

Orange County Public Schools

Olympia High



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Olympia High

4301 S APOPKA VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32835

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

Demographics

Principal: Christy Gorberg

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
2020-21 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%)
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	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Olympia High

4301 S APOPKA VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32835

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	39%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gorberg, Christy	Principal	Oversees general operations, oversee all operations, aspiring Leaders, PLC Leadership, professional development, PTSA, SAC, assistant principals, athletics, clerical, credit recovery, social studies and SGA.
Green, Ava	Assistant Principal	Supervise: Science, JROTC & PE, student discipline team, PASS, discipline, MAO, property manager, Threat Assessment Team , Title IX Coordinator, Facilities/Safety/Security, food services liaison.
Hames, Nigel	Assistant Principal	Supervise: ELA, Reading, ESOL, ESE, Data Meetings, PTSA, SAC, SIP, tutoring programs, back-up API discipline back-up.
Korkes, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Supervise: Math, Guidance, API, attendance, COVID Coordinator, Newspaper/Yearbook, Student Services, media center, world language
	Assistant Principal	Supervises Social Studies, CTE, accountability corrections, FTE, Summer School, testing, transportation, SELL plan
McElveen, Kevin	Other	Oversees athletics, master calendar, supervision calendar
Perrotti, August	School Counselor	Lead guidance counselor
Gabriel, Travis	Dean	Head dean, mentoring, drills

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/19/2021, 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.*

3

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

152

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,765

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

56

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

49

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22**

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	677	698	721	669	2765	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175	204	210	203	792	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	43	41	15	141	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	157	273	206	709	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	153	248	214	777	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136	148	131	116	531	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149	151	136	41	477	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	280	320	273	197	1070	

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	241	312	226	979

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	0	0	1	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	9	2	25

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/19/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				59%	55%	56%	60%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	53%	51%	55%	51%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	40%	42%	46%	40%	44%
Math Achievement				45%	43%	51%	54%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains				56%	49%	48%	48%	44%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	46%	45%	41%	39%	45%
Science Achievement				73%	70%	68%	71%	66%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				80%	73%	73%	81%	69%	71%

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
09	2021					
	2019	53%	52%	1%	55%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	59%	50%	9%	53%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

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
2021					
2019	70%	67%	3%	67%	3%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	77%	69%	8%	70%	7%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	45%	63%	-18%	61%	-16%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	53%	-6%	57%	-10%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

We are using the Orange County Public Schools quarterly Progress Monitoring Assessments for this data.

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	316/59%	321/48%	316/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	130/48%	128/35%	122/33%
	Students With Disabilities	10/25%	14/27%	13/24%
	English Language Learners	12/38%	29/26%	31/29%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	ALG 129/47%, GEO 100/53%	ALG 154/42%, GEO 118/60%	ALG 166/45, GEO 119/62% %
	Economically Disadvantaged	ALG 87/44%, Geo 100/44%	ALG 102/40%, GEO 40/50%	ALG 107/42%, GEO 39/50%
	Students With Disabilities	ALG 11/33%, Geo 3/43%	ALG 11/26%, GEO 4/57%	ALG 10/22%, GEO 3/43%
	English Language Learners	ALG 34/44, Geo 7/ 41%	ALG 42/44%, GEO 14/78%,	ALG 43/45%, GEO 12/71%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	234/91%	236/90%	230/86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73/88%	75/86%	72/82%
	Students With Disabilities	7/100%	7/100%	7/100%
	English Language Learners	10/71%	12/100%	10/77%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	331/50%	276/41%	335/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	117/36%	86/26%	112/48%
	Students With Disabilities	8/23%	4/11%	3/7%
	English Language Learners	21/17%	14/11%	24/18%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	ALG 57/44% GEO 51/27%	ALG 67/40% GEO 62/31%	ALG 67/41% GEO 73/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	ALG 41/41% GEO 26/26%	ALG 48/39% GEO 28/26%	ALG 47/39% Geo 32/28%
	Students With Disabilities	ALG 7/32% GEO 2/25%	ALG 7/29% GEO 3/30%	ALG 8/32% GEO 2/20%
	English Language Learners	ALG 15/34% GEO 20/37%	ALG 26/46% GEO 20/37%	ALG 18/35% GEO 26/45%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	197/55%	182/48%	170/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	113/51%	104/42%	93/35%
	Students With Disabilities	5/17%	5/17%	4/12%
	English Language Learners	58/50%	57/50%	53/43%
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	ALG 4/50% GEO 31/21%	ALG 2/25% GEO 42/25%	ALG1/9 % GEO29/ 17 %
	Economically Disadvantaged	ALG 3/43% GEO 16/16%	ALG 2/29% GEO 24/21%	ALG1/13 % GEO 13/11%
	Students With Disabilities	ALG 0/0% GEO 16/ 11%	ALG 0/0% GEO 6/ 32%	ALG 0/0%GEO 2/ 10%
	English Language Learners	ALG 2/50% GEO 13/23%	ALG 1/4% GEO11/ 55 %	ALG 1/17% GEO 8/ 16%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	6/30%	7/28%	5/16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/21%	5/29%	2/19%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	1/8%	1/12%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	304/72%	338/77%	290/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	157/65%	184/72%	150/57%
	Students With Disabilities	18/60%	20/61%	15/45%
	English Language Learners	54/52%	73/68%	57/53%

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	GEO 117%	ALG 1/100% GEO 4/33%	ALG 1/59% GEO 1/47 %
	Economically Disadvantaged	GEO 1/33%	ALG 1/100% GEO 3/38%	ALG1/50% GEO 4/ 33 %
	Students With Disabilities	GEO 0/1%	ALG N/A% GEO1/ 50%	ALG 0/0% GEO 0/ 0%
	English Language Learners	GEO 0/0%	ALG N/A % GEO 1/ 25%%	ALG N/A% GEO 2/ 40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	3/60%	3/50%	3/27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/50%	3/60%	3/30%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	0/0%
	English Language Learners	1/50%	N/A	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	9/53%	13/76%	14/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/56%	7/70%	8/62%
	Students With Disabilities	1/100%	1/100%	1/50%
	English Language Learners	6/50%	8/12%	9/60%

Subgroup Data Review

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	16	23	25	13	12	13	36	51		89	21
ELL	26	55	55	16	25	21	45	48		97	57
ASN	75	67	36	53	33		75	84		97	75
BLK	41	46	39	13	16	20	48	57		93	51

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
HSP	45	50	48	23	22	18	57	64		97	61
MUL	48	63		23	11		64	67		94	69
WHT	71	63	58	35	26	32	77	86		96	76
FRL	38	46	43	16	19	16	47	60		94	56
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	571
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	91%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	66
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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?

According to ESSA data, state assessment data, College and Career Acceleration assessments, and our local Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMA's), our students with disabilities, ELL, Black, and Hispanic subgroups show significant gaps in achievement compared to the whole school and White students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Overall Math Achievement was at 45%, which was 6% off the state average. Acceleration points from 2017-18 were at 63%, making us 12th out of 20 in the district. On the OCPS Spring district ELA PMA's for 9th and 10th grade, our ELL, ESE, and Economically Disadvantaged students, had significant achievement gaps.

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

Teacher planning and aligning lessons to standards needs to improve for the new school year. In prior years, not all tested areas had common planning during the school day, this needs to change. As a school, we will develop and adopt standardized PLC and Common Planning structures and increase support of PLC's with content coaches and administrators. There needs to be a more systematic plan for teacher support in the areas of pedagogy, planning, and relationship building. We will identify and monitor students who fall within the ESSA subgroups we have identified as needing to improve. As a school we will create systems for teacher support and implement more SEL training for students, faculty, and staff.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on 2019 state assessments, our Math Learning Gains and Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% increased 8% and 9%, respectively. Science achievement improved 2 percent.

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

In the areas that improved, there was an increased focus on standards-based instruction. There was a renewed focus on an appropriate math progression. Another contributing factor was a focus on effective PLC structures and lesson plan implementation, with cycles of feedback from administrators and peers.

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

There needs to be a focus on ensuring students are scheduled in appropriate, but rigorous coursework. We need to expand our course offerings and access to allow students many ways to accelerate their learning. Within the classroom, teachers need to plan so that they are teaching the full extent of the standards while engaging the students in a way that makes them want to learn more. Students need to feel a sense of belonging at our school so they are in an environment where they feel comfortable with taking chances and pushing themselves.

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 be provided PD and growth opportunities in Social Emotional Learning, PLC structures, Data Driven instruction, Mastery Learning/Grading, and their self selected Deliberate Practice strategies.

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

We have added full time coaches for ELA/Reading and Math. We have aligned the master schedule so that all tested areas have common planning. There will be on-going, consistently monitoring of all systems, from the PLC level to the Administrative Team level. Feedback will be timely and actionable.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Improve student achievement on high-stakes assessments through implementation of differentiated support for students within and outside core content classrooms. School leadership will guide the differentiation process by providing teachers with data and resources, planning support through PLC's, and appropriate professional development to ensure students from all subgroups are identified and supported. Improving differentiated instruction will increase overall student improvement. This need was identified by reviewing overall data as well as looking at our lowest overall performing ESSA subgroups from 2018-19 data (ESE 43%, Black/African American 52%, ELL and Economically Disadvantaged (both 59%).

Measurable Outcome: We plan to achieve an increase in pass rates on state EOC's and FSA by 3% in the ESSA subgroups of Students with Disabilities, Black/African American, and Economically Disadvantaged, as well as our lowest 25% in math and reading.

Monitoring: Ongoing monitoring will occur to ensure all professional learning communities are planning for differentiation and high quality instruction collaboratively and students are afforded differentiation, intervention and remediation opportunities needed to ensure an overall improvement in achievement as well as a closing of subgroup achievement gaps. This will happen via classroom walkthroughs, test data, PLC meeting notes, lesson plan review, student work samples, and district assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christy Gorberg (christy.gorberg@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiation through providing Tier 1, 2 and 3 interventions based student assessment data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Through the use of differentiated instruction and support we can help meet students where they are and close achievement gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The school will develop common PLC and planning structures utilizing the district resources to ensure instruction is standards-based and rigorous.
2. Tiered teacher support will take place to improve instruction and planning.
3. Tutoring, push-in, and pull out plans will be implemented to support students in sub groups.
4. Demonstration classrooms will be set up for each department.
5. School will invest in new instructional coaches to support teachers and planning in ELA and Math.

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

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on 2020-21 Panorama data only 35% of students responded positively to the topic, "Sense of Belonging" and only 28% of staff responded positively to the questions in the topic of "Professional Learning About SEL (Social Emotional Learning)". This demonstrates a need to provide better information and training about SEL. It also shows that as a school, we need to improve the culture and environment of our school so that students can feel they belong.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the 2021-22 school year, 100% of students will respond positively to the Panorama questions related to "Sense of Belonging".

By the end of the 2021-2 School year, 75% staff will responded positively to the Panorama questions in the topic of "Professional Learning About SEL"

Monitoring:

This area of focus will be monitored through the use of the Spring 2022 Panorama Survey, outcomes from student lesson from district and school lessons on SEL, student and staff surveys, mentoring logs, lesson observation notes, PD sign in, and common planning notes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Aprea (jennifer.aprea@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The school will provide students, staff, and stakeholders on-going learning and follow up about Social Emotional Learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

By providing students, stakeholders, and staff learning centered around SEL, we will create a positive school culture where students feel they belong, where teachers can more effectively provide student center, high quality instruction, and where the community feels they are partners in the education process.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop and implement year two of our SEL plan.
2. Develop and implement Panorama Action plan.
3. Provide professional development to faculty on SEL strategies and their effect on student outcomes and sense of belonging.
4. Create mentoring plan, assign mentors, and monitor plan.
5. Provide professional development on Culturally Responsive Teaching.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Aprea (jennifer.aprea@ocps.net)

#3. 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:	Acceleration will improve from 63% to 75% Graduation rate will improve from 98% to 99%
Monitoring:	This area will be monitored by administrators via classroom walkthroughs, meeting notes, classroom test data, practice CTE tests, district assessment data, and PLC notes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze student enrollment against student acceleration and identify students needing additional opportunities and support to achieve success via accelerated coursework.
2. Identify and track students at risk of not graduating and provide necessary support.
3. Administration will conduct walkthroughs using common tool to ensure teachers are providing rigorous, standards based instruction.
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.

Person Responsible Jennifer Korkes (61796@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Olympia's incident ranking is "Moderate". We rank 270 out of 505 high schools statewide for total number of incidents. An area of primary concern is "Violent Incidents", where we are considered "Very High" and Suspensions where we are considered "Middle". To help with these issues, we will continue to provide Restorative Practice as a way to decrease overall incidences. We will focus on one-on-one mentoring for our high needs students. We will focus on small group instruction in the classroom to help build relationships.

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.

At Olympia High School, we work hard to build a positive school culture and environment that is built on the success of our students. Through outreach using traditional meetings and gatherings as well as through Social Media, we strive to build lasting relationships with students, faculty, staff, families and the community. PLC meetings, student meetings, and family meetings all assist us in building on our foundation of excellence in Academics, Arts, and Athletics to support all of our stakeholders. We provide myriad opportunities for our all stakeholders to communicate with each other and with school leaders. Communication is key to building community and success.

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

Stakeholders and Roles

- Admin: Christy Gorberg, Nigel Hames, Jennifer Aprea, Ava Green, and Jennifer Korkes: Oversees school stakeholders to support the development of structures and supports which create a positive culture and environment:
- Deans: Travis Gabriel Mark Kelly, Adriene Miller, Semi Tello: Supports and maintains school discipline, procedures, adherence to rules and ensures a safe and supportive school environment for all students, staff and the community.
- SAFE and Mental Health Counseling: Molly Sidwell, Megan Peralta: Provides students emotional and

mental health support to ensure students can feel safe in school and ensures Mental Health lessons are given.

-Student Services and College and Career: August Perrotti, Diana Hernandez, MaryLu Matott, Mackenzie Catron, Sasha Lopez, Jasmine Hollis, Tanya Washington, Angel Cepeda, Stephanie Johnson-Possell: The Student Services Department works to support students in earning their high school diploma and creating post-secondary plans and provides students with emotional support.

-Instructional Coaches: Stacy Eaddy, Tamara Bradford, Chastity Pelham: Works with staff to ensure they are supported and feel they can be successful teaching our students. Ensures Character Lab is implemented.

SEL Team: Responsible for the creation of SELL student and staff events calendar.
Responsible for ensuring that positive relationships are cultivated between students and staff.

- Christy Gorberg Principal
- Miller, Dean
- Staci Eaddy, Instructional Coach
- Ashley Phillips, Teacher
- Sabrina Perrotti, Teacher
- Sam Davis, Teacher
- Michael Pearl, Teacher

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00