

Orange County Public Schools

Lake Nona 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	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
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

Lake Nona High

12500 NARCOOSSEE RD, Orlando, FL 32832

<https://lakenonahs.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
Morsher, Stephen	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal oversees the following areas: English Language Arts, Performing Arts, Visual Arts, and State Testing Coordinator. The Assistant Principal conducts observations and provides feedback to staff, and implements systems and structures for staff to engage in planning.</p> <p>standards-based instruction, monitors student data, as well as works with curriculum leaders in each department to ensure a focus on increasing student achievement.</p>
Bryant, Travis	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal oversees the following areas: ESE, CTE, 504, PE, Nurse, and ESE Support Staff.</p> <p>The Assistant Principal conducts observations and provides feedback to staff implements systems and structures for staff to engage in planning standards-based instruction, monitors student data, as well as works with curriculum leaders in each department to ensure a focus on increasing student achievement.</p>
Rivera, Juliza	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal oversees the following areas: World Languages, Student Services, SAFE/Social Worker, ELL Department, ELL Paraprofessional, and Student Services.</p> <p>The Assistant Principal conducts observations and provides feedback to staff implements systems and structures for staff to engage in planning standards-based instruction monitors student data, as well as works with curriculum leaders in each department to ensure a focus on increasing student achievement.</p>
Van, Linda	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal oversees the following areas: Social Studies, Deans, PASS Coordinator, Front Office/Attendance Staff, and Cafeteria. The Assistant Principal conducts observations and provides feedback to staff implements systems and structures for staff to engage in planning standards-based instruction, monitors student data, as well as works with curriculum leaders in each department to ensure a focus on increasing student achievement.</p>
Hughes, Wilicia	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal oversees the following areas: Mathematics, Reading, and Media Center Staff.</p> <p>The Assistant Principal conducts observations and provides feedback to staff implements systems and structures for staff to engage in planning standards-based instruction, monitors student data, as well as works with curriculum leaders in each department to ensure a focus on increasing student achievement.</p>
Harris, Tonny	Assistant Principal	<p>The assistant principal oversees the following areas: Science, AP Testing Coordinator, and Facilities Coordinator.</p> <p>The Assistant Principal conducts observations and provides feedback to</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		staff, implements systems and structures for staff to engage in planning standards based instruction, monitors student data, as well as works with curriculum leaders in each department to ensure a focus on increasing student achievement.
Freund, Timothy	Dean	The Deans support the efforts to establish and maintain a positive culture as they provide staff with resources and training to support building authentic relationships with students, parents, and the community.
John, Chelsea	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach facilitates professional development in order to support our instructional staff with implementing standards-based instruction, appropriate interventions, and research-based best practices.
Lafayette, Tammy	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach facilitates professional development in order to support our instructional staff with implementing standards-based instruction, appropriate interventions, and research-based best practices.
Cecilio, Olga	Administrative Support	The 504 coordinator supports the efforts to establish and maintain a positive culture as they provide staff with resources and training to support building authentic relationships with students, parents, and the community.
Dry, Cristina	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach facilitates professional development in order to support our instructional staff with implementing standards-based instruction, appropriate interventions, and research-based best practices.
Morgan, Kevin	Dean	The Deans support the efforts to establish and maintain a positive culture as they provide staff with resources and training to support building authentic relationships with students, parents, and the community
Solis, Briana	Administrative Support	The MTSS coordinator supports the efforts to establish and maintain a positive culture as they provide staff with resources and training to support building authentic relationships with students, parents, and the community
Campbell, Nikki	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.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Improvement Plan for Lake Nona High School was developed by administration after analyzing assessment data and identifying subgroup gaps in academic performance. Stakeholders were involved by understanding the purpose and importance of their involvement in the SIP development process. The leadership team explained how their input will contribute to the overall improvement of the school and the success of students. We organized meetings or workshops to gather input from stakeholders. During those workshops we shared relevant background information about the current state of the school, including academic performance data, student demographics, and any other relevant information. We will facilitate discussions during meetings or workshops to encourage stakeholders to share their perspectives, ideas, and concerns. Stakeholders will have opportunities to provide feedback and suggestions on various aspects of the SIP, such as goals, strategies, and action plans. We looked for common themes, patterns, and areas of agreement or disagreement. This will help identify priorities and inform decision-making. We used the input received from stakeholders to inform the development of the SIP to incorporate their suggestions, ideas, and concerns into the goals, strategies, and action plans. We gave stakeholders an opportunity to provide additional input or suggest revisions to ensure that the final document clearly reflects the goals, strategies, and action plan. The final SIP will be shared all stakeholders to keep them informed, engaged and provide clear communication.

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 Improvement Plan is regularly monitored through the following means: 1). Designating a team or individual responsible for analyzing the data and providing regular reports. 2). Establish benchmarks and targets for student achievement based on the State's academic standards. 3). Continuously evaluate the implementation of the SIP to assess its effectiveness. This can include reviewing progress reports, conducting surveys or interviews with stakeholders, and analyzing qualitative and quantitative data. Identify strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement.

The SIP will be revised through continuously evaluating the implementation of the SIP to assess its effectiveness. This can include reviewing progress reports, conducting surveys or interviews with stakeholders, and analyzing qualitative and quantitative data. Identifying strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement. In addition, clearly communicate the revisions to all stakeholders involved in the SIP. Explain the rationale behind the changes and outline the expectations for implementation. Actively provide support and resources to ensure that all stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities in achieving the revised goals. Work together with all stakeholders to implement the revised strategies and action plans as outlined in the SIP. The school team will monitor the implementation closely to ensure fidelity and make any necessary adjustments along the way.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<p>2023-24 Status (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Active</p>
--	---------------

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	77%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
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 *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 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	1382
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	236
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	247
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	537
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	615
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	781

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	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*	59	49	50	67	49	51	66		
ELA Learning Gains				64			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			45		
Math Achievement*	50	34	38	49	36	38	46		
Math Learning Gains				51			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			28		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	78	66	64	72	31	40	80		
Social Studies Achievement*	80	66	66	77	43	48	69		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	99	87	89	100	62	61	100		
College and Career Acceleration	74	65	65	78	70	67	75		
ELP Progress	41	45	45	65			57		

* 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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	481
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	726
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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	69			
HSP	66			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	62			

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	60			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	66			
HSP	63			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	60			

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	59			50			78	80		99	74	41
SWD	22			27			32	55		27	7	20
ELL	38			40			59	59		78	7	41
AMI												
ASN	74			78			92	94		88	6	
BLK	53			38			72	83		66	6	
HSP	53			45			72	76		73	7	41
MUL	68			71			73	80		79	6	
PAC												
WHT	69			66			89	86		76	6	
FRL	47			40			69	73		72	7	36

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	67	64	52	49	51	51	72	77		100	78	65
SWD	24	48	42	18	32	35	28	59		100	33	40
ELL	48	58	52	41	50	57	59	56		100	76	65
AMI												
ASN	86	80	36	70	56		87	100		100	91	
BLK	67	62	36	48	59	68	68	77		100	72	
HSP	60	62	55	45	50	49	66	71		100	76	64
MUL	80	74		45			85	79		100	80	
PAC												
WHT	77	67	47	59	50	50	87	88		99	80	
FRL	56	57	47	40	47	47	60	70		100	73	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	66	59	45	46	31	28	80	69		100	75	57
SWD	29	41	37	23	22	19	54	43		100	33	
ELL	41	55	47	39	35	37	61	49		100	69	57

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	85	79		78	56		94	83		100	86	
BLK	69	59	33	45	27	31	84	69		98	57	
HSP	59	55	45	41	29	30	74	64		100	73	56
MUL	67	67		55			77			100	95	
PAC												
WHT	80	65	50	61	34	19	88	78		99	80	80
FRL	55	52	40	41	31	24	75	63		99	67	52

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	56%	49%	7%	50%	6%
09	2023 - Spring	56%	46%	10%	48%	8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	38%	47%	-9%	50%	-12%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	45%	8%	48%	5%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	63%	11%	63%	11%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	62%	15%	63%	14%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our ELL students demonstrated lower achievement in the areas of Social Studies and Science between 2022 and 2023. ELL students scored 50 percent lower on the US History assessment than non ELL students. ELL students scored 41 percent lower on the Biology assessment than non ELL students. Contributing factors would be a growing ELL population, cultural barriers, linguistic barriers and education level of our staff in regards to ELL Best practices.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was the ELL achievement gap in Social Studies. Contributing factors would be a growing ELL population, cultural barriers, linguistic barriers, and the education level of our staff regarding ELL Best practices. Also, teacher retention, teacher turnover and teachers that did not graduate from a traditional 4-year teacher prep are contributing factors.

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.

We understand that the ELL and Math scores are new and are being evaluated to determine cut scores. However, the achievement gap for ELL and Non ELL students compared to the state average is significant.

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

Algebra 1 proficiency showed the most improvement compared to high schools in Orange County. In order to target these improvements, common planning practices engaged with monitoring questions to ensure that these subgroups and their needs were being addressed by teams during the planning process - this included targeted questioning and remediation tactics being built in to the planning process.

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

EWS data was not reported for grades 9-12 during the 2022-2023 school year.

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

1. Closing the achievement gap between ELL students and Non ELL students.
2. Closing the achievement gap between ESE student and Non ESE students.
3. Increasing School Culture and Climate.

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 Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

After reviewing the results from our annual Panorama survey distributed to teachers, students, and staff. Our team isolated "School Climate" as a specific area of focus for this upcoming school year. The average for "School Climate" among teachers, students, and families was 50% favorable. The school district average for "School Climate" among teachers, students, and families was 52% favorable.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As a result of our targeted efforts to improve campus climate across students and staff, our team is looking to bring our average to 60% favorable in the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored throughout the year through conversations and open dialogues with curriculum leaders and campus leaders throughout various departments. The school team plans to measure growth through Panorama Survey results and targeted small student group surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nikki Campbell (nicolle.campbell@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.)

Increasing student talk time during class is an area of focus through all subject areas that will be targeted through Professional Learning Communities, events and daily operations. The leadership team is implementing PBIS for students and teachers. Students and teachers will be recognized through a point system. Students and teachers will have an opportunity to receive rewards and recognition from Lake Nona High School leadership team members.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increasing focused student talk time within the classroom will help students create a higher sense of community amongst their peers and staff members at Lake Nona High School. Positive behavior interventions have show to increase a sense of purpose and motivation for students and teachers.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus