
2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Olympia High
4301 S APOPKA VINELAND RD
Orlando, FL 32835
407-905-6400

School Demographics

School Type High School	Title I No	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate 40%
Alternative/ESE Center No	Charter School No	Minority Rate 61%

School Grades History

2013-14 A	2012-13 A	2011-12 A	2010-11 A
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

SIP Authority and Template

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

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, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
Differentiated Accountability	4
Part I: Current School Status	5
Part II: Expected Improvements	22
Goals Summary	28
Goals Detail	28
Action Plan for Improvement	31
Part III: Coordination and Integration	37
Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals	38
Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals	40

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. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. 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: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
 - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
 - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
 - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
 - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
 - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School

Olympia High

Principal

Guy Swenson

School Advisory Council chair

Tammy Brister and Helen Ford

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
Guy Swenson, Principal	Ava Green, Assistant Principal
Glenda Hammons, Assistant Principal	Sasha Russ, Assistant Principal
Nick Zambri, Assistant Principal	

District-Level Information

District

Orange

Superintendent

Dr. Barbara M. Jenkins

Date of school board approval of SIP

1/28/2014

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

Composition of SAC:

- Representative group of teachers, parents, administrators, and community members
- Principal must be a member
- Student membership required at high schools
- Racial/Ethnic make-up of SAC must reflect the make-up of student population
- Majority of SAC must be non-school employees

SAC officers and titles:

- Helen Ford. Co-chairperson
- Tammy Brister. Co-chairperson
- Debbie Lehman. Vice Chairperson
- Scott Ford. Finance Chairperson
- Mary Goracke Recording-Corresponding Secretary

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

This year, the SAC has reviewed the plan and suggested minor additions. Last year the SAC gave suggestions to modify the SIP and some of the suggestions were implemented.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

1. SAC will have approximately 8 meetings this year.
2. During the SAC meetings the school improvement plan will be reviewed and at times modified.
3. SAC will review and approve teacher and support team mini grants. The grants have historically ranged from \$50.00 to \$5,000.00. During this process teachers present their mini grant and explain how it improves the school, student performance and how it supports the School Improvement Plan.

Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project

School improvement funds are used for teacher and support team mini grants. The amount of each mini grant varies based on the project that it supports. The grants have historically ranged from \$50.00 to \$5,000.00. Typically a staff member comes to the meeting and presents their grant request. From there, the SAC discusses the grant and votes whether or not to approve.

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC

In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

N/A

Highly Qualified Staff

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

of administrators

5

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Guy Swenson

Principal

Years as Administrator: 7

Years at Current School: 7

Credentials

Bachelors, Mathematics, Indiana University
Masters, Educational Leadership, Stetson University

Performance Record

Contributing team member in achieving 4 school grades of A at Olympia High School.

Olympia High School

- 2012-2013 School Year – Pending Grade Projected A
65% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT (New Standard)
(District Average 54%/State Average 62%)

60% 3.0 or better in Grade 9 FCAT Reading (District Average 53%/State Average 63%)

67% 3.0 or better in Grade 10 FCAT Reading (District Average 52%/State Average 54%)

55% Level 3 and Above Algebra EOC

78% Level 3 and Above Biology EOC

73% Level 3 and Above Geometry EOC

52% Level 3 and Above History EOC

Over 90% Graduation rate

- 2011-2012 School Year –Grade A

Third in OCPS in the Algebra EOC Scores -53%

First in OCPS in the Geometry EOC

Over 90% Graduation rate

89% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT (New Standard)

59% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

- 2010 -2011 School Year – Grade A

91% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT

95% Graduation Rate

57% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

- 2009 -2010 School Year – Grade A

93% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT

57% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

- 2008 -2009 School Year – Grade A

The bottom 25% did reach AYP and Olympia earned a B

Olympia High School had the most quality points toward the school grade in OCPS

60% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

First in the District in FCAT Science

Responsible for all school operations.

Formally Assistant Principal of Instruction at Olympia High supervised Guidance, Mathematics, Science, Performing Arts, and Technology. Mathematics Coach at Jones High School
Mathematics performance on the FCAT improved greatly which led the school from an F to a D in 2007.

Sasha Russ

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 6

Years at Current School: 6

Credentials

Bachelors, Communications, University of South Florida
Masters, Educational Leadership, Stetson University

Performance Record

Contributing team member in achieving 4 school grades of A at Olympia High School.

Olympia High School

• 2012-2013 School Year – Pending Grade Projected A

65% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT (New Standard)
(District Average 54%/State Average 62%)

60% 3.0 or better in Grade 9 FCAT Reading (District Average 53%/State Average 63%)

67% 3.0 or better in Grade 10 FCAT Reading (District Average 52%/State Average 54%)

55% Level 3 and Above Algebra EOC

78% Level 3 and Above Biology EOC

73% Level 3 and Above Geometry EOC

52% Level 3 and Above History EOC

Over 90% Graduation rate

• 2011-2012 School Year –Grade A

Third in OCPS in the Algebra EOC Scores -53%

First in OCPS in the Geometry EOC

Over 90% Graduation rate

89% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT (New Standard)

59% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

• 2010 -2011 School Year – Grade A

91% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT

95% Graduation Rate

57% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

• 2009 -2010 School Year – Grade A

93% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT

57% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

• 2008 -2009 School Year – Grade A

The bottom 25% did reach AYP and Olympia earned a B

Olympia High School had the most quality points toward the school grade in OCPS

60% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

First in the District in FCAT Science

Assistant Principal of Instruction at Olympia High supervised Guidance and other curricular areas.

In previous years supervised Reading, Language Arts, and World Language departments.

Glenda Hammons

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 1

Years at Current School: 1

Credentials

Bachelor of Science, Sports Medicine Valdosta State University,
Master of Education, Educational Administration, University of Nebraska

Performance Record

Contributing team member in achieving a pending grade of A at Olympia High School and 2 school grades of A at Freedom High School.

- 2011-2012 School Year – Grade A

Algebra EOC Scores -49%

87% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT (New Standard)

42% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

- 2010 -2011 School Year – Grade B

FCAT Reading 50% Level 3 or higher

90% Graduation rate

90% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT

57% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

- 2009 -2010 School Year – Grade A

FCAT Reading 50% Level 3 or higher

87% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT

- 2008 -2009 School Year – Grade B

FCAT Reading 51% Level 3 or higher

92% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT

Subjects areas overseen Physical Education, AVID, APEX, World Language

Formerly CRT and Testing Coordinator at Freedom High School.

Ava Green

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 10

Years at Current School: 7

Credentials

Doctorate Organizational Leadership - Nova Southeastern University

Masters Educational Leadership -Nova Southeastern University

Bachelors - Speech Communication - University of South Florida

Performance Record

Contributing team member in achieving 4 school grades of A at Olympia High School.

Olympia High School

• 2012-2013 School Year – Pending Grade Projected A

65% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT (New Standard)

(District Average 54%/State Average 62%)

60% 3.0 or better in Grade 9 FCAT Reading (District Average 53%/State Average 63%)

67% 3.0 or better in Grade 10 FCAT Reading (District Average 52%/State Average 54%)

55% Level 3 and Above Algebra EOC

78% Level 3 and Above Biology EOC

73% Level 3 and Above Geometry EOC

52% Level 3 and Above History EOC

Over 90% Graduation rate

• 2011-2012 School Year –Grade A

Third in OCPS in the Algebra EOC Scores -53%

First in OCPS in the Geometry EOC

Over 90% Graduation rate

89% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT (New Standard)

59% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

• 2010 -2011 School Year – Grade A

91% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT

95% Graduation Rate

57% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

• 2009 -2010 School Year – Grade A

93% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT

57% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

• 2008 -2009 School Year – Grade A

The bottom 25% did reach AYP and Olympia earned a B

Olympia High School had the most quality points toward the school grade in OCPS

60% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

First in the District in FCAT Science

Subjects areas overseen Science, Visual Arts and ESOL

departments. During the 2009-2010, Olympia received an A

grade. In the 2009- 2010 school year Olympia received the highest science test scores in the district.

Nick Zambri

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 9

Years at Current School: 6

Credentials

Bachelors, Exceptional Education University of Central Florida
Masters, Educational Leadership Nova Southeastern University

Performance Record

Contributing team member in achieving 4 school grades of A at Olympia High School.

Olympia High School

- 2012-2013 School Year – Pending Grade Projected A
65% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT (New Standard)
(District Average 54%/State Average 62%)

- 60% 3.0 or better in Grade 9 FCAT Reading (District Average 53%/State Average 63%)

- 67% 3.0 or better in Grade 10 FCAT Reading (District Average 52%/State Average 54%)

- 55% Level 3 and Above Algebra EOC

- 78% Level 3 and Above Biology EOC

- 73% Level 3 and Above Geometry EOC

- 52% Level 3 and Above History EOC

- Over 90% Graduation rate

- 2011-2012 School Year –Grade A

- Third in OCPS in the Algebra EOC Scores -53%

- First in OCPS in the Geometry EOC

- Over 90% Graduation rate

- 89% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT (New Standard)

- 59% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

- 2010 -2011 School Year – Grade A

- 91% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT

- 95% Graduation Rate

- 57% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

- 2009 -2010 School Year – Grade A

- 93% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT

- 57% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

- 2008 -2009 School Year – Grade A

- The bottom 25% did reach AYP and Olympia earned a B

- Olympia High School had the most quality points toward the school grade in OCPS

- 60% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

- First in the District in FCAT Science

- Oversees ESE, Math, and Social Studies. Coordinated and

- oversaw all Saturday tutoring, reading/math tutoring, Graduation

- Preparation, managed and distributed 9th Grade data and

- generated failure letters for all grade levels.

Instructional Coaches**# of instructional coaches**

3

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:**Stephanie Johnson Possell -LRS**

Full-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 4

Years at Current School: 13

Areas

Data, RtI/MTSS, Other

Credentials

Bachelors, Health and Physical Education, East Stroudsburg;
Masters, Education Pennsylvania State University

Performance Record

Contributing team member in achieving 4 school grades of A at Olympia High School.

Olympia High School

- 2012-2013 School Year – Pending Grade Projected A
65% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT (New Standard)
(District Average 54%/State Average 62%)

- 60% 3.0 or better in Grade 9 FCAT Reading (District Average 53%/State Average 63%)

- 67% 3.0 or better in Grade 10 FCAT Reading (District Average 52%/State Average 54%)

- 55% Level 3 and Above Algebra EOC

- 78% Level 3 and Above Biology EOC

- 73% Level 3 and Above Geometry EOC

- 52% Level 3 and Above History EOC

- Over 90% Graduation rate

- 2011-2012 School Year –Grade A

- Third in OCPS in the Algebra EOC Scores -53%

- First in OCPS in the Geometry EOC

- Over 90% Graduation rate

- 89% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT (New Standard)

- 59% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

- 2010 -2011 School Year – Grade A

- 91% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT

- 95% Graduation Rate

- 57% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

- 2009 -2010 School Year – Grade A

- 93% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT

- 57% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

- 2008 -2009 School Year – Grade A

- The bottom 25% did reach AYP and Olympia earned a B

- Olympia High School had the most quality points toward the school grade in OCPS

- 60% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

- First in the District in FCAT Science

Classroom teacher and mentor for 22 years. Has been at Olympia since 2001 earning 4 A rankings and all other years our school has earned a B ranking. Stephanie was Olympia Teacher of the year in 2008 and was named one of the county's top 5 teachers.

Angela X. Kahn-Reading Coach

Full-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 4

Years at Current School: 7

Areas

Reading/Literacy, RtI/MTSS

CredentialsBachelors, English, Rollins
College**Performance Record**Contributing team member in achieving 4 school grades of A at
Olympia High School.

Olympia High School

• 2012-2013 School Year – Pending Grade Projected A

65% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT (New Standard)
(District Average 54%/State Average 62%)60% 3.0 or better in Grade 9 FCAT Reading (District Average
53%/State Average 63%)67% 3.0 or better in Grade 10 FCAT Reading (District Average
52%/State Average 54%)

55% Level 3 and Above Algebra EOC

78% Level 3 and Above Biology EOC

73% Level 3 and Above Geometry EOC

52% Level 3 and Above History EOC

Over 90% Graduation rate

• 2011-2012 School Year –Grade A

Third in OCPS in the Algebra EOC Scores -53%

First in OCPS in the Geometry EOC

Over 90% Graduation rate

89% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT (New Standard)

59% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

• 2010 -2011 School Year – Grade A

91% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT

95% Graduation Rate

57% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

• 2009 -2010 School Year – Grade A

93% Meeting the Writing Standard for FCAT

57% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

• 2008 -2009 School Year – Grade A

The bottom 25% did reach AYP and Olympia earned a B

Olympia High School had the most quality points toward the
school grade in OCPS

60% 3.0 or better in FCAT Reading

First in the District in FCAT Science

Classroom teacher at Apopka High School and Olympia High
School. Current Reading Coach at Olympia High School where
OHS has earned an A, B, A, A, respectively in the years working
at Olympia. In process of working on a masters degree in
education with a focus in reading.

Lorna Wooten-Inclusion Coach

Full-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 0

Years at Current School: 0

Areas

Other

Credentials

B.A. Psychology-University of Missouri-St.Louis, M.A.-Counseling and Psychology -Troy University, Licensed Mental Health Counselor(LMHC)

Performance Record

2001-2005-ESE Teacher

Lorna Wooten was secondary ESE teacher for 4 years at an alternative school. Ms . Wooten used the student's unique learning styles to design/implement lesson plans that promoted learning gains.

2005-2013-Staffing Specialist.

In this position she functioned as a part of a team to develop behavioral intervention plans and coordinated services for students with educational disabilities. Ms. Wooten also trained staff on IEPs and monitored the implementation/compliance of IEPs. Represented Silver Star Center at disciplinary meetings.

Classroom Teachers**# of classroom teachers**

154

receiving effective rating or higher

154, 100%

Highly Qualified Teachers

100%

certified in-field

154, 100%

ESOL endorsed

7, 5%

reading endorsed

7, 5%

with advanced degrees

60, 39%

National Board Certified

17, 11%

first-year teachers

4, 3%

with 1-5 years of experience

52, 34%

with 6-14 years of experience

71, 46%

with 15 or more years of experience

27, 18%

Education Paraprofessionals**# of paraprofessionals**

7

Highly Qualified

7, 100%

Other Instructional Personnel**# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above**

0

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

Recruitment: To recruit teachers we use the school's record of success to make applying at Olympia appealing. Additionally, we use the OCPS recruiting system to get the properly certified candidates. We only hire in field teachers. Our system of selection is as follows, the school secretary looks at the applications and resumes of the teachers and field. A selection committee of teacher leaders and an assistant principal conduct interviews and narrow the group of candidates to one or two candidates selected by the principal.

Retain: To retain and motivate teachers several things are used:

1. Professional relationships that promote effective practices and excellence
2. On-site inservices to require points
3. Opportunities for leadership and advancement
4. Fair and consistent evaluations
5. Input on classes teachers teach
6. PLCs
7. Staff functions to build camaraderie
8. Staff recognition for excellence
9. SAC grants

The principal, assistant principals, instructional coaches and teacher leaders are responsible for these processes.

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

Olympia High School's Learning Resource Specialist (LRS) is in charge of our school mentoring programs. The LRS pairs each new teacher with someone in his or her field who would like to guide a

new teacher or teacher that's new to the district. There are many formal and informal meetings over the school year to give support in all the elements of teaching. Support opportunities include meetings with: the designated Professional Learning Community (PLC), the mentor teacher, and the LRS. Additionally, staff developments are provided the entire year.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI)

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

Olympia High School's data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness are as follows:

1. Core Instruction - Our core instruction uses the common core standards as well as district and state data in each subject area. Teachers meet in Professional Learning Communities (PLC) groups to make sure instruction is given consistently and tests have fidelity. There are cross curricular meetings in multiple areas.
2. Resource Allocation (Funding and Staffing) - The principal of the school is responsible for the allocation of funding and all staff members are in the appropriate area for staffing. Resources are allocated by the principal and the administrative team.
3. Teacher Support Systems - The Learning Resource Specialist (LRS) along with the administrative team is responsible for our teacher support systems. There is ongoing staff development for seasoned staff members and staff developments for new teachers to support them. Each new teacher is paired with a mentor that oversees the new teachers transition to the classroom. The new evaluation system also gives our new teachers extra support.
4. Small Group and Individual Student Needs - Small group and individual needs are met through the use of IEP's, parent-teacher conferences, and 504 plans. Data is used for proper class placement and course selection as well. Additionally guidance counselors meet with specific students to make sure that students are provided the right coursework to meet their academic success.

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

Principal: Guy Swenson;
 Assistant Principals: Ava Green, Glenda Hammons, Sasha Russ, Nick Zambri;
 Deans: Jason Greer, Stevie Oliver, Hector Serrano, Lauren Bradley; Doug Farley
 CT: Mariela Laracuente;
 ESE Placement Specialist: Patti Wissig;
 Learning Resource Specialist: Stephanie Possell;
 Reading Coach: Angela Kahn;
 Inclusion Coach: Lorna Wooton;
 Department Leaders: Greg Isaacson, Nancy Coleson, Chris Conrad, Nancy Bridge, Ed Budd, Stephanie Adolph, and Sylvia D'Torres

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

MTSS – once a parent or a teacher recommends that a student be tested for learning disabilities or psychological evaluation the MTSS process is started. We have two different flow charts that we use for this process. One is when the request is teacher initiated, and the other is when a parent initiates. The student's counselor organizes three separate meetings and records interventions that the teacher has attempted and will attempt in the classroom. MTSS meetings are held bi-weekly to discuss data. The

process results in a recommendation to test the student, or if the parent still wishes it to happen, the case is then turned over to our school psychologist and our staffing specialist, who make the final recommendations or issue an IEP/504 for the student.

SIP – We use a combination of data on EDW, Pearson, and Performance Matters to monitor if the academic goals on the SIP are met each year. Data is then collected by the testing coordinator and sent out to the admin and/or the teachers so adjustments can be made.

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

SMS – reports can be pulled off of SMS to find targeted information related to academics, testing, attendance, or behavior. This is only valid for the current year, though, so EDW is a better source if you wish to look at past years or multiple years together.

EDW – this is the County's collection point for each year's data once it is processed. This is the best place to look at school or district-wide trends in academic, discipline, attendance, or graduation data. This is usually compiled at the end of the year, so if data is needed quicker, SMS or Performance Matters is a better source.

Performance Matters – this is now the District's data collection program for state and locally administered testing such as FCAT, EOC, Benchmarks, and FAA. Reports can be individualized for teachers and sent to them, but training is also provided so all teachers can pull their own data to drive their own specific instruction.

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

The plan will help staff and parents understand database problem solving and MTSS in the following ways:

1. There will be staff developments on performance matters and other various ways to get data
2. Staff will understand the School Improvement Plan will go over it in several sessions
3. During SAC we will overview the School Improvement Plan and the data.
4. We will make opportunities for the parents to see the School Improvement Plan emphasizing the MTSS process.
5. Communicator goals through newsletter emails and act parent meetings.

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Weekend Program**Minutes added to school year: 3,000**

Olympia High School has developed a student preparation and tutoring program that has allowed us to increase our graduation rate, Advanced Placement success rate, and EOC success rate. Our program was developed using a tiered system that integrates students of all levels. We offer a Saturday program that provides tutoring and enrichment for students in need of graduation assistance, Algebra and Biology EOC tutoring, and Advanced Placement and Honors acceleration. Through this program we are also able to offer physical fitness courses and ESOL enrichment. The full implementation of this graduation prep-tutoring-acceleration program allows Olympia High School to increase the amount and quality of learning we provide while also providing teachers and staff with additional professional development and collaboration opportunities.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education
- Teacher collaboration, planning and professional development

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Data is collected at a variety of levels for this program. Teachers collect attendance records for each week. Furthermore, teachers and students monitor academic success both inside of this program and for the student's school week classes. Administration monitors the success of the program through the teacher lesson plans, student attendance, student performance data, and grade reports.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Students are responsible for monitoring their own success, the program teachers monitor their classroom success, and the program administration monitors the success of courses, teachers and students as well as that of the overall program.

Seth Knight and Nora Pachnik coordinate this program under the direction of Nick Zambri and Ava Green.

Strategy: Extended Day for All Students**Minutes added to school year:** 1,440

After school tutoring is provided to students in preparation for the Algebra I and Geometry EOC. Instruction is focused on benchmark and test taking skills.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Benchmark assessment scores and EOC scores are collected to track the progress of students participating in the after school tutoring program to see if their scores increase over time. The EOC scores of students participating in the program vs. not participating in the program are compared to see if the participating students' scores are higher than those of their counterparts.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Natasha Zapata coordinates this program under the direction of Nick Zambri.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)**Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT**

Name	Title
Angela Kahn	Literacy Coach
Guy Swenson	Principal
Nick Zambri	Assistant Principal
Sasha Russ	Assistant Principal
Ava Green	Assistant Principal
Glenda Hammons	Assistant Principal
Stephanie Possell	LRS
Mariela Laracuente	CCT
Molly Sidwell	Safe Coordinator
Doug Farley	Academic Dean
Lauren Bradley	Dean
Jason Greer	Dean
Stevie Oliver	Dean
Hector Serrano	Attendance Dean
Tom Curran	Athletic Director
Nancy Bardoe	Media Specialist
Bill Connell	Media Specialist

How the school-based LLT functions

The LLT collaborates twice a month in an effort to develop cross curricular campus wide reading proficiency. Additionally, meetings with individual reading teachers are completed on a weekly basis by our reading coach. In these meetings, student data from the bottom 25% is analyzed and strategies are put into place that will maximize success.

In this process, the principal implements the school's vision for increasing reading scores in the lowest quartile. The assistant principals analyze data with the help of the administrative deans and other members of the LLT. The Reading Coach assists the instructional staff in implementation of best practice for reading.

In addition, the LLT supports reading in the content areas across the curriculum. All teachers are given reading data and expected to use it in tandem with the best practices to improve overall reading scores. Senior members of the team delegate responsibilities and follow up on implementation of the plans.

Major initiatives of the LLT

The LLT will continue to use data to ensure the following initiatives are implemented in an effort to increase Olympia High School's reading scores:

1. Data will be used to target the bottom 25% in reading. Instructional staff will be provided reading data for their students to analyze in order to differentiate instruction appropriately.
2. Instructional staff support in the area of literacy and writing workshops will be provided on an ongoing basis.
3. The LLT will increase their proficiency in obtaining, disaggregating and distributing data to classroom personnel across the curriculum.
4. The Media Center and other areas of school instructional support will endeavor to recognize literacy through a variety of means including: Celebrate Literacy Week, Banned Book Week, and various cultural awareness months. Instructional personnel will support this effort in their classrooms.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

Teachers are diligent in using multiple sources of reading data in designing instruction. They participate in data chats concerning progress monitoring reading data, such as Benchmarks and Fair data.

Additionally, teachers are encouraged to utilize content area reading strategies and are supported in this effort through the Reading Coach, Reading teachers, and multiple resources such as McRel's Teaching Reading in the Content Areas. Departments are provided professional development in literacy strategies by our Reading Coach and other expert teachers in such areas as Close Reading, Text Dependent Questioning, and Comprehension Tools.

College and Career Readiness

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future

The school applies college readiness to seek and identify students who are able to take honor courses and Advanced Placement courses. Guidance Counselors discuss with students their class selections as a path to college, military and vocational occupations. Teachers as well discuss with students the possible future occupations and their courses they are taking. For example, a student taking Anatomy Honors is most likely interested in medicine and or the physical occupation field. It is in the curriculum of the class to discuss future occupations from knowledge of Anatomy.

How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful

All students meet with their Guidance Counselor in the spring of the school year to discuss their course selection for next year. The team reviews recent test scores, grades and future testing. They also review future plans after graduation. During the fall of student's senior year, Guidance Counselors provide a "Senior Interview". During this meeting, the counselor discusses college, career and what processes need to be accomplished so the student can graduate with an expectation of post-secondary education.

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

The school reviews reports of AP data and exam pass rate. Also taken in consideration is data from Collegeboard and ACT of the number of students and the mean score. Students who receive high test scores in FCAT are strongly encouraged to take AP classes and honor classes. Also the state mandated PERT Score is also given to the students for College Readiness data.

Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	71%	64%	No	74%
American Indian				
Asian	77%	68%	No	79%
Black/African American	53%	44%	No	57%
Hispanic	62%	53%	No	66%
White	83%	81%	No	84%
English language learners	42%	25%	No	48%
Students with disabilities	43%	33%	No	48%
Economically disadvantaged	57%	50%	No	61%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	316	24%	26%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	559	40%	45%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		40%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		20%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	818	70%	75%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	206	67%	72%

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	93	65%	70%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	67	47%	50%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	67	47%	50%

Postsecondary Readiness

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.	349	56%	61%

Area 2: Writing

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	464	64%	75%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	11	68%	75%

Area 3: Mathematics**High School Mathematics****Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA**

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	62%	74%	Yes	66%
American Indian				
Asian	80%	86%	Yes	82%
Black/African American	51%	56%	Yes	56%
Hispanic	63%	69%	Yes	67%
White	68%	88%	Yes	71%
English language learners	57%	50%	No	61%
Students with disabilities	45%	47%	Yes	51%
Economically disadvantaged	55%	62%	Yes	60%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		40%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		10%

Learning Gains

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (EOC and FAA)	693	78%	83%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (EOC)	157	58%	65%

Postsecondary Readiness

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.	349	68%	75%

Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	291	36%	40%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	124	19%	23%

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	201	29%	35%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	298	43%	45%

Area 4: Science**High School Science****Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		45%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		65%

Biology I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	257	36%	40%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	293	41%	45%

Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)**All Levels**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	2		5
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	111	80%	85%

High Schools

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses	1678	56%	60%
Completion rate (%) for students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses		93%	96%
Students taking one or more advanced placement exams for STEM-related courses	0	0%	0%
CTE-STEM program concentrators	104		110
Students taking CTE-STEM industry certification exams	6	1%	10%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE-STEM industry certification exams		67%	80%

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses	677	24%	725%
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more <i>accelerated</i> courses	42	2%	3%
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> courses		90%	92%
Students taking CTE industry certification exams	6	1%	10%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams		67%	75%
CTE program concentrators	16	1%	2%
CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications	1	0%	3%

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

High School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	381	8%	7%
Students in ninth grade with one or more absences within the first 20 days	194	26%	20%
Students in ninth grade who fail two or more courses in any subject	117	16%	12%
Students with grade point average less than 2.0	609	20%	17%
Students who fail to progress on-time to tenth grade	93	13%	10%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	313	11%	9%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	383	13%	11%

Graduation

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students dropping out of school, as defined in s.1003.01(9), F.S.	3	0%	0%
Students graduating in 4 years, using criteria for the federal uniform graduation rate defined in the Code of Federal Regulations at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)	633	93%	96%
Academically at-risk students graduating in 4 years, as defined in Rule 6A-1.09981, F.A.C.	89	13%	10%
Students graduating in 5 years, using criteria defined at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)	1	0%	0%

Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Parental involvement targets for the school

Olympia High School will maintain 15,000 volunteer hours, we will increase parent attendance at beginning of the year attendance events and we will increase the amount of 9th grade students and families who log on to Progressbook.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
New Student Orientation	456	45%	50%
9th Grade APEX Orientation	100	83%	90%
Progressbook logon for 9th grade students and families	695	84%	95%

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

Specific Additional Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
--------	---------------	---------------	---------------

Goals Summary

- G1.** Olympia High School' student achievement in the lower quartile in all subject areas will increase with the implementation of the MTSS process with fidelity which includes desegregating data and analyzing data for specific subgroups.
- G2.** Olympia High School' student achievement in their FCAT Writing Scores will increase with the implementation of staff developments including writing in the content areas, use of data, and differentiation of instruction.

Goals Detail

G1. Olympia High School' student achievement in the lower quartile in all subject areas will increase with the implementation of the MTSS process with fidelity which includes desegregating data and analyzing data for specific subgroups.

Targets Supported

- All Areas
- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, Learning Gains, CELLA)
- Writing
- Math (High School, High School AMO's, High School FAA, High School FAA, High School Postsecondary Readiness)
- Algebra 1 EOC
- Geometry EOC
- Social Studies
- U.S. History EOC
- Civics EOC
- Science
- Science - High School
- Science - Biology 1 EOC
- STEM
- STEM - All Levels
- STEM - High School

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- MTSS team, leadership team, assessment data, teachers, computer labs, core reading and math programs, materials and training.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- The teachers do not meet the diverse academic needs and differentiating instruction.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

The MTSS process will be implemented to increase achievement in the lower quartile.

Person or Persons Responsible

The administrative team and teachers

Target Dates or Schedule:

Ongoing

Evidence of Completion:

Assessment data

G2. Olympia High School' student achievement in their FCAT Writing Scores will increase with the implementation of staff developments including writing in the content areas, use of data, and differentiation of instruction.

Targets Supported

- Reading (FCAT2.0, Learning Gains, CELLA)
- Writing
- Social Studies
- U.S. History EOC
- Science
- Science - High School
- Science - Biology 1 EOC
- STEM
- STEM - High School

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Olympia High School's resources for student achievement in FCAT Writing scores include: LRS, leadership team, assessment data, teachers, computer labs for writing practice, writing prompts, materials and training.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Not all teachers are using writing in their content area and writing rubrics are not incorporated in grading student writing.
- New teachers have a difficult time dis-aggregating writing data for students and are not using the data drive instruction.

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

The MTSS process will be implemented to increase writing scores

Person or Persons Responsible

The administrative team and teachers

Target Dates or Schedule:

Ongoing

Evidence of Completion:

Assessment data

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. Olympia High School' student achievement in the lower quartile in all subject areas will increase with the implementation of the MTSS process with fidelity which includes desegregating data and analyzing data for specific subgroups.

G1.B2 The teachers do not meet the diverse academic needs and differentiating instruction.

G1.B2.S1 Teachers will be given professional development on disaggregating data to help support differentiating instruction the class (I,S).

Action Step 1

Professional development for differentiated instruction and data disaggregation.

Person or Persons Responsible

All teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October and ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Sign-in Sheets and Classroom walk throughs

Facilitator:

LRS and other trainers

Participants:

All teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B2.S1

IObservation

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative Team

Target Dates or Schedule

Daily

Evidence of Completion

Teachers will be using differentiated instruction when applicable.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S1

Monitoring of instruction based on I Observation data that teachers are using best practices.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative team

Target Dates or Schedule

Bi-weekly

Evidence of Completion

Assessment data

G1.B2.S3 The LRS and other administrative support team members will assist teachers with creating rigorous centers that target student's specific learning needs (I).

Action Step 1

Creating rigorous tasks and centers

Person or Persons Responsible

All reading and language arts teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October and ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Assessment data

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B2.S3

Specific target rigorous centers

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative team

Target Dates or Schedule

Daily

Evidence of Completion

Assessment data.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S3

Classroom walk throughs and IObservations

Person or Persons Responsible

The Administrative team

Target Dates or Schedule

daily

Evidence of Completion

Assessment data

G2. Olympia High School' student achievement in their FCAT Writing Scores will increase with the implementation of staff developments including writing in the content areas, use of data, and differentiation of instruction.

G2.B1 Not all teachers are using writing in their content area and writing rubrics are not incorporated in grading student writing.

G2.B1.S1 Teachers will be asked to incorporate writing in their lesson plans and instruction weekly (I).

Action Step 1

Teachers will include writing in their content area in their plans weekly.

Person or Persons Responsible

All teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October and on-going

Evidence of Completion

Plans on Sharepoint.

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B1.S1

Monitor plans on Sharepoint and through teacher observation

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative team

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Teacher plans and I-Observations

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S1

Monitor of writing prompts and teacher input

Person or Persons Responsible

The administrative team

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Assessment data, student performance data

G2.B3 New teachers have a difficult time dis-aggregating writing data for students and are not using the data drive instruction.

G2.B3.S1 New teachers will be given professional development on disaggregating data to help support writing instruction the class (I, S).

Action Step 1

Professional development on disaggregating data to help support writing instruction the class.

Person or Persons Responsible

First year teachers and selected teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October and ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Sign-in sheets

Facilitator:

LRS/Selected Staff

Participants:

First year teachers and selected teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B3.S1

Sign-in sheets and exit slips from staff developments

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative team and the LRS

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Sign-in sheets and exit slips from staff developments/IObservation data

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B3.S1

Monitoring of instruction based on IObservation data that new teachers are using best practices.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrative team

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

New teachers are using best practices when teaching and monitoring writing

Coordination and Integration

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Title II funds are used for Professional Development Training. The professional development opportunities include paying for training outside of our school, bringing a trainer into our school, and substitutes so our teachers can attend trainings.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Olympia High School' student achievement in the lower quartile in all subject areas will increase with the implementation of the MTSS process with fidelity which includes desegregating data and analyzing data for specific subgroups.

G1.B2 The teachers do not meet the diverse academic needs and differentiating instruction.

G1.B2.S1 Teachers will be given professional development on disaggregating data to help support differentiating instruction the class (I,S).

PD Opportunity 1

Professional development for differentiated instruction and data disaggregation.

Facilitator

LRS and other trainers

Participants

All teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October and ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Sign-in Sheets and Classroom walk thoughts

G2. Olympia High School' student achievement in their FCAT Writing Scores will increase with the implementation of staff developments including writing in the content areas, use of data, and differentiation of instruction.

G2.B3 New teachers have a difficult time dis-aggregating writing data for students and are not using the data drive instruction.

G2.B3.S1 New teachers will be given professional development on disaggregating data to help support writing instruction the class (I, S).

PD Opportunity 1

Professional development on disaggregating data to help support writing instruction the class.

Facilitator

LRS/Selected Staff

Participants

First year teachers and selected teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

October and ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Sign-in sheets

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
G1.	Olympia High School' student achievement in the lower quartile in all subject areas will increase with the implementation of the MTSS process with fidelity which includes desegregating data and analyzing data for specific subgroups.	\$1,000
Total		\$1,000

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Professional Development	Total
Title II	\$1,000	\$1,000
Total	\$1,000	\$1,000

Budget Details

Budget items identified in the SIP as necessary to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Olympia High School' student achievement in the lower quartile in all subject areas will increase with the implementation of the MTSS process with fidelity which includes desegregating data and analyzing data for specific subgroups.

G1.B2 The teachers do not meet the diverse academic needs and differentiating instruction.

G1.B2.S1 Teachers will be given professional development on disaggregating data to help support differentiating instruction the class (I,S).

Action Step 1

Professional development for differentiated instruction and data disaggregation.

Resource Type

Professional Development

Resource

LRS and Presenters

Funding Source

Title II

Amount Needed

\$1,000