coaches and administrators to sweep through every content classroom, everyday, and provide actionable feedback based on observation or instructional practices and student tasks. Administrators and coaches would work specifically with these content areas in order to progress monitor, model lesson, and provide professional development through department and PLC meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrew Leftakis (andrew.leftakis@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.)

Identified levels of support based on teacher needs, coupled with differentiated coaching cycles.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing continuous feedback to teachers, ineffective or non-standards based lessons can be corrected immediately, teachers will be provided with actionable feedback on a daily/weekly basis, and coaching opportunities will be presented to support individual teacher growth.

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.

- 1). Develop PD calendar during the summer
- 2). Identify teacher leaders who can assist in monitoring of systems and deliver PD

- 3). Restructure Instructional Leadership Team who will monitor instructional systems, conduct classroom sweeps, provide feedback
- 4). Develop meeting schedule - admin team meets every Tuesday and instructional leadership every Thursday. Purpose is to review structures, monitor student achievement via formative assessments, and to plan shifts in instruction and operations. Additionally, these meetings allow coaches and administrators to discuss sweep observations, teacher needs, and coaching opportunities, as well as calibrate feedback.
- 5). PD, which may include formative assessment creation, blended classroom strategies, and engagement strategies.

Person Responsible: Brittany Brockmeier (brittany.brockmeier@ocps.net)

By When: Pre-planning

- 6). Provide on-going, professional development based on classroom walkthrough data and teacher feedback.
- 7). Create a daily sweep schedule to observe classroom instruction and monitor that the schedule is being followed on a daily/weekly basis and weekly actionable feedback
- 8) Identify teachers in need of targeted coaching cycle and implement every three weeks.

Person Responsible: Andrew Leftakis (andrew.leftakis@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

#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.

Our area of focus will be to increase student sense of belonging at Windermere High School in order to increase student attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By increasing student sense of belonging, we expect to see improved attendance and reduce the number of students who have ten or more absences. Additionally, we anticipate an increase in our Panorama survey data, specifically student sense of belonging. We hope to increase from 34% to 40% responding favorably to that question.

Monitoring:

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

We will use Skyward attendance reports to monitor at risk students, create in-house surveys to gauge interest in student activities, and monitor participation in extra-curricular activities and athletics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Utilize the Child Study Team meeting format in order to address student attendance issues.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is the most prudent way to involve the parent, student, and the school when addressing attendance matters.

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.

Addition of attendance dean and new senior sponsor.

Person Responsible: Andrew Leftakis (andrew.leftakis@ocps.net)

By When: Pre-plan

Communicate with community about attendance expectations and create tiered response to non-attendance.

Person Responsible: Brittany Brockmeier (brittany.brockmeier@ocps.net)

By When: Quartley

Create student surveys to gauge interest in student activities.

Person Responsible: Brittany Brockmeier (brittany.brockmeier@ocps.net)

By When: Quartley

Utilize Child Study Team meeting format to address student attendance concerns and create a tiered response system to non-attendance.

Person Responsible: Bridget Bresk (bridget.bresk@ocps.net)

By When: On-going.

Use Panorama survey to overall student sense of belonging.

Person Responsible: Bridget Bresk (bridget.bresk@ocps.net)

By When: End of school year.