Olympia High

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Olympia High

4301 S APOPKA VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32835

https://olympiahs.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Christy Gorberg

Start Date for this Principal: 6/30/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2019-20 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	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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.](http://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.

Table of Contents

Olympia High

4301 S APOPKA VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32835

https://olympiahs.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	51%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	B

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bradley, Lauren	Administrative Support	
Pachnik, Nora	Assistant Principal	
Green, Ava	Assistant Principal	
Pagan-Pearl, Michael	Teacher, K-12	
Wooten, Lorna	Administrative Support	
Laracuente, Mariela	Instructional Coach	
Perrotti, August	School Counselor	
Korkes, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Hames, Nigel	Assistant Principal	
McMiller, Crystal	Instructional Coach	
Gorberg, Christy	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/30/2020, Christy Gorberg

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
20

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2019-20 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	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

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	701	776	730	811	3018
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	180	195	214	678
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	49	36	36	166
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160	359	291	239	1049
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	318	285	272	1034
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	156	149	102	540
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	157	56	133	481
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	212	361	299	290	1162

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	1	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	5	6	20

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/2/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	803	891	764	866	3324
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	93	98	58	341
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142	106	72	52	372
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	368	401	276	222	1267
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	229	229	149	35	642

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	259	263	180	66	768

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	3	7	17	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	11	15	21	62

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	803	891	764	866	3324
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	93	98	58	341
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142	106	72	52	372
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	368	401	276	222	1267
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	229	229	149	35	642

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	259	263	180	66	768

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	3	7	17	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	11	15	21	62

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	59%	55%	56%	61%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	53%	51%	54%	46%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	40%	42%	45%	34%	41%
Math Achievement	45%	43%	51%	39%	34%	49%
Math Learning Gains	56%	49%	48%	38%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	46%	45%	34%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	73%	70%	68%	68%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	73%	73%	84%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**				**Total**
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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**
09	2019	53%	52%	1%	55%	-2%
	2018	56%	50%	6%	53%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	59%	50%	9%	53%	6%
	2018	57%	49%	8%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

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	70%	67%	3%	67%	3%
2018	69%	62%	7%	65%	4%
Compare		1%			

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	77%	69%	8%	70%	7%
2018	77%	65%	12%	68%	9%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	45%	63%	-18%	61%	-16%
2018	35%	61%	-26%	62%	-27%
Compare		10%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	53%	-6%	57%	-10%
2018	62%	65%	-3%	56%	6%
Compare		-15%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	29	29	18	47	60	42	45		91	48
ELL	36	60	58	41	56	50	63	69		97	51
ASN	77	60	38	70	74		85	95		99	83
BLK	39	45	44	29	49	53	51	67		98	39
HSP	50	58	53	44	52	47	72	78		98	58
MUL	60	59		50			92	80		100	73
WHT	77	62	40	62	65	67	88	90		98	78
FRL	46	51	47	39	56	57	63	73		97	53
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	22	40	38	35	37	46	38	59		87	21
ELL	33	55	54	49	57	56	57	60		93	32
ASN	83	68	75	69	53		89	90		97	74
BLK	45	47	35	34	34	30	54	66		95	37
HSP	51	57	57	53	53	48	67	80		95	45
MUL	52	60		73	50		53	100		100	65
WHT	73	58	43	70	55	52	82	90		97	72
FRL	49	52	44	46	45	41	62	72		95	43

2017 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	18	25	33	21	35	42	23	62		87	21
ELL	23	47	46	25	37	36	46	74		87	37
AMI	64	45		50	45						
ASN	76	63	64	57	49	29	81	85		96	66
BLK	43	46	37	25	31	31	52	67		91	38
HSP	53	51	46	34	38	35	66	86		92	52
MUL	77	50		35	28		71	92		81	71
WHT	74	61	56	52	41	39	80	95		96	69
FRL	48	48	42	31	34	33	59	76		90	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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	703
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Native American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	76
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	52
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	62
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	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	73
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.

Algebra overall shows the lowest performance. A 45% achievement in 2019 represents a 10% improvement over prior year. The improvement in achievement is based upon a more clearly aligned PLC which focuses on standards based instruction and uses data to determine needed interventions and remediation.

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

The greatest decline in performance from prior year was in Geometry at 47% for a 15% decline. The decline is contributed to by a lack of intense focus on standards alignment.

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.

Algebra had the greatest gap when compared to the state performance, at 16%, and geometry's gap was next at 10%. These gaps can be attributed to over scaffolding for background knowledge and lack of intense on standard instruction.

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

Biology and US History are both up 5% over the previous year. This can be attributed to a focus on PLC alignment and using data to inform instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The major area of concern from the EWS data is the achievement level of our ESE children, which fell across all content areas.

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

1. Algebra
2. Geometry
3. ELA 10
4. ELA 9
5. SWD

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improve student achievement on high-stakes assessments by utilizing collaborative common planning to produce high-quality and rigorous standards-based instruction and assessments. School leadership will guide the PLC planning and collaboration process. Improving the Professional Learning Community (PLC) alignment will increase the overall student achievement. This was identified as need through our school survey.
Measurable Outcome:	This area of focus will be measured through the Alg 1 EOC, FSA ELA, Geometry EOC, Biology EOC and US History EOC achievement rates. We will compare the 18-19 results to the 20-21 results. 1. Increase ELA from 59% to 62%; Increase ELA Gains from 56% to 59%; Increase ELA 25% Gains from 47% to 50% 2. Increase Math from 45% to 48%; Increase Math Gains from 56% to 59%; Increase Math 25% Gains from 54% to 57% 3. Increase Biology from 73% to 76% 4. Increase U.S. History from 80% to 83%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie A Johnson Possell (stephanie.johnsonpossell@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ongoing monitoring will occur to ensure all professional learning communities are planning high quality instruction collaboratively and students are afforded the intervention and remediation opportunities needed to ensure an overall improvement in achievement as well as a closing of subgroup achievement gaps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Targets Supported by the plan for improvement: •Algebra I EOC Pass Rate •U.S. History EOC Pass 0 •FSA ELA Achievement •Bio I EOC Pass •Geometry EOC Pass Rate Resources available to Help Support the plan for improvement: • Instructional coaches • Support facilitators • Targeted professional development • District support personnel • District provided CRMs • School based administration

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze student achievement levels and identify trends and subgroup performance gaps
2. Identify teachers and students who need additional support to achieve success
3. Provide enrichment and remediation opportunities to identified teachers and students
4. Monitor progress on targeted achievement levels
5. Adjust interventions to support identified trends
6. Build our culture of collaboration between professionals to increase student success in all subgroups.

7. Develop and implement a system of teaching social behaviors.
8. Increase our systematic use of explicit instruction.
9. Explicitly teach students to maintain and generalize new learning across time and settings.

Person Responsible   Christy Gorberg (christy.gorberg@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students will achieve post-secondary readiness through accelerated course work in college readiness courses, AP courses and/or CTE Dual Enrollment courses. This need was identified as critical through data analysis that compared our achievement to comparable schools in the state. The focus on post-secondary readiness will ensure students are provided the access to rigorous courses and the supports needed for them to achieve success in the rigorous courses. This was identified as a need based upon school grade analysis.
Measurable Outcome:	The area of focus will impact our four-year graduation rate and our high school acceleration rate. We will continue to support our graduation rate while increasing the number of students who graduate college and career ready. We will compare the 18-19 results to the 20-21 results. Acceleration will improve from 58.6% to 75% Graduation rate will improve from 98% to 99%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dianalin Melendez (39014@ocps.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. An intense focus on student data for Industry Cert, AP, DE, ACT, SAT, and teacher common assessments will be monitored for students' post-secondary readiness. 2. Increase our systematic approach to providing scaffolded supports. 3. Students generate inferences and elaborate to provide evidence that demonstrates an understanding of learned content.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	An intense focus on post-secondary readiness with our students will ensure our students graduate with a skill set that provides them opportunities for success after high school. Scaffolded supports provide temporary assistance to students so they can successfully complete tasks that they cannot yet do independently and with a high rate of success.Teachers select powerful visual, verbal and written supports; carefully calibrate them to students' performance and understanding in relation to learning tasks; use them flexibly; evaluate their effectiveness; and gradually remove them once they are no longer needed. Students must be skilled at generating valid conclusions based on content in order to support future analytical thinking and enhance comprehension. Resources available include: • CTE Career Specialist • After school tutoring • AP tutoring • College and Career Resource Center (CCRC) • Academic Lab • College and Career Specialist • Instructional Leadership Team

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze student enrollment against student acceleration
2. Identify students needing additional opportunities and support to achieve success
3. Identify additional opportunities to engage students in post-secondary readiness courses

4. Provide enrichment and remediation opportunities for students requiring additional support
5. Monitor student progress and adjust remediation opportunities to target gaps in learning and performance.
6. Build our culture of collaboration between professionals to increase student success.
7. Build up our system of interpretation and communication of assessment information that is shared between stakeholders to collaboratively design and implement educational programs.

Person Responsible   Dianalin Melendez (39014@ocps.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students will graduate prepared for long-term success in life and as responsible, caring citizens in our multicultural society. Students will develop the ability to communicate and interact responsibly with peers and staff which will help students advocate for themselves. Student self-advocacy will support student learning in the classroom through empowering the students to feel comfortable to ask questions and challenge ideas. This was identified as a need on the student survey.
Measurable Outcome:	The area of focus will impact our referral rate and our repeat offender rate. We will continue to support our students while decreasing the number of students who get classroom behavior referrals. We will compare the 18-19 results to the 20-21 results. Overall all offense rate will improve from 12.2% to 8% Repeat offense rate will improve from 38% to 20%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lauren Bradley (62674@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. An intense focus on restorative justice practices will be employed and monitored to ensure students are focusing on communication with peers. 2.An intense focus on restorative justice practices will be employed and monitored to ensure students are focusing on communication with teachers. 3. Increase our systematic approach to providing scaffolded supports for social and emotional needs and classroom behaviors..
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	An intense focus on communication and self-advocacy with our students will ensure our students graduate with a skill set that provides them opportunities for success after high school. Scaffolded supports provide temporary assistance to students so they can successfully communicate and advocate even if they cannot yet do it independently. Staff will help provide powerful visual, verbal and written supports; carefully calibrate them to students' performance and understanding in relation to learning tasks; use them flexibly; evaluate their effectiveness; and gradually remove the tools once they are no longer needed. Students must be skilled at generating communicating and advocating. Resources available include: • Guidance Services • Discipline Deans • College and Career Resource Center (CCRC) • SAFE Coordinator • School Social Worker • Social and Emotional Training • Character Lab • Instructional Leadership Team

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze trends in student concerns within the AdvancED survey.
2. Train and support teachers on the use of CASEL strategies in the classroom.
3. Identify students needing additional opportunities and support to achieve success.
4. Identify additional opportunities to engage students in self awareness and self management activities.
5. Provide training and support for all staff on restorative justice practices.
5. Monitor student progress and adjust remediation opportunities to target gaps in learning and performance.

6. Build our culture of collaboration between professionals to increase student success.
7. Build up our system of interpretation and communication of assessment information that is shared between stakeholders to collaboratively design and implement educational programs.

Person Responsible   Lauren Bradley (62674@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The school leadership team will address the gaps in subgroup performance by educating our teachers on their existence and supporting teacher's targeted learning on strategies designed to support the subgroups. Subgroup performance will become an integral part of our PLC discussions and data analysis as we target the learning for all students.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

To build and maintain a positive school culture and environment the following action steps will be implemented:

1. Develop messaging to all stakeholders that school climate improvement is a focus
2. Use FAC to provide suggestions, based upon AdvancED survey, on actions needed to address survey concerns
3. Conduct orientation activities for all school personnel
4. Conduct orientation activities for all students, families and community
5. Focus on forming effective family-school partnerships
6. Weekly communication to all stakeholders

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00