

Lake County Schools

# Lake Minneola High School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Lake Minneola High School

101 N HANCOCK RD, Minneola, FL 34715

<https://lmh.lake.k12.fl.us/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Roberts William**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2010

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	58%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Native American Students Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: B (60%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	

<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake 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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Lake Minneola High School

101 N HANCOCK RD, Minneola, FL 34715

<https://lmh.lake.k12.fl.us/>

## School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	45%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

## School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	B	B	C

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake 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.**

"The mission of Lake Minneola High School is to educate ethical and responsible learners who will be accepting, kind, compassionate, and tolerant citizens for an ever-changing global society. Learners are prepared for college and career in a technology-rich environment that promotes scholarship while developing critical thinking skills for academic and personal decision making."

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

"Lake Minneola is a student-centered school working together to create a foundation of positive relationships and technological expertise that will result in high academic performance and real world success."

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cavinder, Kristine	Assistant Principal	ESE/ 9th Grade
Harrison, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Haberkorn, Pamela	Teacher, K-12	
Paul, Gina	School Counselor	
Cole, Devon	Assistant Principal	
Rice, Roger	Assistant Principal	
Boykin, Rhonda	Assistant Principal	
Page, Cyndi	Assistant Principal	
Shepherd, Linda	Principal	
Heath, Jeff	Other	
Mayuski, Stephanie	Other	
Johnson, Daisy		
Todd, Renee	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Head
Branum, Mary	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Head
Carlson, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Media Specialist
DeQuevedo, Ann	Teacher, K-12	ILS
Jones, Pandora	Teacher, K-12	Graduation specialist
Katz, Brian	Teacher, K-12	SS Department Head
Martin, James	Other	Testing Coordinator
Nash, Bartholomew	Teacher, K-12	CTE Department Head
Pautienus, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	AVID Lead
Snow, Debbra	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach

## 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	458	432	442	504	1836
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	25	37	39	142
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	31	22	19	116
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	51	89	36	262
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	158	119	78	424

**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	67	100	81	54	302

**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	0	0	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	9	17

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

98

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

Monday 8/26/2019

**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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	54	53	69	212
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	19	17	12	88
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	88	105	105	412
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	105	135	120	409
	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	17	22	20	16	75

**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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	54	53	69	212
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	19	17	12	88
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	88	105	105	412
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	105	135	120	409
	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	17	22	20	16	75

## 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	61%	50%	56%	59%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	46%	51%	60%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	33%	42%	58%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	57%	44%	51%	57%	44%	49%
Math Learning Gains	59%	45%	48%	56%	41%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	36%	45%	41%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	74%	68%	68%	75%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	69%	73%	71%	69%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	458 (0)	432 (0)	442 (0)	504 (0)	1836 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	41 (36)	25 (54)	37 (53)	39 (69)	142 (212)
One or more suspensions	44 (40)	31 (19)	22 (17)	19 (12)	116 (88)
Course failure in ELA or Math	86 (114)	51 (88)	89 (105)	36 (105)	262 (412)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	69 (49)	158 (105)	119 (135)	78 (120)	424 (409)

**Grade Level Data**

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	57%	47%	10%	55%	2%
	2018	57%	46%	11%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	60%	48%	12%	53%	7%
	2018	61%	49%	12%	53%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	72%	66%	6%	67%	5%
2018	69%	61%	8%	65%	4%
Compare		3%			
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	71%	67%	4%	70%	1%
2018	69%	69%	0%	68%	1%
Compare		2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	29%	52%	-23%	61%	-32%
2018	43%	62%	-19%	62%	-19%
Compare		-14%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	49%	12%	57%	4%
2018	53%	50%	3%	56%	-3%
Compare		8%			

## 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	27	38	37	27	49	45	37	43		94	22
ELL	35	54	62	35	52	33	55	14		70	
ASN	72	61		66	65		78	70		96	44
BLK	42	51	38	38	45	41	55	66		98	35
HSP	55	49	41	49	56	44	65	64		96	51
MUL	66	38		54	47	40	80	83		100	65
WHT	67	60	49	65	65	53	81	81		98	59
FRL	47	48	44	46	54	41	60	68		94	46
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	37	42	33	27	48	40	57	40		86	16
ELL	31	42	33	33	33		20			86	25
ASN	71	77	60	69	65		86	68		100	68
BLK	41	41	37	37	49	50	65	57		93	33
HSP	51	51	45	39	50	42	60	60		92	48
MUL	71	54	40	60	76		72	60		83	40
WHT	69	58	47	62	52	50	78	78		95	58
FRL	49	50	42	41	46	42	64	59		92	41
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	25	54	54	16	38	33	37	33		79	5
ELL	20	40	31		55					46	
ASN	63	55		67	64		85	61		97	64
BLK	42	55	60	39	39	24	62	45		91	22
HSP	52	59	54	52	54	45	70	72		83	39
MUL	58	60	50	66	73		57	67		85	41

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
WHT	67	63	62	61	59	41	81	80		91	48
FRL	48	55	55	48	50	41	68	58		85	37

### 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	60
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	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	663
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
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	69
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
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	56
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	64
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 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	68
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## 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.**

The component that showed the lowest performance for Lake Minneola in 2019 was ELA Lowest 25% Percentile. 44% of the students in the category achieved proficiency, this is above the district(33%) and state(42%) averages. This is a continued decline from 2018 with a decrease from 45%. The increased number of students in this area continues to create a demand on closing the gap. Disruption in instruction due to a teacher change in 9th grade Intensive Reading class is felt to be a contributing factor for this negative trend. The decreasing trend is contributed to the reduction in allocations for Reading teachers, which in turn has created an increase of number of students in each section of intensive reading, while also not serving many level 2 students in reading but through ELA classes or reading endorsed classes.

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

The greatest decline in achievement was seen in the area of Algebra 1 EOC. Performance from 2018 was 43%, in 2019, the achievement declined to 29%. Both of which are well below the State and District average. A long term plan of testing students in LAM 1 as well as Alg. 1 is a major contributing factor to this negative growth. The goal is to determine skills still lacking in Alg. 1 by testing LAM 1 students against the Alg. 1 EOC. Although this creates a data point that is unflattering, it gives teacher who will instruct these students whom are typically Level 1 and very low level 2 in Algebra a clearer picture of their deficiencies. The decline in the area of Alg. 1 EOC is felt to be connected to multiple instructional changes throughout the year, one on maternity leave and a secondary teacher took another position. These two factors are major impact on student achievement.

**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.**

The greatest gap when compared to state average is again achievement in the Algebra 1 EOC area. LMHS students scored 32% under that of the state average of 61%. A long term plan of testing students in LAM 1 as well as Alg. 1 is a major contributing factor to this negative growth. The goal is to determine skills still lacking in Alg. 1 by testing LAM 1 students against the Alg. 1 EOC. Although this creates a data point that is unflattering, it gives teacher who will instruct these students whom are typically Level 1 and very low level 2 in Algebra a clearer picture of their deficiencies.

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

The Geometry EOC component of Math Achievement showed the most gain, increasing 8%. The biggest transition in this area was the use of flex time (Mo'Hawk Time) to create focused areas of review based on student need and teacher strength. The secondary action was the implementation of the use of IXL for targeted practice of benchmarks on grade level.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

From ESSA data the two areas of concern for Lake Minneola is Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners. Although both are above the minimum 41% with 42% and 45% respectively, these two areas are closest to the set expectations. These areas are increasing in proficiency, the lagging process is felt to be connected to an instructional change that occurred where a substitute was necessary for an extended time in the ESOL classroom. Use of Word to Word dictionaries for ESOL students as well as support via the ESOL TA to assist this population.

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

1. Algebra 1 EOC pass rate
2. Increase achievement in the lowest quartile in ELA/Math
3. Increase CTE achievement through industry certification
4. Increase AP achievement
5. Increase achievement/growth in the ESE subgroups

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:



#1	
<b>Title</b>	Academic/Intervention: Based on Grade Level Data including Algebra 1 pass rate of 29% from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section Purpose is one of our most critical areas of focus.
<b>Rationale</b>	This Area of Focus was identified as a critical are of need because of the pass rate of the Algebra I EOC falling to 29% from 43% in 2018. By providing a clear purpose throughout instruction the student level of mastery of the benchmarks will increase. This focus will have a direct impact on Math Lowest 25% percentile growth.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By focusing on this area, we expect to see increased benchmark mastery in Algebra I through classroom walkthroughs, benchmark assessments and common assessments. The expected growth will atleast 32% up from 29% a 3% growth. The focus will also be measured by looking at the learning gains for the lowest 25% in math from 47% to 50%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Cyndi Page (pagec@lake.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To increase the student achievement in this area, classroom walkthroughs will focus on collecting data using the 3 questions, "what are you learning, why are you learning it, and how will you know when you have learned it." This will be followed with questions to teacher during common planning time on how they are answering these questions and interventions/extensions for students. The master of the benchmarks will be documented using benchmark assessments as well as teacher created common assessments. AVID strategies will also be implemented throughout classrooms and supported in the AVID elective with the use of tutors for tutorials. After school tutoring will also be provided with transportation to allow students increased remediation time specifically focused on the lowest quartile in math.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	If we implement, monitor, and support use of focus on purpose student master of standards will increase. The use of classroom walkthroughs data will allow teachers to view student understanding of the expected learning target. The use of common planning to foster collaboration for teachers to create common assessments will foster the alignment of data for comparison. The WICOR strategies within AVID are focused on higher level thinking and will increase student comprehension. Tutoring will increase student to teacher contact time and allow for additional remediation for lower quartile students. An ESE TA will assist with tutoring to increase intervention effectiveness with students.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create a schedule for common planning and Instructional Planning Days</li> <li>2. Collect data through classroom walkthroughs focused on the 3 questions</li> <li>3. Use of Common Assessments and data</li> <li>4. Use of IXL for intervention and extension</li> <li>5. Use of intervention block to focus time for students.</li> <li>6. Use of after school tutoring to time for students with requested teacher resources. (SAI Funded)</li> <li>7. Use of AVID tutors within the AVID classroom to increase impact of WICOR strategies. (SAI Funded)</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Cyndi Page (pagec@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2	
<b>Title</b>	Academic/Intervention: Based on School Grade Components including CTE and AP pass that compile the College and Career data (53%) point from the Needs Assessment/ Analysis section Purpose is one of our most critical areas of focus.
<b>Rationale</b>	By focusing instruction on purpose within the AP and CTE classrooms students will be better prepared for Industry Certification exams as well as AP exams.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By focusing on this area, we expect to see increased mastery in AP and CTE exams classroom walkthroughs, benchmark assessments and common assessments. The expected growth will be 56% up from 52%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Roger Rice (ricer@lake.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To increase the student achievement in this area, classroom walkthroughs will focus on collecting data using the 3 questions, "what are you learning, why are you learning it, and how will you know when you have learned it." This will be followed with questions to teacher during common planning time on how they are answering these questions and interventions/extensions for students. The master of the benchmarks will be documented using benchmark assessments as well as teacher created common assessments.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	If we implement, monitor, and support use of focus on purpose student master of standards will increase. The use of classroom walkthroughs data will allow teachers to view student understanding of the expected learning target. The use of common planning to foster collaboration for teachers to create common assessments will foster the alignment of data for comparison.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create a schedule for common planning</li> <li>2. Collect data through classroom walkthroughs focused on the 3 questions</li> <li>3. Use of Common Assessments and data</li> <li>4. Use of practice exams for intervention and extension</li> <li>5. Use of intervention block to focus time for students.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Roger Rice (ricer@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3	
<b>Title</b>	Academic/Intervention: Based on School Data including ELA pass rate of 61% from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section Purpose is one of our most critical areas of focus.
<b>Rationale</b>	This Area of Focus was identified as a critical area of need because of the pass rate of the ELA FSA as both Learning Gains and Achievement have remained stagnant at 55% and 61% respectively. While the gains of the lowest quartile decreased to 44% from 45% in 2018. By providing a clear purpose throughout instruction the student level of mastery of the benchmarks will increase. This focus will have a direct impact on Math Lowest 25% percentile growth.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increased focus on purpose by using the three questions will result in increased achievement for ELA from 61% to 64%, which will also create growth within the learning gains in ELA from 55% to 58%. As well as ultimately correcting the fall in learning gains in lowest quartile from 45% to 44% to 47%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Rhonda Boykin (boykinr1@lake.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To increase the student achievement in this area, classroom walkthroughs will focus on collecting data using the 3 questions, "what are you learning, why are you learning it, and how will you know when you have learned it." This will be followed with questions to teacher during common planning time on how they are answering these questions and interventions/extensions for students. The master of the benchmarks will be documented using benchmark assessments as well as teacher created common assessments. AVID strategies will also be implemented throughout classrooms and supported in the AVID elective with the use of tutors for tutorials. After school tutoring will also be provided with transportation to allow students increased remediation time specifically focused on the lowest quartile in ELA. An ESE TA will assist with tutoring to increase intervention effectiveness with students.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	If we implement, monitor, and support use of focus on purpose student master of standards will increase. The use of classroom walkthroughs data will allow teachers to view student understanding of the expected learning target. The use of common planning to foster collaboration for teachers to create common assessments will foster the alignment of data for comparison. The WICOR strategies within AVID are focused on higher level thinking and will increase student comprehension. Tutoring will increase student to teacher contact time and allow for additional remediation for lower quartile students.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create a schedule for common planning and Instructional Planning Days</li> <li>2. Collect data through classroom walkthroughs focused on the 3 questions</li> <li>3. Use of Common Assessments and data</li> <li>4. Use of intervention block to focus time for students.</li> <li>5. Use of after school tutoring to time for students with requested teacher resources. (SAI Funded)</li> <li>6. Use of AVID tutors within the AVID classroom to increase impact of WICOR strategies. (SAI Funded)</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Rhonda Boykin (boykinr1@lake.k12.fl.us)

#4	
<b>Title</b>	Culture: With high expectations and implementation of the HAWKS creed that focuses on climate and culture LMHS will increase student attendance as well as decrease disciplinary incidents.
<b>Rationale</b>	If we implement, monitor, and support the HAWKS creed student attendance will increase as students and staff will feel valued on campus. This sense of belonging will directly impact the number of disciplinary incidents that result in OSS.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The increase in ONEHAWK culture will ultimately increase student achievement in areas mentioned in focus areas 1-3. These increases will be a result in focused instruction as students are held to a high level of expectations. The culture will also impact teacher retention.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	[no one identified]
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teachers will focus on implementing Capturing Kids Hearts training through Social Contracts, appropriate interactions and the use of the 3 questions. Teen Leadership will continue the "ONEHAWK" mindset with ongoing student lead activities. Teachers will take an active role in developing a culture of belonging with the implementation of the Pep Squad. Teachers will participate in challenges to increase collegiality and connection to each other and students. Teachers and students will be celebrated throughout the year, with gifts, parties, food, awards, etc. Implement the use of the mental health professional to increase emotional stability within student body by implementing meditation, counseling, and restorative practices.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Student attendance will be tracked as well as discipline incidents through performance matters.
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create attendance and discipline committee</li> <li>2. Train faculty and staff on expected behaviors of ONEHAWK</li> <li>3. Monitor student attendance/discipline through MTSS and Progress Monitoring</li> <li>4. Provide student and family support through conferences</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Linda Shepherd (shepherdl@lake.k12.fl.us)

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**