# Olsen Middle School

# 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Olsen Middle School

## 330 SE 11TH TER, Dania Beach, FL 33004

## [ no web address on file ]

### Demographics

## Principal: Janet Giancarli

Start Date for this Principal: 9/28/2021

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2020-21 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (50%) |
| **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 Broward 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

# Olsen Middle School

## 330 SE 11TH TER, Dania Beach, FL 33004

## [ no web address on file ]

## 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) |
|---|---|---|
| Middle School 6-8 | Yes | 73% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 86% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | | C | C | C |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

Olsen Middle School iCan Magnet Academy's mission is to provide students with the opportunity to participate in project based and blended learning to develop college and workplace technology skills and engage in mentoring by a network of advisers from business, industries and post-secondary institutions.

### Provide the school's vision statement.

Olsen Middle School iCAN Magnet Academy commits itself to the vision of providing "Excellence for every student, every day!"

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Harris, Valerie | Principal | Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; shapes a vision of academic success for all students; creates a climate hospitable to education; cultivates leadership in others; manages people; reviews data and action plans; improves school leadership. Exercise proactive leadership in promoting the vision and mission of the District's Strategic Plan; Utilize collaborative leadership style and quality processes to establish and monitor the school's mission and goals that are aligned with the District's mission and goals through active participation of stakeholders' involvement in the school improvement process with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and School Advisory Forum (SAF). |
| McKie, Kenyatta | Assistant Principal | Instructional Leader of Literacy (ELA, Reading), Math, Science and Magnet Electives.<br>Responsible for the academic and behavioral growth and development of 7th graders<br>Ensure that teachers are armed with the instructional tools and strategies to support diverse learners.<br>Monitor for the effective implementation of instructional shifts in ELA, Reading, Math, Science, and Magnet<br>Monitor and support the implementation of grant deliverables for the iCAN Magnet programs<br>Monitor and support the implementation of grant deliverables for the JFG (Jobs for FL Graduates) program grant<br>Monitor for the effective implementation of school wide practices such as PBL, BEST, standards-based instruction, monitor student learning, and growth.<br>Operational leader responsible for carrying out the needs and expectations outlined by the Principal in support of the school's mission and vision. |
| Norris, Claire | Assistant Principal | Serve as instructional leader and administrator for Social Studies.<br>Serve as 6th grade assistant principal.<br>Monitor for the effective implementation of Social Studies action plans and improvement efforts.<br>Monitor for the effective implementation of school-wide practices |
| Zimmerman, Charles | Assistant Principal | Mr. Zimmerman is the AP in charge of facilities, electives, grade level 7/8 and security. He ensures that all primary needs are met as well as supports instructional leadership across content areas. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 9/28/2021, Janet Giancarli

**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.*

14

**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.*

28

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

40

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

675

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

2

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

2

**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 | 266 | 237 | 228 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 731 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 60 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 77 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 97 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 200 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 62 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 48 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 65 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 192 |

**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 | 109 | 124 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 336 |

**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 | 8 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 9/28/2021

## 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 | 258 | 220 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 692 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 58 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 61 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 177 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 46 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

## 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 | 258 | 220 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 692 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 58 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 61 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 177 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 46 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

## 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 | | | | 35% | 57% | 54% | 37% | 57% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 44% | 57% | 54% | 46% | 57% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 35% | 48% | 47% | 44% | 50% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 41% | 60% | 58% | 48% | 60% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 45% | 58% | 57% | 53% | 59% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 47% | 49% | 51% | 37% | 50% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 34% | 49% | 51% | 51% | 52% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 47% | 71% | 72% | 55% | 72% | 72% |

**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 |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 57% | -24% | 54% | -21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30% | 55% | -25% | 52% | -22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -33% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30% | 59% | -29% | 56% | -26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -30% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 46% | 58% | -12% | 55% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 24% | 53% | -29% | 54% | -30% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -46% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 24% | 45% | -21% | 46% | -22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -24% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30% | 43% | -13% | 48% | -18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 41% | 71% | -30% | 71% | -30% |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| **ALGEBRA EOC** | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 70% | 61% | 9% | 61% | 9% |
| **GEOMETRY EOC** | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 100% | 56% | 44% | 57% | 43% |

## Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 24.3 | 26.3 | 22.1 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 20.5 | 25.3 | 18.3 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10.4 | 14.3 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 14.3 | 18.8 | 7.1 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 20.5 | 18.9 | 31.8 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17.7 | 15.8 | 26.4 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8.7 | 8.5 | 19.2 |
| | English Language Learners | 7.7 | 6.7 | 0 |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 21.2 | 23.4 | 28.6 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 21.4 | 22.4 | 32.4 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2.3 | 7.7 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 8.3 | 12.5 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 12.8 | 19.2 | 15.4 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 14.5 | 19.3 | 15.9 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 8.1 | 11.8 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 4.3 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Civics | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 26.6 | 23 | 2.6 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 25.8 | 21.5 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 6.9 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 4.8 | 9.1 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 15.8 | 15 | 9.1 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17.1 | 13.8 | 9.1 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 8.3 | 0 |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

## 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 | 17 | 32 | 41 | 13 | 24 | 33 | 31 | 14 | | | |
| ELL | 18 | 29 | 23 | 13 | 16 | 30 | 11 | 33 | 44 | | |
| BLK | 18 | 20 | 25 | 12 | 7 | 16 | 22 | 29 | 27 | | |
| HSP | 27 | 34 | 34 | 17 | 18 | 34 | 28 | 42 | 26 | | |
| MUL | 39 | 47 | | 30 | 11 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 39 | 33 | | 45 | 27 | | 29 | 40 | 19 | | |
| FRL | 24 | 28 | 30 | 15 | 12 | 25 | 26 | 35 | 25 | | |
| 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 | 28 | 46 | 37 | 29 | 44 | 40 | 25 | 30 | | | |
| ELL | 25 | 44 | 40 | 40 | 45 | 48 | 30 | 47 | 48 | | |
| BLK | 27 | 40 | 32 | 30 | 40 | 47 | 20 | 46 | 50 | | |

| 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 |
| HSP | 36 | 48 | 33 | 48 | 50 | 49 | 38 | 48 | 51 | | |
| MUL | 22 | 7 | | 38 | 36 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | 51 | 47 | 55 | 49 | 39 | 54 | 43 | 72 | | |
| FRL | 31 | 43 | 35 | 39 | 44 | 46 | 30 | 44 | 55 | | |

| 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 | 17 | 35 | 37 | 31 | 36 | 26 | 4 | 34 | | | |
| ELL | 18 | 49 | 59 | 40 | 53 | 40 | 42 | 41 | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 45 | 41 | 40 | 44 | 28 | 48 | 41 | 77 | | |
| HSP | 35 | 45 | 45 | 49 | 57 | 49 | 48 | 59 | 65 | | |
| MUL | 50 | 50 | | 41 | 75 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | 49 | 50 | 64 | 65 | 36 | 71 | 70 | 88 | | |
| FRL | 34 | 43 | 43 | 45 | 52 | 35 | 49 | 53 | 71 | | |

## 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 | 26 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 7 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 31 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 259 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 81% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 26 |
| 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 | 25 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 20 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 29 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Multiracial Students** | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 32 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **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% | |
| **White Students** | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 33 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 25 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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?**

Students in Algebra and Geometry performed better than the district and state averages.

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

Students with disabilities (ESE) and English Language Learners demonstrate the greatest need for improvement in all 3 grade levels in math.

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

Virtual learning and lack of engagement during the 2020-2021 year contributed to this.
A more personalized approach with a focus on engagement needs to occur - the creation of labs for ESE and ELL students will address this need for improvement.

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

ELLs showed improvement in Social Studies achievement and ELLs and ESE students showed improvement in LA.

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

Civics curriculum aligned between the two teachers. Monthly PD for teachers focusing on literacy strategies.

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

Continued focus on ELLs and ESE students through the labs,.

**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.**

ESE accommodations
ESOL strategies
UDL - Universal Design for Learning
PBL training (ensure all faculty are trained)

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

ESE and ELL labs will be created and service students 2 or more times a week.
ELO (after school and weekends) will be implemented.
School wide writing and vocabulary plans will be created and implemented.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Literacy is the foundation of all subject-areas and improves student outcomes as it relates to college and career. Focus on school-wide reading and writing implementation plans will improve student performance on statewide assessments. Data indicates that 65% of our students are reading below grade-level and need additional supports. An area of focus is getting good diagnostic data that will inform our instructional practice through the implementation of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model. District support of standards-aligned instruction through the use of the Assessment Level Descriptors and state Test Item Specification focuses our instruction on how students are assessed on reading skills and what students are expected to know and be able to do. Inclusion of an interdisciplinary approach creates an atmosphere where every child succeeds and is expected to perform in support of evidence based strategies for reading and writing. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Student proficiency on the FSA Reading will increase to 50% with LG targets of 65% across grade-levels. |
| **Monitoring:** | This Area of Focus will be monitored through monthly common formative assessments and use of iReady diagnostic (3 times a year) and the Growth Measure assessment. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kenyatta McKie (kenyatta.mckie@browardschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | High-quality instruction, use of high quality texts, and evidence based reading and writing. Teachers will use the tools and resources provided by the district to support students reading skills. In addition, students who are identified as the lowest quartile on the FSA have been provided additional support through reading class to support their foundational reading skills through BEST. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | High-quality instruction implements differentiation and small group stations that allow teachers to meet the needs of all learners. At Awesome Olsen MS we believe that every student can learn, but not on the same day or in the same way. Focused lessons that align to the expectation of the assessment through the use of backwards design prepares students and supports educators in meeting the needs of their learners. School-wide initiatives creates a community of learning literacy that will improve outcomes towards college and career for our students. |

#### Action Steps to Implement

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

**Primary area of concern is violent incidents with 7.7 incidents per 100 students reported.**
**Secondary area of concern is drug/public order incidents with 2.93 incidents per 100 students reported.**
**School culture and environment will be monitored through the number of discipline referrals each quarter, with a particular focus to the two areas of concern noted above.**
**Mentoring programs, PASL classes, school based positive behavior plan, and social emotional learning plan will be utilized to positively impact the discipline data.**

## 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.**

Weekly Virtual Parent Town Hall Meetings and monthly SAC and SAF meetings provide parents, students, and community members to learn about updates and programs, as well as providing them with an opportunity to provide input into these programs.
The school has additionally capitalized on communication tools because of the eLearning environment brought upon by the pandemic and instituted a Zoom Welcome Center which runs in operation of the physical school day to immediately address the questions/concerns of any parents and students.
The many clubs and organizations across campus (SGA, NJHS, FFEA, LiA, etc) provide students with multiple leadership experiences and give students opportunities to provide input and suggestions regarding Olsen.
Mentor groups across campus such as Personalization in Academic and Social and Emotional Learning (PASL), AmeriCorps Recovery Ambassadors, Angels Watching Over Me (AWOM) and Girls Scouts provide opportunities for our students to connect and receive support in the areas of academic, behavioral and social aspects of the whole scholar.
The magnet program has allowed us to strengthen our relationships with broad stakeholder groups and ensures an ongoing dialogue between Olsen and these groups, including "virtual" field trips and virtual class meetings.

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

Sara Akiba - girls mentoring group
Lighthouse Church/Brother Mac - boys mentoring group
Guidance Department - Monique Foster and Elisa Weisel - Kids of Character monthly celebrations, monthly
birthday celebrations, and monthly Positive Referrals

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | $0.00 |
|---|--------|---------------------------------------------|-------|
|   |        | Total: | $0.00 |