Osceola High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Osceola High School

420 S THACKER AVE, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Johanna Santiago

Start Date for this Principal: 8/30/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (46%) 2020-21: (45%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Osceola 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.

Osceola High School will provide access to rigorous courses with interventions to support all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Graduate all students career and college ready.

School Leadership Team

Membership
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**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
Santiago, Johana	Principal		Manage school
Walters, Erica	Assistant Principal		Assistant Principal of Instruction
Rivera, Ivet	Assistant Principal		Assistant Principal of College and Career
Bryant, Bronsky	Assistant Principal		Assistant Principal of Student Services
Schmidt, Dana	Instructional Coach		Literacy Coach
Rodriguez Villegas, Sandra	Math Coach		Math Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/30/2022, Johanna Santiago

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
17

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
67

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

194

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,405

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

33

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

31

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	609	610	570	557	2346
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	78	52	57	288
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	105	95	69	350
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	146	107	93	405
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	22	50	44	159
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223	221	195	154	793
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	309	257	125	175	866
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	351	360	340	275	1326

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	90	182	130	131	533

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	3	38	23	32	96
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14	8	13	46

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/30/2022

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	609	610	570	557	2346
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	78	52	57	288
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	105	95	69	350
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	146	107	93	405
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	22	50	44	159
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223	221	195	154	793
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	309	257	125	175	866
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	351	360	340	275	1326

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	90	182	130	131	533

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	3	38	23	32	96
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14	8	13	46

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	609	610	570	557	2346
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	78	52	57	288
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	105	95	69	350
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	146	107	93	405
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	22	50	44	159
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223	221	195	154	793
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	309	257	125	175	866
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	351	360	340	275	1326

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	182	130	131	533

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	38	23	32	96
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14	8	13	46

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	33%			33%			37%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	41%			38%			43%	48%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%			33%			34%	43%	42%
Math Achievement	25%			26%			29%	46%	51%
Math Learning Gains	39%			31%			35%	41%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%			42%			36%	46%	45%
Science Achievement	55%			49%			48%	69%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	51%			56%			66%	70%	73%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

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
2022					
2019	47%	62%	-15%	67%	-20%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	61%	62%	-1%	70%	-9%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	19%	49%	-30%	61%	-42%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	37%	44%	-7%	57%	-20%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	30	24	22	41	50	22	14		82	16
ELL	15	36	30	20	38	42	41	30		85	49
ASN	54	48		40						100	73
BLK	26	38	31	19	33	50	42	39		89	40
HSP	30	41	30	24	38	46	56	53		91	44
MUL	24	69		42	50		36			93	69
WHT	48	43	26	37	49	44	62	56		91	53
FRL	27	38	29	19	34	46	48	47		86	38

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	20	28	29	19	35	52	36	55		92	12
ELL	13	33	36	19	33	44	33	36		94	48
ASN	58	45		59	46					90	50
BLK	25	29	33	16	25	31	39	59		93	40
HSP	32	38	33	25	31	44	51	52		94	53
MUL	41	44		30						100	64
WHT	44	45	29	36	34	57	55	71		94	53
FRL	31	35	32	20	25	36	45	51		91	48

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	31	28	20	37	37	31	33		83	7
ELL	19	39	33	23	36	42	33	40		73	49
ASN	60	53		64	45			75		95	85
BLK	30	42	27	24	28	28	39	59		95	35
HSP	35	43	35	28	37	39	48	64		86	47
MUL	53	33						77		100	60
WHT	48	50	33	39	32	21	59	77		92	51
FRL	33	43	32	25	32	34	46	63		91	48

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	503
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	63
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	41
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	45
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	55
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	51
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	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our ELL and ESE populations in all core content areas scored need academic intervention and improvement to reach proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

9th grade ELA, Alg 1 and High school acceleration are areas that exhibit the greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Our teachers need to continue to learn how to desegregate the data during a professional learning team and identify needed action steps based on that data to improve student proficiency in core classes.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science (Biology) scores; in 20-21 BIO EOC proficiency was 49% and in 21-22 BIO EOC scores were 55% which was a 7% increase.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Consistent areas of coaching by the Science Coach; providing consistent procedures and expectations during academic and intervention time. The Science Coach led professional learning teams using the progress monitoring data to create interventions and enrichments using standards-based collaborative groups.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will implement the continued use of scheduled weekly intervention time, Professional Learning Teams with increased monitoring by administration and leadership team members, use of AVID strategies within core classes, across the school.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will engage in AVID/WICOR training throughout the year, focusing specifically on collaborative study groups which will engage all learners and increase proficiency in all core classes.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Students are provided intervention time in all their classes on a weekly basis, coaching cycles completed by academic coaches with teachers and new teachers are assigned a teacher mentor to work with throughout the year. Teachers are all in professional learning communities that support rigorous teaching and learning. In addition, teachers will participate in monthly professional development that focuses on collaborative study groups to create intervention and enrichment opportunities.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	We looked at our data for ELA achievement in both 9th and 10th grade as well as the targeted subgroups of ELL and ESE and we realized that in ELA, we remained the same in achievement gains. Therefore, we a plan was created to focus on increasing achievement in ELA.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Increase ELA achievement from 33% to 42%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The Literacy Coach and Principal will monitor teacher PLCs as well as complete coaching cycles with teachers in the classroom on collaborative study groups and other standards-based instructional strategies during intervention time.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Johana Santiago (johana.santiago@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	AVID strategies (gallery walks and strategy walks) with teacher peers as well as intervention time once a week during core classes focusing on collaborative study groups with students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	AVID strategies are proven high impact strategies that include collaboration and reading and critical thinking skills.

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.

LASSO interventions (remediation); professional learning teams will identify, gather and analyze data that identifies students in the lowest quartile, ELL and ESE to create targeted interventions that focus on skills, standards, extension of skills through the AVID strategy of Collaborative Study Groups.

Person Responsible	Johana Santiago (johana.santiago@osceolaschools.net)

Targeted bootcamps for students who are LY to prep for graduation ELA requirement and SAT/ACT prep.

Person Responsible	Dana Schmidt (dana.schmidt@osceolaschools.net)

Professional development calendar will focus on WICOR AVID strategies to increase student engagement and skills while developing teacher strategies through the AVID strategy of Gallery Walks.

Person Responsible	Erica Walters (erica.walters@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our math achievement data dropped from 26% to 25% in the 21-22 school year. We looked at our subgroup data and realized that we need to focus on our lowest quartile, ELL and ESE subgroups.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Increase our math achievement from 25% to 42% in the 22-23 school year.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will utilize Professional Learning Teams to evaluate progress monitoring data, interventions/extensions of learning using WICOR (standards-based) strategies and subgroups' targeted skills in order to increase student engagement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sandra Rodriguez Villegas (sandra.rodriguezvillegas@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Teachers will utilize collaborative study groups based on progress monitoring data during intervention time (LASSO) to increase student achievement and engagement in the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	AVID strategies are high-impact proven strategies.

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.

LASSO (interventions) will use progress monitoring data to identify target areas of practice to increase achievement. Bootcamps for ELL and lowest quartile students will be utilized prior to testing to increase achievement on particular skills identified during profess monitoring.

Person Responsible	Sandra Rodriguez Villegas (sandra.rodriguezvillegas@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Increase science instruction to improve proficiency from 55% to 58%. continue to strengthen our lowest quartile science students.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Professional learning teams will identify, gather, and analyze data that identifies students in the lowest quartile, ELL and ESE to create targeted interventions that focus on skills, standards, extension or skills through the AVID strategy of collaborative study groups.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	During PLTs, teachers will identify and monitor data that they collect during LASSO interventions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erica Walters (erica.walters@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	LASSO intervention time, collaborative study groups
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	AVID are high impact strategies that improve teaching and learning.

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.

Specialized intervention for the lowest quartile, ELL, and ESE students to improve instruction and learning within classes.

Person Responsible	Erica Walters (erica.walters@osceolaschools.net)

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school will utilize positive behavior intervention supports to increase student attendance and academic engagement while reducing student discipline by using HERO as the tool for both staff and students. The school will continue to have a campus-wide mentoring program through the MTSS process. Leadership team members will ensure that PLTs (professional learning teams) are collaborating and digging through data from intervention and progress monitoring to ensure that high impact strategies are being utilized in order to increase student achievement and engagement. The full-time Attendance Clerk supports the MTSS, LASSO (intervention time) and PBIS/HERO initiatives to increase student attendance, behavior and engagement in the classroom.

The school has a 94% graduation rate which attributes to our post-secondary planning. Our College and Career Counselor works with all grade levels to complete Xello lessons within core classes as well as meetings with individual students for post-secondary planning and goal-setting. The College and Career Counselor works with community members, military recruiters, as well as two and four-year universities to help students attain their post secondary goals.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Johana Santiago: Principal
Erica Walters: Assistant Principal
Ivet Rivera: Assistant Principal
Bronksy Bryant: Assistant Principal
Breanna Wilkerson: MTSS Coach
Ivet Ortiz, Dean of Students
Jonathan Zalinkas, Dean of Students
Guice Gallman, Dean of Students
Kim McGevna, Dean of Students
Jaquez Johnson, College and Career Counselor