Lake Minneola High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lake Minneola High School

101 N HANCOCK RD, Minneola, FL 34715

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/23/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Roberts, William	Principal	SAI Component & Final Check; School Principal. Monitor student achievement and remediation. Oversee and evaluate CTE/ Foreign Language and Arts departments. Overall running of Lake Minneola High school.
Boykin, Rhonda	Assistant Principal	SIP Plan Coordinator; ELA/Reading and AVID Achievement. Quarterly data chats, Master Scheduling and AP testing, Guidance, Registrations and Night School Coordinator
Cavinder, Kristine	Assistant Principal	Science Achievement, Grade Recovery, Summer School and Edgenuity Labs,
Pannett, Timothy	Assistant Principal	Data Disaggregation; Math Achievement. School Safety, Transportation, New teachers and Volunteers
Rice, Roger	Assistant Principal	Social Studies Achievement, Testing Coordinator, MoHawk Intervention, Master Calendar, College Interns, Field trips, Active Supervision schedule and Textbook Manager.
Wolf, Rhonda	Assistant Principal	ESE Achievement, ELL, Professional Development, Athletics and CTE Contact
Jones, Pandora	Graduation Coach	Monitor student progress to ensure they are on track for graduation.
Snow, Debbra	Reading Coach	Reading Achievement ensuring students have met their reading requirement for graduation.
Branum, Mary	Teacher, Adult	ELA Achievement Department Chair
Harrison, Kim	Teacher, Adult	Science Achievement, Department Chair
Katz, Brian	Teacher, Adult	Social Studies Achievement, Department Chair
Johnson, Daisy	Teacher, Adult	PASS instructor, follows up with students to ensure they are on track in their classes both behaviorally and academically.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

School data will be reviewed at the first faculty meeting identifying strengths and weaknesses from previous year. Areas of focus will be addressed and how these goals will be met. SIP plan will be reviewed at the first SAC meeting with the members.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP plan will be reviewed quarterly with teachers and staff during data chats and faculty meetings to ensure students are making adequate academic growth. Changes will be made to the SIP as needed to best meet the needs of the students. SIP will be reviewed with the SAC committee updating on changes that may need to be made to best meet the needs of our students.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	58%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	52	45	50	52	45	51	58		
ELA Learning Gains				43			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			41		
Math Achievement*	41	40	38	47	33	38	45		
Math Learning Gains				42			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			35		
Science Achievement*	72	62	64	67	38	40	68		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	62	66	65	41	48	70		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	97	90	89	98	59	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	65	61	65	69	64	67	67		
ELP Progress	70	56	45	65			75		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	466

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	97

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	619
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	98

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	2	
ELL	60			
AMI	48			
ASN	81			
BLK	52			
HSP	65			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	61			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	1	
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	58			
BLK	48			
HSP	55			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	52			41			72	69		97	65	70
SWD	18			17			46	34		25	6	
ELL	33			42			50	67		73	7	70
AMI	55			40							2	
ASN	73			60			88	81		86	6	
BLK	38			26			49	57		42	6	
HSP	47			35			70	69		64	7	74
MUL	51			40			64	80		43	6	
PAC												
WHT	59			49			79	71		74	6	
FRL	39			29			56	61		57	7	92

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	52	43	34	47	42	37	67	65		98	69	65
SWD	20	33	34	23	37	34	26	28		95	44	
ELL	41	52	33	21	45		65	48		100	60	65
AMI												
ASN	61	43	27	56	30		77	61		100	71	
BLK	47	38	29	32	36	30	52	57		100	55	
HSP	48	47	40	41	39	39	66	61		97	63	67
MUL	41	37	30	31	38		64	70		100	68	
PAC												
WHT	57	43	32	58	48	48	71	70		97	75	
FRL	39	38	29	32	37	38	50	50		97	60	58

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	58	49	41	45	39	35	68	70		99	67	75
SWD	28	39	32	15	35	39	49	44		96	38	
ELL	26	41	46	21	34	31	30	57		100	38	75
AMI												
ASN	67	71	75	60	42		89	89		100	88	
BLK	51	51	48	26	33	31	46	48		100	49	
HSP	53	44	30	45	41	49	66	68		99	60	67
MUL	49	50	50	27	40		53	76		100	85	
PAC												
WHT	62	49	42	53	38	26	76	74		98	71	
FRL	52	51	44	34	30	29	58	61		98	58	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
10	2023 - Spring	52%	44%	8%	50%	2%
09	2023 - Spring	53%	44%	9%	48%	5%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	32%	51%	-19%	50%	-18%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	49%	49%	0%	48%	1%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	60%	11%	63%	8%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	60%	7%	63%	4%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Algebra showed the lowest performance dropping from 47% to 40% from the previous year. Contributing factors to this is personnel changes in the Math Department. We had several math teachers who did not return and then a few who left mid year. Another contributing factor is the change in assessment.

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

Algebra showed the greatest decline from 47% to 40% from the previous year. Contributing factors to this is personnel changes in the Math Department. We had several math teachers who did not return and then a few who left mid year. Another contributing factor is the change in assessment.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Algebra had the biggest gap compared to the state average with a 13% difference. Lake Minneola High scored 40% and the state average was 53%. Contributing factors to this is personnel changes in the Math Department. We had several math teachers who did not return and then a few who left mid year. Another contributing factor is the change in assessment.

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

Biology showed the most improvement increasing from 67% to 71% from the previous year. Biology surpassed the state average by 18%. LMHS scored 71% in Biology while the state average was 53%. Professional Learning Teams were implemented allowing teachers to plan together and desegregate the data to determine best teaching strategies. MoHawk time was implemented at the beginning of the year for intervention as well as tutoring. MoHawk Intervention was scheduled every Tuesday and Thursday for 30 minutes allowing students to attend the class of their choice where they may need help. Teachers are there to work with the students in small groups. Teachers can also require a student to attend their MoHawk to the teacher can help the student in the deficient area.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Absenteeism: Reducing excessive absences through intervention, relationship building (Capturing Kids Hearts), positive behavior support/student recognitions, Positive Alternative to School Suspension (PASS) and classroom engagement resulting in increased opportunities and enhanced exposure to standards-based instruction. & Students with disabilities: improve rating in ESSA to at least 41%. Capturing Kids hearts is a program that we had our teachers trained in to help build relationships among the students and staff allowing Lake Minneola High to be a place where students feel safe and want to come therefore increasing student achievement.

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

During Intervention time for students; we will utilize the following guiding questions to guide intervention:
What do we want all students to know and
be able to do?
How will we know if they learn it?
How will we respond when some students do
not learn?
How will we extend the learning for
students who are already proficient?

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Through a common vision of instruction, increase student proficiency through reading, writing, thinking, and student discourse in every classroom, resulting in high-quality standards-based instruction. Academic tutoring will be offered to students after school as well as AVID tutors to assist students in the AVID classrooms.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By focusing on this area, we expect to see the following in each designated
area:
Meeting High Standards in ELA: Increase from 53% to 55%
Making Learning Gains in ELA: Increase from 43% to 50%
ELA Lower Quartile Gains: Increase from 34% to 50%
Making High Standards in Math: Increase from 40% to 50%
Making Learning Gains in Math: Increase from 42% to 50%
Math Lowest Quartile Gains: Increase from 37% to 50%
Achievement in Biology: Increase from 71% to 75%
Achievement in US History: Increase from 67% to 75%

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Quarterly summative assessments (Lake Standards Assessments, APM/FAST, and
Pre-AP Unit Checks) will be used to progress monitor learning gains as addressed in
the measurable outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Roberts (robertsw@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Professional Learning Communities, and the programs noted below for each area, will
be used to increase student achievement and learning gains by 3%- 5% each quarter
in order to meet the measurable outcome. To monitor this strategy, student progress
monitoring data and classroom walkthrough instructional data will be analyzed
quarterly by administration, the leadership team and within our Professional Learning
Communities.
*Achieve 3000 (ELA/Intensive Reading)
*StudySync (ELA)
* Pre-AP Curriculum (ELA and Algebra 1)
*Khan Academy (ELA/Intensive Reading)
*ALEKS (Algebra & Geometry)
*MoHawk Time (all content areas)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we implement, monitor and support with an instructional refocus on purpose, guided
instruction, and collaboration, then teachers can adjust instruction in response to essential standard

student data on a weekly basis, and implement targeted re-teaching and remediation in support of all students, increasing achievement and learning gains.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Provide all Level 1 9th & 10th grade students with Intensive Reading support.
2. Provide all ESE and ELL support within regular education classroom in all tested areas.
3. Targeted re-teach and remediation time during the school day (MoHawk Time).
4. Weekly Professional Learning Communities using the Four Planning Questions, with a focus on analyzing mastery of essential content standards to drive instruction through the lens of the District Instructional Framework, and structuring relearning opportunities.
5. Pre-AP spiraling curriculum for Algebra 1, English 1 and English 2.
6. Use of ALEKS for additional remediation support.
7. Utilizing SAI funding for afterschool tutoring and grade recovery.
8. Utilizing SAC funding for SAT/ACT registrations to support evidence of mastery (concordant scores) for Algebra 1 EOC and ELA graduation testing requirements.
9. Provide AVID tutors ($5,000).
10.Utilizing SAI funding for support in Intensive Reading classes ($2000).

Person Responsible: Rhonda Boykin (boykinr1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: By May of 2024

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based upon the ESSA data, the Federal Index for Students with Disabilities is our most critical area of need. This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because it was the only area in which LMHS did not meet the federal target of 41%. With a focus on targeted interventions, our students with disabilities will demonstrate increased student achievement and demonstrate learning gains.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By focusing on this area, we expect to see the following in each designated
area:
Meeting High Standards in ELA: Increase from 53% to 55%
Making Learning Gains in ELA: Increase from 43% to 50%
ELA Lower Quartile Gains: Increase from 34% to 50%
Making High Standards in Math: Increase from 40% to 50%
Making Learning Gains in Math: Increase from 42% to 50%
Math Lowest Quartile Gains: Increase from 37% to 50%
Achievement in Biology: Increase from 71% to 75%
Achievement in US History: Increase from 67% to 75%

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

IEP Goals/Quarterly Data Chats
Quarterly summative assessments (Lake Standards Assessments, APM/FAST, and
Pre-AP Unit Checks) will be used to progress monitor learning gains as addressed in
the measurable outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rhonda Wolf (wolfr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Professional Learning Communities, and the programs noted below for each area, will
be used to increase student achievement and learning gains by 3%- 5% each quarter
in order to meet the measurable outcome. To monitor this strategy, student progress
monitoring data and classroom walkthrough instructional data will be analyzed
quarterly by administration, the leadership team and within our Professional Learning
Communities.
*Achieve 3000 (ELA/Intensive Reading)
*StudySync (ELA)
* Pre-AP Curriculum (ELA and Algebra 1)
*Khan Academy (ELA/Intensive Reading)
*ALEKS (Algebra & Geometry)
*MoHawk Time (all content areas)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we implement, monitor and support with an instructional refocus on purpose, guided instruction, and collaboration, then teachers can adjust instruction in response to essential standard student data on a weekly basis, and implement targeted re-teaching and remediation in support of all students, increasing achievement and learning gains.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Reducing excessive absences through intervention, relationship building (Capturing Kids Hearts), positive behavior support/student recognitions, Positive Alternative to School Suspension (PASS) and classroom engagement resulting in increased opportunities and enhanced exposure to standards-based instruction.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

To maintain an absenteeism rate < 10%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monthly data tracking on the school data wall.
Teacher and counselors will hold conversations/meetings with students and parents of students with habitual absenteeism.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Roberts (robertsw@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Positive Incentives/Reinforcement for students showing substantial improvements in being present at school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To celebrate students for being here, reinforcing that time away from school is lost instructional time.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No