Lake Buena Vista High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lake Buena Vista High School

11305 DARYL CARTER PARKWAY, Orlando,, FL 32821

[no web address on file]

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
Fuller, Beth	Assistant Principal	API responsible for all student and teacher schedules. Curriculum leader for Social Studies and Science, CTE/NDCC and Guidance, Leader of Daily Operations, FTE, Senior Awards, Yearbook/Newspaper, and Supervision Schedule Supplements.
Robb, Sheri	Assistant Principal	Curriculum Leader of ESE, Visual Arts and Performing Arts. Leader of ESE/Gifted/MTSS process; facilities, keys, inventory, radios, safety and drills, safety and security, work orders, Sonitrol, ESE documentation and state and federal compliance, PLC Coordinator.
Perez Cedeno, Melania	Assistant Principal	Curriculum Leader of Reading and Language Arts, oversees Discipline and Attendance, Administrator over Summer School; Substitute Teacher, TAM, and Field Trip Coordinator, PLC coordinator, parking hangers, lockers.
Petrusic, Gordana	Dean	Support Student Discipline.
Swenson, Guy	Principal	The principal is accountable for the total school program through teaching and learning (instructional leadership); all components of academic programs (all subject areas); and School Improvement Plan implementation. They monitor all school data points, prescribing and overseeing appropriate efforts and initiatives that ensure successful attainment of the school's mission and vision with a keen focus on student success. They supervise and lead all school-based leadership members, who serve to further the school's mission and vision by functioning as instructional leaders and inclusive leaders through shared decision making in assigned areas.
Royal, Ladara	Dean	Support Student Attendance
Laracuente, Mariela	ELL Compliance Specialist	Maintain compliance with English Language Learners and support teachers.
Scott, Gerald	Dean	Support Student Discipline.
Peddy, Brant	Dean	Support Student Discipline.
Dawson, Alexandra	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Support new teachers, lead mentor and AP coordinator.

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.

Using student achievement data, the leadership team meets regularly to evaluate goals, analyze and identify barriers to achieving success, and develop implementation and monitoring goals. The School Advisory Committee (SAC) assists the school in setting priorities for the goals and strategies that are included in the School Improvement Plan and also provides guidance for targeting areas in need of improvement and for monitoring and implementation of the plan. The SAC is comprised of each stakeholder group: parents, faculty, staff, and students. Faculty works collaboratively in departmental teams and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and they are encouraged to provide input.

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))

Leadership team will meet to discuss and reflect on achievement data and strategies to discuss data during Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) after the following tests are administered and data is available: English Language Arts (ELA) 9th and 10th Standards Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs) and Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) PM1 and PM2, STAR (12th ELLs less than two years in the USA), WIDA (ELLs), ACT (11th and 12th), PSAT (9th - 11th), SAT (12th), FAST PM3 Retake (11th) and Florida State Assessment (FSA) ELA Retake (12th). By reflecting on data as it is acquired, we will amend and continue instructional practices in the classrooms so that we can improve student outcomes. During teacher professional learning communities, lead teachers and administrators will convey data findings to all teachers so that teachers can make sound decisions about their instructional practices under the guidance of departments heads, PLC leaders, and administration.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	82%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	61%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)*

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: 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	733
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	496
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	493
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	597

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	3

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

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

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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*	45	49	50	48	49	51			
ELA Learning Gains				53					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41					
Math Achievement*	33	34	38	29	36	38			
Math Learning Gains				40					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48					
Science Achievement*	57	66	64	54	31	40			
Social Studies Achievement*	54	66	66	71	43	48			
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate		87	89		62	61			
College and Career Acceleration		65	65		70	67			
ELP Progress	49	45	45	47					

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

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	238
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	431
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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	25	Yes	2	1
ELL	35	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	41			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	66			

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	41			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	1	
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	46			
HSP	42			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	45			

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	45			33			57	54				49
SWD	20			21			35	23			4	
ELL	23			26			37	39			5	49
AMI												
ASN	70			60			90	77			4	
BLK	33			26			32	37			4	
HSP	33			30			45	46			5	49
MUL	64										1	

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	67			43			80	76			5	62
FRL	35			30			47	45			5	47

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	48	53	41	29	40	48	54	71				47
SWD	24	34	36	12	50	62	37					
ELL	25	44	42	22	38	44	33	47				47
AMI												
ASN	77	67		46	67		73	87				
BLK	33	53	59	22	37	55	44	68				
HSP	36	47	39	24	37	43	43	63				47
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	73	60		54	52		80	84				
FRL	40	49	39	25	34	54	47	73				42

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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	38%	49%	-11%	50%	-12%
09	2023 - Spring	40%	46%	-6%	48%	-8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	29%	47%	-18%	50%	-21%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	32%	45%	-13%	48%	-16%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	63%	-13%	63%	-13%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	47%	62%	-15%	63%	-16%

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.

ELA combined achievement for 9th and 10th grade is 39%. Algebra achievement is 35%. Geometry achievement is 33%. Biology achievement is 50%. US History achievement is 48%. Based on these percentages, ELA, Algebra 1, and Geometry achievement are the lowest in terms of performance. The biggest trend shown is that our ELA 9/10, Algebra 1, & Geometry achievement scores are the lowest performing year-to-year. Low performance was an outcome due to contributing factors such as a high percentage of new teachers with only one instructional coach available to serve and assist our new teachers. The final contributing factor for low performance trends is we only had one ESOL interventionist on staff to serve the needs of our high ELL population of approximately 600 students.

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

The greatest decline was in US History as it was 71% in school year 21-22, but in 22-23 it was 48%, which represents a 23 point decline. The factors that contributed to this decline are new teachers, and student attendance. Teachers also needed additional support to teach ELL students as there were vacancies in the ESOL department that were essential to supporting our ELL population.

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.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Algebra 1 as achievement was 35% for Lake Buena Vista High School and 54% for the state which represents a 19% difference. The factors that contributed to this decline are new teachers, hurricane Ian, and student attendance.Hurricane Ian contributed missed instructional time, which set teachers and students back on the level of standards/benchmarks that they needed to achieve; because of this, it was difficult for teachers and students to catch up on necessary instruction for the academic year. Teachers also needed additional support to teach ELL students as there were vacancies in the ESOL department that was essential to supporting our ELL population.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Algebra 1. Our Algebra 1 achievement scores increased 19 points from 16% in 2021-2022 to 35% in 2022-2023. The new actions that our school implemented in this area were data analysis, classroom walkthroughs by the instructional coach and administration, mentorship development for new teachers by veteran teachers. In addition, during PLCs data was analyzed to make informed decisions on daily practices.

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

Students with 10% or more days absent.

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

1. ELL instructional development
2. New teachers development
3. Building relationships with students
4. Interdisciplinary instruction
5. Culturally responsive instruction.

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 Differentiation

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.

Due to Lake Buena Vista High School's large population of ESOL students, additional supports and resources need to be provided to teachers such as paraprofessional support in classrooms, additional ELL support training, and teaching strategies specific to ELLs.

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

The measurable outcome that we plan to achieve will be at least 50% of our ESOL population (approximately 351 of 702 students) will experience proficiency in ELA and Social Studies achievements. This measurable outcome includes our ELL students currently in the ESOL program (LY students, approximately 566) as well as our ELL students who were exited from the ESOL program and still within a two-year monitoring period (LF students, approximately 136).

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

Leadership team, as well as the ESOL Compliance Specialist, will meet to discuss and reflect on achievement data and strategies to discuss during PLCs after the following tests are administered and data is available: ELA 9th and 10th SBUAs and FAST PM1 and PM2, STAR (12th ELLs less than two years in the USA), WIDA (ELLs), ACT (11th and 12th), PSAT (9th - 11th), SAT (12th), FAST PM3 Retake (11th) and FSA ELA Retake (12th). By reflecting on data as it is acquired, we will amend and continue instructional practices in the classrooms so that we can improve student outcomes. During teacher professional learning communities, lead teachers and administrators will convey data findings to all teachers so that teachers can make sound decisions about their instructional practices under the guidance of departments heads, PLC leaders, and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mariela Laracuente (mariela.laracuente@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 be utilizing the following evidence-based intervention: targeted pull-out small groups with additional scaffolded supports (such as the use of an ESOL paraprofessional for interventions), providing direct vocabulary instruction (such as concrete examples, prefixes/root words, and vocabulary pre-teaching), and the use of visuals to help create connections. All of these evidence-based interventions will be utilized the most for our ELL population which is the highest at our school with approximately 702 students out of 1990 total students on campus.

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

We selected these strategies as they target English Language Learners the most, and our ELL population is so large that this is one of our specific areas of focus this year. Also, the above evidence-based practices can be utilized for other subgroups, such as ESE, 504, and/or low-achieving students, as they include scaffolds that are easy to replicate for these other subgroups.

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- Administer local and state exams

2- Stakeholders review and reflect on data as they become available

3- Identify the areas of need in order to implement intervention

4- Utilyze ESOL Paraprofessionals to intervene with our ELL population in the areas needing the most improvement after data analysis, review and reflection.

Person Responsible: Mariela Laracuente (mariela.laracuente@ocps.net)

By When: After each grading period.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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

Due to the fact that Lake Buena Vista High School had a high turnover at the conclusion of the 2022-2023 school year, additional supports and resources need to be provided to our new teachers to continue their successful employment at our school and increase the overall level of positivity in our school's culture.

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

One of the measurable outcomes that we intend to achieve is a higher level of belonging and competency. We will achieve this by sending out "temperature check" surveys to our staff to determine on a set scale how they feel about their work environment at Lake Buena Vista High School, including but not limited to, their confidence in their curriculum, their confidence in their leadership, their feelings of support for both instructional and professional resources, etc.

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

In addition to the "temperature check" surveys mentioned above, leadership will conduct classroom walkthroughs and observations to get a clearer understanding for how well teachers are able to deliver standards-based instruction and how confident they are in the classroom (i.e. classroom management ability is high). We will also provide monthly professional development opportunities for our entire staff, as well as targeted professional development opportunities for new teachers through the use of our new instructional coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alexandra Dawson (alexandra.dawson@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.)

Some of the evidence-based interventions that we will implement include coaching observations from members of leadership (specifically our Curriculum Resource Teacher/Instructional Coach), targeted feedback to teachers based on their performance in the classroom, professional development opportunities to grow in their instructional practice, shadowing opportunities for teachers to learn from other teachers (i.e. observing their classrooms, co-teaching content, etc.), and appreciation-based events and programs to help increase overall morale on campus.

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

We choose these specific strategies because our goal is to decrease teacher turnover at the end of the 2023-2024 school year and increase the overall level of positivity in our school's culture. By focusing on our new teachers and our school's culture, this will create a "trickle down" effect that will help our teachers to help our students achieve academically and socially. We expect increased levels of achievement in our content areas, as discussed in our previous area of focus.

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. Professional Development opportunities monthly
2. Mentor/mentee surveys for 0-2 years teachers biweekly
3. Appreciation events/programs monthly
4. Classroom walkthroughs/observations weekly
5. "Temperature Check" survey once a semester
6. End of Year "Temperature Check" at the end of the 2023-2024 year

Person Responsible: Alexandra Dawson (alexandra.dawson@ocps.net)

By When: Surveys by the end of each semester (December 2023 & April 2024) as well as end of the year assessment (May 2024)

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).

Our School Advisory Committee (SAC) will meet to determine the needs of our school. Once needs have been identified, they meet to discuss, vote, and approve plans to allocate school improvement funds, which will then be sent to our bookkeeper for final purchase approval.