

Orange County Public Schools
University High



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

University High

2450 COUGAR WAY, Orlando, FL 32817

<https://universityhs.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Anne Carcara

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2013

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	60%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: B 2016-17: C 2015-16: B 2014-15: B 2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	

Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Carcara, Anne	Principal	Serves as the instructional leader of the school. Responsible for engaging all stakeholders in the education of our students and bridging family, community and school to ensure success.
Roman, Antonio	Assistant Principal	Provide effective leadership for all staff and students, help analyze data, coach and conducts classroom walkthroughs to maintain effective classroom instruction, ensure a positive commitment to all students and staff, provide feedback and suggestions for intervention ideas and be an active member of the MTSS leadership team. Additional duties include improving student achievement performance by at least 5% in the area of Biology, oversee Advanced Placement, Master Schedule, FTE/Enrollment, Magnet Programs administrator, Khan Academy Lead, Corrective programs-corrections for DOE, Semester Exam Schedule, Graduation, Acceleration points, Monitoring of school grade components, School Newsletter, Oversee Latinos in Action, ESOL Compliance Lead, In charge of Senior Class.
Corn, Frederick	Assistant Principal	Provide effective leadership for all staff and students, help analyze data, coach and conducts classroom walkthroughs to maintain effective classroom instruction, ensure a positive commitment to all students and staff, provide feedback and suggestions for intervention ideas and be an active member of the MTSS leadership team. Additional duties include School Calendar, improving student achievement and reducing the achievement gap between all subgroups in Math as measured by the FSA and EOC exams, Administrator over Digital Learning, School Safety Plan, Facilities Administrator, Oversee Technology Support, Oversee Calculus project, Digital Curriculum Lead, Property administrator, Athletics administrator, In charge of Sophomore Class.
Ruff, Wendy	Instructional Coach	Works with teachers through the coaching cycle including the planning process. Works with Professional learning communities (PLCs) which meet after-school every Wednesday to analyze common assessment data and discuss how this data informs their instructional decision making. Members of the leadership team are present to assist teachers in breaking down data as it relates to Common Formative Assessments. Content area teachers also have common planning time during the school day where they meet to plan standards-based lessons and create common assessments. PLCs plan interventions that will assist students with mastering specific standards during their common planning time.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Concannon, Adam	Dean	Deans work together with all stakeholders at the school to ensure a safe learning environment and enforce the OCPS Code of Conduct and discipline procedures. Monitor behavior to increase student achievement and decrease disciplinary disruptions. Deans and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Behavioral Specialist work together to develop Behavior Intervention Plans (BIP). As a member of the leadership team, deans and other members meet weekly to discuss common trends across the school and to plan ways to address school-wide needs.
Lambert, Christine	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Staffing Specialist works together with community based social/emotional organizations to provide students and families external support along with school-based crisis intervention with the guidance team. The Inclusion Coach works closely with the ESE Placement Specialist and Facilitation Support Personnel in monitoring the data for early warning signs and academic achievement. There are monthly consultations between faculty and the Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) Manager. Follow up steps are written based on the data reviewed during monthly consultations.
Calderon, Leonardo	Administrative Support	Works with parents and students regarding all facets of the ELL process including meetings and ensuring that all information is in compliance and students are placed in the appropriate courses. Works to cross reference students needing ESOL strategies depending on the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) status of the student. Works with teachers to provide feedback and suggestions for intervention strategies that can be implemented in the classroom, conduct non-evaluative classroom walk-throughs to provide feedback and support and ensure effective classroom instruction for ELL students. Works with ELL teachers in the common planning process during their grade level weekly PLC meetings.
Schmitt, Cindy	Instructional Coach	Works with teachers through the coaching cycle including the planning process. Works with Professional learning communities (PLCs) which meet after-school every Wednesday to analyze common assessment data and discuss how this data informs their instructional decision making. Members of the leadership team are present to assist teachers in breaking down data as it relates to Common Formative Assessments. Content area teachers also have common planning time during the school day where they meet to plan standards-based lessons and create common assessments. PLCs plan interventions that will assist students

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		with mastering specific standards during their common planning time.
Schmidt, David	Assistant Principal	Provide effective leadership for all staff and students, help analyze data, coach and conducts classroom walkthroughs to maintain effective classroom instruction, ensure a positive commitment to all students and staff, provide feedback and suggestions for intervention ideas and be an active member of the MTSS leadership team. Additional duties include initiatives aimed at improving student achievement performance by at least 5% in the area of US History, Discipline Administrator, Attendance Administrator, ASPIRE program, Mentoring Program, Substitutes, In charge of Freshman Class.
Langston, Sherry	Assistant Principal	Provide effective leadership for all staff and students, help analyze data, coach and conducts classroom walkthroughs to maintain effective classroom instruction, ensure a positive commitment to all students and staff, provide feedback and suggestions for intervention ideas and be an active member of the MTSS leadership team. Additional duties include initiatives aimed at improving student achievement performance by at least 5% in both ELA 9/10, MAO and Males of Color Initiatives, Oversee CTE Programs, Increase number of students passing industry certification exams by 8%, AdvanceED, Textbook administrator, School Improvement Plan, In charge of Junior Class.
Medina, Norma	Dean	Deans work together with all stakeholders at the school to ensure a safe learning environment and enforce the OCPS Code of Conduct and discipline procedures. Monitor behavior to increase student achievement and decrease disciplinary disruptions. Deans and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Behavioral Specialist work together to develop Behavior Intervention Plans (BIP). As a member of the leadership team, deans and other members meet weekly to discuss common trends across the school and to plan ways to address school-wide needs.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	775	696	711	687	2869
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136	153	139	145	573
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	38	20	19	132
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	75	68	54	245
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	215	197	130	34	576

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596	590	543	590	2319

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	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	5	6	4	4	19

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

112

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/15/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	151	134	195	578
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	75	42	26	216
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199	322	249	202	972
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	249	200	45	17	511

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183	223	122	97	625

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	151	134	195	578
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	75	42	26	216
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199	322	249	202	972
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	249	200	45	17	511

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183	223	122	97	625

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	55%	56%	54%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	53%	51%	52%	51%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	40%	42%	48%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	41%	43%	51%	47%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains	58%	49%	48%	41%	44%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	46%	45%	50%	39%	45%
Science Achievement	67%	70%	68%	65%	66%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	86%	73%	73%	77%	69%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	775 (0)	696 (0)	711 (0)	687 (0)	2869 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	136 (98)	153 (151)	139 (134)	145 (195)	573 (578)
One or more suspensions	55 (73)	38 (75)	20 (42)	19 (26)	132 (216)
Course failure in ELA or Math	48 (199)	75 (322)	68 (249)	54 (202)	245 (972)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	215 (249)	197 (200)	130 (45)	34 (17)	576 (511)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
09	2019	52%	52%	0%	55%	-3%
	2018	51%	50%	1%	53%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	53%	50%	3%	53%	0%
	2018	53%	49%	4%	53%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	67%	-1%	67%	-1%
2018	62%	62%	0%	65%	-3%
Compare		4%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	69%	16%	70%	15%
2018	75%	65%	10%	68%	7%
Compare		10%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	63%	-33%	61%	-31%
2018	21%	61%	-40%	62%	-41%
Compare		9%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	45%	53%	-8%	57%	-12%
2018	58%	65%	-7%	56%	2%
Compare		-13%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	19	28	24	27	59	62	35	59		93	48
ELL	20	35	30	27	60	69	34	59		96	66
ASN	79	56	27	72	41		88	98		100	89
BLK	43	46	28	27	54	50	59	79		98	64
HSP	48	50	36	36	58	63	60	82		98	72
MUL	56	45		36			71	90		100	65
WHT	70	58	38	61	64	77	78	92		100	74
FRL	46	48	34	37	56	60	61	84		98	71

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	16	41	40	15	27	40	21	51		85	17
ELL	13	35	38	26	40	39	29	41		90	30
ASN	85	75	69	76	45		89	85		97	78
BLK	44	50	55	41	32	56	58	75		100	48
HSP	45	46	43	42	41	51	58	73		96	45
MUL	60	56		42	33		70	76		100	57
WHT	67	59	55	62	47	48	77	87		96	65
FRL	46	49	47	43	39	49	58	73		96	47

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	678
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
-----------------------	--

Federal Index - Asian Students	72
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
-----------------------------	--

Federal Index - Multiracial Students	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

During the 2018-2019 school year, the lowest performing data component was in English Language Arts (ELA) Lowest 25th Percentile with 35 percent of our students scoring at a level 3 or above on the Florida State Assessment (FSA) ELA assessment. While University maintained overall ELA Achievement at 54 percent of students scoring at level 3 or above on the FSA ELA Assessment, there was a decrease by 1 percent in the overall ELA learning gains. The trend that we see looking at prior years, is that even though University did not decrease in overall ELA achievement, there was a significant decrease in many of the subgroups and this is an area that needs additional support and resources. Some contributing factors that led to this decrease are lack of leadership due to a vacant assistant principal position, district scope and sequence not followed with fidelity and the English Language Learners (ELL) students were without a certified teacher for the last nine weeks of the school year.

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

During the 2018-2019 school year, the data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year was the ELA lowest 25th percentile with 35 percent of our students scoring at a level 3 or above on the FSA ELA assessment. Factors that led to this decline would be lessons not meeting the rigor level of the standard, teachers changing the recommended text in the Curriculum Resource Materials (CRM's) and as a result the new text does not meet the level of rigor as needed, Khan Academy and NewsELA not implemented with fidelity and more PD is needed for teachers so that they can effectively plan for culturally responsive instruction to meet the needs of all students.

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

During the 2018-2019 school year, the component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was in ELA Lowest 25th Percentile with 35 percent of our students scoring at a level 3 or above on the FSA ELA assessment. Factors that led to this decline would be lessons not meeting the rigor level of the standard, teachers changing the recommended text in the CRM's and as a result the new text does not meet the level of rigor as needed, Khan Academy and NewsELA not implemented with fidelity and more PD is needed for teachers so that they can effectively plan for culturally responsive instruction to meet the needs of all students.

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

During the 2018-2019 school year, the component that showed the most improvement was math learning gains with a 17 percent increase with 58 percent of students scoring at a level 3 or above on the End of Course (EOC) exams. Teachers utilized Carnegie and Khan Academy to help facilitate differentiated instruction. Tutoring was provided for students during lunch, after school and on Saturdays. The focus of Saturday tutoring was review and remediation as well as previewing the upcoming week's content. Teachers and support facilitators targeted the lowest performing students made contact with parents and guardians to explain tutoring options as well as Saturday instruction options so that parents were aware of all available opportunities. The math coach assisted by pushing into classes and offering small group instruction for struggling students as well as offering additional tutoring opportunities. During PLCs, as well as weekly administrative data sessions, teachers and administration analyzed formative and summative data including common assessments, culminating tasks, and exit tickets.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The areas of concern within the EWS data would be attendance below 90 percent with 20 percent of the students at school falling into this category and Level 1 on statewide assessment with 20 percent of students falling into this category. Overall, 80 percent of the students at the school fall into the categories of two or more early warning indicators.

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

1. Increase ELA learning gains in the lowest 25th percentile
2. Increase ELA learning gains overall.
3. Increase overall ELA achievement.

4. Increase overall Math achievement.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	During the 2018-2019 school year, there was a 13 percent decrease in this component with only 35 percent of the students proficient which is below the state average of 42 percent.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 2019-2020 school year, University will have a goal to improve the ELA lowest 25th percentile from 35 percent to 40 percent which is a 5 percent increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sherry Langston (sherry.langston@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students systematically engage in processing content to generate conclusions through collaborative interactions with other students. Students interact in small groups and utilize effective conative skills necessary for collaboration to practice and deepen knowledge. In order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, learners must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, the students, and the content. Students use of conative skills necessary for understanding and interacting with others allows students to strategically extend learning by enhancing procedural skills and deepening knowledge.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will implement standards based instruction with the use of the CRM's. 2. Teachers will identify the lowest performing students in their classes, as well as achievement gaps in subgroups in order to monitor and track achievement data throughout the school year. 3. Teachers will receive professional development opportunities that will allow them to implement a small group and rotational model within their classes and plan for culturally responsive instruction. 4. Administration and teachers will work together to narrow achievement gaps within our student subgroups by enhancing culturally responsive instruction and request support as needed from the MAO. 5. Teachers will have a common planning time each week where they will analyze classroom data and/or PMA data and use this data to plan lessons that meet the rigor of the standards as well as culturally responsive instruction in order to meet the needs of the all students within the classroom.
Person Responsible	Norma Medina (norma.medina@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Implement Literacy Strategies across Curriculum
Rationale	University will continue to implement the strategies from participation in the District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) that focus on literacy, complex texts, text-dependent questions and increase writing across all content areas. By supporting and implementing the initiatives of the DPLC, University High School will continue to work towards increase reading proficiency and close achievement gaps within the lowest 25th percentile.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 2019-2020 school year, University will have a goal to improve the ELA learning gains from 51 percent to 55 percent which isa 4 percent increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sherry Langston (sherry.langston@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students generate inferences and elaborate to provide evidence that demonstrates understanding of learned content. Students produce and defend claims through the analysis of reasoning and logic of information, demonstrating new insights gained through this process
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students must be skilled at generating valid conclusions based on content in order to support future analytical thinking and enhance comprehension. Students’ analysis of reasoning deepens their understanding of content knowledge and enhances long term retention, decision making, critical thinking and problem solving.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administration will provide teachers with professional development opportunities on all of the targeted areas and strategies of the DPLC team. 2. Administration will provide mentors for new teachers to ensure they are implementing with fidelity the use of complex texts, close reading strategies and using writing strategies across all content areas. 3. Teachers will have a common planning time each week where they will plan for upcoming instruction and implement the strategies from the DPLC team in their instructional practices to include opportunities for writing strategies across all content areas. 4. Teacher will infuse writing strategies as well as the use of complex texts and close reading strategies in the different content areas as well as allowing ELA teachers to mentor and coach teachers of other subject areas. 5. Administration will utilize a DPLC school team and that will walk classrooms throughout the school and provide non-evaluative feedback for teachers in order to drive development and and training for teachers.
Person Responsible	Wendy Ruff (wendy.ruff@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

During the 2019-2020 school year, University High School would continue work towards increasing overall learning gains and achievement levels in ELA as well as the overall achievement levels for math. The plan of action for these areas of focus starts with the continuation of teachers implementing standards based instruction with the use of the Curriculum Resource Materials. Administration will work with teachers teachers' to identify the performance levels of all students in their classes, as well as achievement gaps in subgroups in order to monitor and track achievement data throughout the school year. Teachers will receive professional development opportunities that will allow them to implement a small group and rotational model within their classes and plan for culturally responsive instruction. Administration and teachers will work together to narrow achievement gaps within our student subgroups by enhancing culturally responsive instruction and request support as needed from the Minority Achievement Office (MAO). Teachers will have a common planning time each week where they will analyze data from various sources and use this data to plan lessons that meet the rigor of the standards as well as culturally responsive instruction in order to meet the needs of the all students within the classroom. Each member of the leadership team will attend their assigned Professional Learning Community (PLC) and collaborate with teachers in regards to analyzing classroom data and PMA data and ensure that teachers are using this data to drive the instruction within their classrooms. Additionally teachers will implement the use of anchor charts, reference sheets, graphic organizers, use of complex texts, close reading strategies and writing strategies within their classrooms to increase and retain academic vocabulary and critical content. The leadership team will walk classrooms each week and provide teachers with actionable feedback that can be implemented immediately in their classes to help improve student achievement. The math and literacy coaches will conduct targeted pullouts for bubble students weekly. Students will be provided with tutoring opportunities after school and on Saturday's in both ELA and Math. The attendance for tutoring will be closely monitored by administration to ensure that the lower performing students are taking advantage and participating in the tutoring opportunities.