Lake County Schools

Lake Minneola High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

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

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

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

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	41%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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	
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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/1/2010, Roberts William

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

93

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	58%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Native American Students Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	433	489	445	392	1759
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	40	53	58	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	23	13	67
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	19	30	3	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	18	31	3	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	105	135	289
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	116	70	196

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	252	215	214	200	881

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	14	1	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	2	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/27/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	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%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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
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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	69
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

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 are 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?

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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. 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.
Measurable Outcome:	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%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cyndi Page (pagec@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a schedule for common planning and Instructional Planning Days
2. Collect data through classroom walkthroughs focused on the 3 questions
3. Use of Common Assessments and data
4. Use of IXL for intervention and extension
5. Use of intervention block to focus time for students.
6. Use of after school tutoring to time for students with requested teacher resources. (SAI Funded)
7. Use of AVID tutors within the AVID classroom to increase impact of WICOR strategies. (SAI Funded)

Person Responsible	Cyndi Page (pagec@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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. 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.
Measurable Outcome:	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%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Roger Rice (ricer@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a schedule for common planning
2. Collect data through classroom walkthroughs focused on the 3 questions
3. Use of Common Assessments and data
4. Use of practice exams for intervention and extension
5. Use of intervention block to focus time for students.

Person Responsible	Roger Rice (ricer@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on School Data including ELA pass rate of 61% from the Needs Assessment/ Analysis section differentiation is one of our most critical areas of focus. This Area of Focus was identified as a critical are of need because of the pass rate of the ELA FSA as both Learning Gains and Achievement have remained stagnate at 55% and 61% respectively. While the gains of the lowest quartile decreased to 44% from 45% in 2018. By providing a differentation throughout instruction the student level of mastery of the benchmarks will increase. This focus will have a direct impact on Math Lowest 5% percentile growth.
Measurable Outcome:	Increased focus on differentiation 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%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristine Cavinder (cavinderk@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase the student achievement in this area, classroom walkthroughs will focus on collecting data using he 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. 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. ESE TA will assist with tutoring to increase intervention effectiveness with students. The use of the three questions and response will be used to inform instruction. To be used in planning to increase lesson effectiveness while taking into account the learning needs of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor, and support use of focus on differentiation student mastery 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.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a schedule for common planning and Instructional Planning Days
2. Collect data through classroom walkthroughs focused on the 3 questions
3. Use of Common Assessments and data
4. Use of intervention block to focus time for students.
5. Use of after school tutoring to time for students with requested teacher resources. (SAI Funded)

Person Responsible	Kristine Cavinder (cavinderk@lake.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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. 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.
Measurable Outcome:	The increase in ONEHAWK culture will ultimately increase student achievement in areas mentioned in focus areas 1-3. The OSS total will reduce by 10% from 67 students to 55 students receiving one or more out of school suspension.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Devon Cole (coled1@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Student attendance will be tracked as well as discipline incidents through performance matters. The use of the program will allow for data to be reviewed in one place to include discipline, course success rate as well as attendance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create attendance and discipline committee
2. Train faculty and staff on expected behaviors of ONEHAWK
3. Monitor student attendance/discipline through MTSS and Progress Monitoring
4. Provide student and family support through conferences

Person Responsible	Linda Shepherd (shepherdl@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

x

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

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

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

Lake Minneola focuses it effort on creating a positive culture and environment by implementing the #ONEHAWK and HAWKS Creed. The mindset of the school is that if we work together as a whole the students, teachers and families will be successful. The HAWKS Creed stands for Honorable, Academically focused,Wise, Kind-Hearted and Successful. This creed is woven into each decision that is made for the students and faculty at LMHS. The use of this mindset allows for a positive culture and environment where students, faculty and staff have high level of expectations upon them. The continued use of Capturing Kids Hearts training will reinforce the culture and impact the reduction of disciplinary actions on campus.

To encourage students to earn high levels of excellence, awards are part of the HAWK culture. Students are awarded at the end of each year with certificates, plaques, trophies, stols. This effort is funded by the SAC.

The environment at Lake Minneola is also one that needs to be safe. To assist with safety, the SAC continues to assist with funding PPE equipment, purchasing and maintenance of safety equipment, including golf carts, fencing, directional signage, etc.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**				**$3,500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0901 - Lake Minneola High School	Other		$3,500.00
			Notes: IPD days for tested areas.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**				**$5,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3336	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0901 - Lake Minneola High School	General Fund		$5,000.00
			Notes: IXL & USA TEST PREP			

3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation**				**$0.00**
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline**				**$11,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0901 - Lake Minneola High School			$6,000.00
			Notes: SAC will purchase on request Awards for student of the month, GPA and Graduation stols, pins, cords, etc.			
			0901 - Lake Minneola High School			$5,000.00
			Notes: Safety equipment to include, but not limited to PPE for students and staff.			
					Total:	**$19,500.00**