

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Lake Nona High
12500 NARCOOSSEE RD
Orlando, FL 32832
407-956-8300

School Demographics

School Type High School	Title I No	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate 42%
Alternative/ESE Center No	Charter School No	Minority Rate 68%

School Grades History

2013-14 PENDING	2012-13 A	2011-12 A	2010-11 B	2009-10 C
---------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

SIP Authority and Template

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

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, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
Differentiated Accountability	4
Part I: Current School Status	5
Part II: Expected Improvements	26
Goals Summary	32
Goals Detail	32
Action Plan for Improvement	35
Part III: Coordination and Integration	43
Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals	44
Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals	48

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. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. 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: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
 - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
 - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
 - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
 - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
 - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School

Lake Nona High

Principal

Margaret Nampon

School Advisory Council chair

Teresa Loomis

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
Margaret Nampon	Principal
Jennifer Bellinger	Assistant Principal
Paul Browning	Assistant Principal
James Hoffman	Assistant Principal
George Arscott	Administrative Dean
Karen Reid-Santo Domingo	Administrative Dean
Amy DeMott	Academic Dean
Nirsa Gautier	Curriculum Resource Teacher
Andrew Chiles	Athletic Director
Ann Marie Rodriguez	SAFE Coordinator

District-Level Information

District

Orange

Superintendent

Dr. Barbara M Jenkins

Date of school board approval of SIP

1/28/2014

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

The SAC is comprised of school administrators, teachers, parents, and community leaders.

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

The LNHS meets monthly throughout the school year. During the meetings, school performance data is reviewed with the SAC and discussed. The goals that have been established in the improvement plan

based upon performance data are evaluated. The SAC works together in a problem-solving method to develop strategies to help LNHS achieve improvement goals. The process is continuous throughout the year.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

During monthly meetings student assessment data is reviewed for progress monitoring. Student achievement is discussed to identify areas of need. Using the school improvement goals, instructional strategies and professional development are shared and discussed to meet the school goals.

Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project

N/A

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC

In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

Highly Qualified Staff

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

of administrators

4

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Margaret Nampon

Principal

Years as Administrator: 6

Years at Current School: 5

Credentials

B.S. English Education from U.S.F.
 M.Ed. Educational Leadership from U.S.F.
 NBCT – ELA/AYA
 English – 6-12
 Gifted Endorsement
 Middle Grades
 Endorsement
 Educational Leadership
 Principal – K-12

Performance Record

Margaret Nampon has been in the education field for 24 years with 5 years as an assistant principal and 1 year as a principal. As Assistant Principal for Instruction since LNHS opened in 2009, Mrs. Nampon helped develop and implement the Collegiate Academy that has seen students successfully accrue more than 4,100 credit hours in four years. In addition, through the Collegiate Academy and through a strategically developed master schedule, Mrs. Nampon has helped to develop an Advanced Placement program that has demonstrated consistent growth in both participation and performance growing from 581 students taking 905 Advanced Placement exams with a 38.4% success rate in 2011-12 to 672 students taking 1,136 Advanced Placement exams with more than a 45% success rate in 2012-13. As principal, Mrs. Nampon has continued to focus on acceleration opportunities for students including an increase of 26% in Advanced Placement participation for the 2013-14 school year. Below is documentation of the last three years of state testing performance data that shows the overall student achievement for Lake Nona High School students while Mrs. Nampon has been a part of the administrative team:

2012-2013: Lake Nona High School
 School grade – Pending
 FCAT Reading – 61% proficient
 Learning Gains – 68%
 Learning gains L25% - 71%
 FCAT Math – 67% proficient
 Learning Gains – 70%
 Learning gains L25% - 64%
 ALG EOC (if applicable) – 59%
 GEO EOC (if applicable) – 57%
 FCAT Writing – 54% at 3.5 or higher
 Biology EOC (if applicable) – 64% proficient
 AMO targets data:
 Reading AMO Target Met – Yes
 Math AMO Target Met – Yes
 Writing AMO Target Met – No

2011-12: Lake Nona High School
 School grade - A

FCAT Reading – 57% Proficient
Learning Gains – 69%
Learning gains L25% - 75%
FCAT Math – 66% proficient
Learning Gains – 66%
Learning gains L25% - 85%
ALG EOC (if applicable) – 48.8% proficient
GEO EOC (if applicable) – 86% proficient
FCAT Writing – 65% at 3.5 or higher
Biology EOC (if applicable) – 79% Proficient
2010-11: Lake Nona High School
School grade - B
FCAT Reading – 53% Proficient
Learning Gains – 54%
Learning gains L25% - 47%
FCAT Math – 77% proficient
Learning Gains – 78%
Learning gains L25% - 66%
FCAT Writing – 96% at 3.0 or higher

Paul Browning		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 0	Years at Current School: 1
Credentials	<p>B.A., Finance, University of Central Florida M.A., Biblical Studies, Reformed Theological Seminary Modified Core, Educational Leadership, University of Central Florida Social Sciences, Grades 6-12 Educational Leadership, K-12</p>	
Performance Record	<p>Paul Browning has been in education for ten years. For seven years as a classroom teacher, Mr. Browning was successful in implementing strategies designed to help all students achieve. He enhanced learning for high achieving students while provide support and intervention for struggling learners. Mr. Browning also served as a teacher-leader while working as a classroom teacher. For the past three years, Mr. Browning has served in an instructional support role at William R. Boone High School. While there he successfully functioned as an instructional coach providing instructional training and professional development. Mr. Browning also provided school-wide support for MTSS and Rtl, helping teachers to utilize student data to make instructional decisions and to monitor progress in order to increase student achievement. He also supported teachers in the implementation and use of Marzano instructional strategies.</p> <p>2012-2013: Boone High School School grade – Pending FCAT Reading – 66.6% proficient Learning Gains – 66.5% Learning gains L25% - 64.9% FCAT Math – 73% proficient Learning Gains – 77% Learning gains L25% - 64% ALG EOC – 52% GEO EOC – 75% FCAT Writing – 56.5% at 3.5 or higher Biology EOC – 68% proficient AMO targets data: 2012-2013 AMO Targets Reading AMO Target Met – NO Math AMO Target Met – YES Writing AMO Target Met – NO 2011-12: Boone High School School grade - B FCAT Reading – 64.7% Proficient Learning Gains – 59.3% Learning gains L25% - 52.9% FCAT Math – 68% proficient ALG EOC – 52% proficient GEO EOC – 69% proficient FCAT Writing – 89.9% at 3.5 or higher</p>	

Biology EOC – 71% Proficient
2010-11: Boone High School
School grade - B
FCAT Reading – 75.4% Proficient
Learning Gains – 64.6%
Learning gains L25% - 34.2%
FCAT Math – 86.9% proficient
Learning Gains – 80.7%
Learning gains L25% - 66.5%
FCAT Writing – 87.7% at 3.0 or higher
ALG EOC – 58% proficient

James Hoffman		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 4	Years at Current School: 2

Credentials

EDUCATION:
 Masters in Educational Leadership: Nova Southeastern University, Orlando Florida
 Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education and Specific Learning Disabilities: West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon West Virginia
 CERTIFICATION:
 Educational Leadership K-12
 Multi-Subjects Grade 1-6
 Varying Exceptionalities Grade K-12
 Specific Learning Disabilities Grade K-12

Performance Record

Mr. Hoffman has a diverse background in education with seven years of teaching experience in both elementary and secondary environments. He also has four years of experience as a high school Staffing Specialist and three years of experience as a district administrator.
 Prior to being appointed as an assistant principal for Lake Nona High School, Mr. Hoffman supervised and evaluated the School Psychologists and School Social Workers district wide. He also worked extensively on student data collection and analysis using several student data systems including state reporting sites.
 Mr. Hoffman’s educational work experience includes the following:
 Assistant Principal for Lake Nona High School, District Program Specialist for Psychological and Social Services, High School Staffing Specialist for Exceptional Student Education, 8th Grade Language Arts Teacher for students with Specific Learning Disabilities, Elementary School Exceptional Student Education Teacher, High School Learning Strategies Teacher and High School Co-Teacher for English, Math and History.
 2012-2013: Lake Nona High School
 School grade – Pending
 FCAT Reading – 61% proficient
 Learning Gains – 68%
 Learning gains L25% - 71%
 FCAT Math – 67% proficient
 Learning Gains – 70%
 Learning gains L25% - 64%
 ALG EOC (if applicable) – 59%
 GEO EOC (if applicable) – 57%
 FCAT Writing – 54% at 3.5 or higher
 Biology EOC (if applicable) – 64% proficient
 2012-2013 AMO Targets
 Reading AMO Target Met – Yes
 Math AMO Target Met – Yes
 Writing AMO Target Met – No
 2011-2012: District
 School grade – B

FCAT Reading – 58.5% proficient
Learning Gains – 64.7%
Learning gains L25% - 64.5%
FCAT Math – 58.9% proficient
Learning Gains – 65.5%
Learning gains L25% - 60.6%
2010-2011: District
School grade – B
FCAT Reading – 63.1% proficient
Learning Gains – 50.6%
Learning gains L25% - 31.8%
FCAT Math – 63.6% proficient
Learning Gains – 50.3%
Learning gains L25% - 29.3 %

of instructional coaches

3

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Amy DeMott

Full-time / School-based

Years as Coach: 0

Years at Current School: 1

Areas

Data, RtI/MTSS, Other

Credentials

BS-Elementary Education, University of Central Florida
 Masters-Ed. Leadership, University of Central Florida
 Elementary Education
 Educational Leadership, K-12
 ESOL

Performance Record

Lake Nona Middle School 2012-2013
 School grade A
 FCAT Reading 73.7%
 Learning Gains 70.2%
 Learning gains L25%- 66.7%
 FCAT Math 68.3%
 Learning Gains 63.6%
 Learning gains L25% 66.2%
 FCAT Writing 61.2%
 Reading AMO Target Met -- YES
 Math AMO Target Met -- YES
 Writing AMO Target Met -- YES
 Lake Nona Middle School 2011-2012
 School grade A
 FCAT Reading 70.7%
 Learning Gains 68.8%%
 Learning gains L25%- 69.2
 FCAT Math 65.9%
 Learning Gains 66.7%
 Learning gains L25% 65.4%
 FCAT Writing 84.1%
 Lake Nona Middle School 2010-2011
 School grade A
 FCAT Reading 68.9%
 Learning Gains 51.8%
 Learning gains L25%-29.2%
 FCAT Math 64.0%
 Learning Gains 50.6 %
 Learning gains L25% 25.5%
 FCAT Writing 81.8%

Alyson Boger		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 3	Years at Current School: 3
Areas	Reading/Literacy, Data, RtI/MTSS, Other	
Credentials	B.A., English, Eastern Connecticut State University M.Ed – Curriculum and Instructional Design, Reading, Grand Canyon University English, 6-12 Reading, K-12	
Performance Record	Consistent gains in the lowest 30% including ESE and ESL for two previous years – 70% of lowest showed gains the first year, at least 50% showed gains the second year due to a pull-out program using small group instruction to tutor reading and math. 100% ESE graduation rate two years running. 2012-2013: Lake Nona High School School grade – Pending FCAT Reading – 61% proficient Learning Gains – 68% Learning gains L25% - 71% FCAT Math – 67% proficient Learning Gains – 70% Learning gains L25% - 64% ALG EOC (if applicable) – 59% GEO EOC (if applicable) – 57% FCAT Writing – 54% at 3.5 or higher Biology EOC (if applicable) – 64% proficient AMO targets data: Reading AMO Target Met – Yes Math AMO Target Met – Yes Writing AMO Target Met – No 2011-12: Lake Nona High School School grade - A FCAT Reading – 57% Proficient Learning Gains – 69% Learning gains L25% - 75% FCAT Math – 66% proficient Learning Gains – 66% Learning gains L25% - 85% ALG EOC (if applicable) – 48.8% proficient GEO EOC (if applicable) – 86% proficient FCAT Writing – 65% at 3.5 or higher Biology EOC (if applicable) – 79% Proficient 2010-11: Lake Nona High School School grade - B FCAT Reading – 53% Proficient Learning Gains – 54% Learning gains L25% - 47% FCAT Math – 77% proficient Learning Gains – 78%	

Learning gains L25% - 66%
FCAT Writing – 96% at 3.0 or higher

Nirsa Gautier		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 0	Years at Current School: 5
Areas	Reading/Literacy, Data, Other	
Credentials	B.S., Elementary Education M.A., Instructional Technology English 6-12 ESOL K-12 Integrated Curriculum 5-9 Elementary Education	
Performance Record	<p>Mrs. Gautier has been a teacher for 24 years and 13 years at OCPS, Mrs. Gautier has been a faculty member at Lake Nona High since the school opened in 2009. She taught English I, English I ESOL and English II; Mrs. Gautier and has just joined the administrative team. For the 2010-2011, 61% of Mrs. Gautier's English I/Honors classes showed learning gains; in 2011-2012, 75% Mrs. Gautier's English I students showing learning gains. In 2012 -2013, 58% of English II students made learning gains, 75% of her ESOL students made learning gains, and 79% of her English I students showed learning gains.</p> <p>2012-2013: Lake Nona High School School grade – Pending FCAT Reading – 61% proficient Learning Gains – 68% Learning gains L25% - 71% FCAT Math – 67% proficient Learning Gains – 70% Learning gains L25% - 64% ALG EOC (if applicable) – 59% GEO EOC (if applicable) – 57% FCAT Writing – 54% at 3.5 or higher Biology EOC (if applicable) – 64% proficient AMO targets data: Reading AMO Target Met – Yes Math AMO Target Met – Yes Writing AMO Target Met – No</p> <p>2011-12: Lake Nona High School School grade - A FCAT Reading – 57% Proficient Learning Gains – 69% Learning gains L25% - 75% FCAT Math – 66% proficient Learning Gains – 66% Learning gains L25% - 85% ALG EOC (if applicable) – 48.8% proficient GEO EOC (if applicable) – 86% proficient FCAT Writing – 65% at 3.5 or higher Biology EOC (if applicable) – 79% Proficient</p> <p>2010-11: Lake Nona High School School grade - B</p>	

FCAT Reading – 53% Proficient
 Learning Gains – 54%
 Learning gains L25% - 47%
 FCAT Math – 77% proficient
 Learning Gains – 78%
 Learning gains L25% - 66%
 FCAT Writing – 96% at 3.0 or higher

Classroom Teachers

of classroom teachers

88

receiving effective rating or higher

88, 100%

Highly Qualified Teachers

100%

certified in-field

86, 98%

ESOL endorsed

11, 13%

reading endorsed

6, 7%

with advanced degrees

34, 39%

National Board Certified

8, 9%

first-year teachers

11, 13%

with 1-5 years of experience

32, 36%

with 6-14 years of experience

36, 41%

with 15 or more years of experience

9, 10%

Education Paraprofessionals

of paraprofessionals

4

Highly Qualified

4, 100%

Other Instructional Personnel

of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above

8

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

1. High quality professional learning opportunities (Principal/Assistant Principals/CRT/Academic Dean)
2. Comprehensive Interviewing Process (Principal/Assistant Principals)
3. New Teacher Induction/Mentoring (CRT/Academic Dean)
4. Professional Learning Communities (Principal/Assistant Principals/CRT/Deans)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

Mentors are paired with their mentees according to common teaching assignments (e.g. – Algebra II with Algebra II) or common teaching fields (e.g.—English with English). Also, mentors and mentees are paired according to proximity. When proximity is minimal it allows for more frequent collaboration and professional discourse between the mentor and the mentee. The mentors also meet with the mentee informally on a weekly basis in order that the mentor may be able to address concerns, offer professional guidance, and suggest strategies for growth. In addition, quarterly new teacher meetings are held to address issues and or concerns for all new teachers.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI)

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

The MTSS Leadership Team meets on Thursdays during 2nd period to discuss progress with initiatives and trouble shoot issues with implementation and/or monitoring of student progress. Assistant Principals function as support for all grade levels and groups of students. Each Dean acts as a grade-level specific leader for intervention and implementation for identified students. They work with teachers directly to insure students are receiving appropriate interventions at the appropriate intensity. The Guidance Counselors act as additional support for identification and monitoring of students and their instructional/intervention needs. Curriculum Leaders assist in implementation across curricular areas and specific grade levels. The MTSS Leadership Team is comprised of members from all areas across the school organization. As a result, the efforts of MTSS are integrated into the processes for all areas. The weekly meetings provide a forum for exchange of information and monitoring of processes from all stakeholders and across all areas. MTSS is integrated into all strategies and facets of the school organization.

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

The Principal oversees and coordinates all MTSS activities and efforts to insure needs are being addressed and effective MTSS strategies are being developed and implemented. The Assistant Principals oversee respective content areas, assist teams with data analysis and progress monitoring, developing instructional strategies, and identifying academic needs. Assistant Principals also meet regularly with PLC's to facilitate collaboration among teachers and to address needs. The Discipline Deans monitor student behavior and report to the MTSS team any concerns they have related student behaviors that will negatively impact student achievement. They also work with the team to develop interventions for students who are behavior risks. The Academic Dean oversees all testing and assessment. She provides progress monitoring data from all formative assessments to the MTSS team in order that the team might develop support systems to help struggling students be successful. The CRT oversees all professional development. She works with teachers to improve instructional practice and strategies. She identifies those strategies most needed that target the greatest need among students and helps teachers to implement these strategies in daily instruction.

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

The MTSS team meets weekly to address students' needs. Each team member is responsible for ongoing monitoring of a sub-population among the student body. Lists are maintained of students within these sub-populations of struggling students. In addition to the student lists, interventions and supports are discussed at team meetings and put into place to help all students be successful. Progress monitoring data is monitoring on an ongoing basis and if students are not being successful additional supports are implemented.

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

Progress is monitored through analysis of data from multiple sources including but not limited to: standardized and benchmark test data from EDW, TRACE, and Performance Matters; attendance and discipline data from SMS and EDW; student academic performance from SMS and ProgressBook. Data is summarized and communicated via large and small group methods including faculty meetings, Curriculum area meetings, leadership team meetings, and PLC's meet as appropriate with additional access provided via SharePoint. Teachers will also have immediate access to student data as they are able to monitor class level and individual student performances and monitor their students' strengths as well as their areas of improvement through Performance Matters.

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

All professional development includes MTSS strands to help teachers with the differentiation and application of strategies for Tiers 1, 2, and 3 students. Lake Nona High School teachers teach, re-teach, and provide small group instruction based on differentiated instruction and work collaboratively in their PLCs with members of the MTSS Leadership team during department meetings, PLC meetings, trainings and pre-observation conferences. Teachers also document their interventions in the LNHS lesson plan template.

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Weekend Program

Minutes added to school year: 900

AP Tutuoring -- AP teachers provide Saturday tutoring to their students in their respective accelerated courses.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Sign In Sheets

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

API, Guidance Counselors, AP Teachers

Strategy: Summer Program

Minutes added to school year: 1,920

Summer EOC Camp -- Students receive addition instruction and support in the lead up to the summer administration of EOC's.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

EOC assessments

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

API, Guidance Counselors, Summer School Principal, Summer School Teachers

Strategy: Summer Program

Minutes added to school year: 9,600

Summer School

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Teacher Assessments, Report Card Grades, FCAT/EOC Assessments

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

API, Guidance Counselors, Summer School Principal

Strategy: Before or After School Program

Minutes added to school year: 1,800

MVP's (Most Valuable Pupils) -- an intervention program to support students in the lowest 30%. Beginning in the second semester, students are pulled from electives and placed in this class for additional support in reading and math.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Data collected and analyzed include -- report card grades, teacher made assessments, benchmark test, and FCAT/EOC assessments.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

API, Guidance Counselors, Inclusion Coach, Teachers

Strategy: Before or After School Program

Minutes added to school year: 8,640

Night School -- Students take required course for credit recovery and grade forgiveness.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Grades Collected

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

API, Guidance Counselors, Night School Coordinator, Night School Teachers

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

Name	Title
Margaret Nampon	Principal
Paul Browning	Assistant Principal
Nirsa Gautier	CRT
Amy DeMott	Academic Dean
Susan Hannah	Media Specialist
Kelly Nicholas	Reading Teacher
Luis Boada	Reading Teacher
Cristen Krugh	Reading Teacher
Melisa Linares	Reading Teacher

How the school-based LLT functions

The LLT meets monthly with Nirsa Gautier who is the facilitator of the meetings. The team works to coach teachers on how to implement reading strategies across the content areas. The LLT identifies the areas of reading that need improvement and assists administration in identifying the appropriate professional development to assist teachers in choosing the best strategies for intervention, how to use the strategy in the classroom, and how to monitor the use of the strategy. The LLT also plays an integral role in monitoring the strategies and interventions that are part of the MTSS/Rtl process for Lake Nona High School. The LLT will also play a significant role in the successful implementation of the ELA Standards of the CCSS across all content areas and grade levels.

Major initiatives of the LLT

Implementation of active reading strategies into content area classrooms.

Increased fluency and comprehension of students in intensive reading classes.

Increased student use of self-selected reading strategies.

Rigorous vocabulary taught to increase comprehension for lower level readers and ELL readers.

Use of higher order thinking questions to increase comprehension for all content area reading.

Using metacognition, background knowledge and inference skills to increase comprehension for all content area reading.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

All teachers at Lake Nona High School work with students on Active Reading Brain Strategies to help improve student's reading comprehension and teach students how to monitor their comprehension as they are reading. One of the strategies is "Marking the Text" which takes students through steps divided into different active reading activities. Teachers break down the text with students in order to provide detailed instruction on the reading. Teachers provide students with advance rigor and deep complex articles using non-fiction in order to prepare students' brains for higher-level thinking within all content areas of text. Teachers monitor students' comprehension, vocabulary and fluency through different styles of reading while re-enforcing the good reading habits of before and after reading strategies.

College and Career Readiness

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future

At Lake Nona High School, students have access to Advanced Placement Courses, College Dual Enrollment Courses, and Career and Technical Education Courses as part of their high school curriculum. In addition, teachers provide some interdisciplinary instruction that provides students examples of the integrated relationship among the courses they are taking. Lake Nona High School has developed programs in partnership with Valencia College as part of the Collegiate Academy; and with Sanford-Burnham Research Institute as part of the Science Research Cohort program; with Florida Hospital as part of the Health Academy program. The administration and faculty of Lake Nona High School understand the important role that community partnerships can play in preparing students for their college and career choices. Through our on-campus business education courses, students are provided with instruction that will allow them to earn industry certifications. These certifications will assist as they enter the job market even during their high school career.

How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful

Guidance Counselors visit the classrooms at least twice a year and discuss course selection and future goals and planning. The Guidance Counselors also list a breakdown of suggested courses for each year of high school for three different post-secondary goals. In addition, we have evening presentations for students and parents regarding AP, Dual Enrollment, Colleges and college planning, and Financial Aid. Finally, we also discuss Technical Dual Enrollment and Valencia Dual Enrollment with students.

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

The Guidance Counselors go to the annual SUS, State University System, conference to learn about updates and changes from the Directors of Admissions of the 12 public universities in Florida. The counselors then bring the information back to our students in classroom visit settings. Lake Nona High

School invites representatives from colleges, universities, and technical schools to our school to speak to our juniors and seniors about their programs and application process. In addition to this, LNHS has a college night and a financial aid night in order to promote college attendance and make students aware of available financial assistance programs.

Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	64%	61%	Yes	68%
American Indian				
Asian	71%	73%	Yes	74%
Black/African American	50%	48%	Yes	55%
Hispanic	55%	55%	Yes	60%
White	78%	73%	Yes	81%
English language learners	31%	28%	No	38%
Students with disabilities	41%	35%	Yes	47%
Economically disadvantaged	53%	47%	No	58%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	231	25%	28%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	336	36%	40%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		17%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		83%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	546	68%	71%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	149	71%	74%

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	124	67%	70%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	75	40%	44%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	82	44%	47%

Postsecondary Readiness

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.	1230	62%	66%

Area 2: Writing

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	282	54%	57%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		60%

Area 3: Mathematics

High School Mathematics

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	59%	67%	Yes	63%
American Indian				
Asian		81%		
Black/African American	49%	56%	Yes	54%
Hispanic	55%	63%	Yes	60%
White	67%	77%	Yes	70%
English language learners	44%	46%	Yes	50%
Students with disabilities	32%	31%	No	39%
Economically disadvantaged	53%	56%	Yes	58%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		60%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		60%

Learning Gains

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (EOC and FAA)	392	70%	73%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (EOC)	119	64%	67%

Postsecondary Readiness

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.	1111	56%	60%

Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	114	41%	44%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	52	19%	22%

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	178	36%	39%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	104	21%	24%

Area 4: Science

High School Science

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		75%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		25%

Biology I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	192	38%	41%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	132	26%	29%

Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)

All Levels

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	5		10
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	215	12%	18%

High Schools

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses	433	23%	26%
Completion rate (%) for students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses		85%	88%
Students taking one or more advanced placement exams for STEM-related courses	672	35%	38%
CTE-STEM program concentrators	279		290
Students taking CTE-STEM industry certification exams	279	15%	18%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE-STEM industry certification exams		83%	86%

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses	536	27%	30%
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more <i>accelerated</i> courses	509	26%	29%
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> courses		85%	88%
Students taking CTE industry certification exams	137	7%	10%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams		83%	86%
CTE program concentrators	63	3%	6%
CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications	5	71%	74%

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

High School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	318	17%	14%
Students in ninth grade with one or more absences within the first 20 days	84	18%	15%
Students in ninth grade who fail two or more courses in any subject	8	2%	1%
Students with grade point average less than 2.0	114	6%	3%
Students who fail to progress on-time to tenth grade	45	9%	6%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	462	25%	21%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	178	7%	4%

Graduation

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students dropping out of school, as defined in s.1003.01(9), F.S.	16	4%	2%
Students graduating in 4 years, using criteria for the federal uniform graduation rate defined in the Code of Federal Regulations at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)	368	95%	97%
Academically at-risk students graduating in 4 years, as defined in Rule 6A-1.09981, F.A.C.	102	26%	30%
Students graduating in 5 years, using criteria defined at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)	257	67%	63%

Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Parental involvement targets for the school

During the 2013-2014 school year, Lake Nona High School will continue to engage parents and encourage parental involvement through a variety of opportunities. This effort is made to give parents and guardians an opportunity to be active participants in their student's educational experience.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
75% of parents or guardians will participate in at least one school activity.	1300	70%	75%

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

This section is optional. At this time Lake Nona High School is choosing to focus on the core curricular goals

Specific Additional Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
--------	---------------	---------------	---------------

Goals Summary

- G1.** To increase academic rigor in reading across all content areas
- G2.** To integrate writing with reading in order to prepare students for college and career.
- G3.** To close the achievement gap by increasing academic achievement among all student subgroups

Goals Detail

G1. To increase academic rigor in reading across all content areas

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- Social Studies
- U.S. History EOC
- Civics EOC
- EWS - High School
- EWS - Graduation

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- School wide staff development on academic rigor
- Professional learning literature including volumes by Robert Marzano
- An active and involved culture of Professional Learning Communities

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Lack of knowledge of reading strategies across all content areas
- Students are not reading enough across the content areas

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Classroom Walk Throughs and Observations, lesson plans,

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principals, CRT

Target Dates or Schedule:

Ongoing

Evidence of Completion:

Benchmark assessments and classroom data

G2. To integrate writing with reading in order to prepare students for college and career.

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- Writing
- Social Studies
- U.S. History EOC
- Civics EOC
- Science - High School
- Science - Biology 1 EOC
- STEM
- STEM - High School
- EWS - High School
- EWS - Graduation

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- School Wide Professional Development
- Technology

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Teachers may not be able to provide timely feedback to ensure student success

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

During Professional Development sessions and PLCs, teachers will be asked to present their data for discussion and reflection

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principals, Resource Teachers, and Classroom Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule:

Monthly

Evidence of Completion:

Classroom Data and Sample Student Artifacts

G3. To close the achievement gap by increasing academic achievement among all student subgroups

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- Writing
- Algebra 1 EOC
- Geometry EOC
- Social Studies
- U.S. History EOC
- Civics EOC
- EWS - High School
- EWS - Graduation

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Resource Personnel
- Data to inform teachers regarding the student subgroups
- Performance Matters for progress monitoring

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Ineffective planning for subgroups

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Criteria to evaluate results will include classroom data, benchmark exams, EOC's, FCAT

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principals, Resource Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule:

MTSS Meetings

Evidence of Completion:

Classroom Data, EOCs, FCAT,

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. To increase academic rigor in reading across all content areas

G1.B1 Lack of knowledge of reading strategies across all content areas

G1.B1.S1 School wide professional development on reading strategies

Action Step 1

Close Reading, Academic Rigor, and Text Complexity professional developments during teacher's planning period. Teachers will be given an overview, view a model presentation and be given an opportunity to practice.

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, AP's, CRT, Academic Dean, CCT, Staffing Specialist

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Teachers will share reflections on the practice with PLC's

Facilitator:

Principal and CRT

Participants:

All instructional staff

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S1

Lesson Plan Template, Classroom Walk throughs

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principals, Resource Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Classroom data, Benchmark Exams, EOCs and FCAT

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Classroom Data, Benchmark Exams, Classroom Walkthroughs

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers, Principals, Assistant Principals, Resource Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Marking period midpoint and endpoint

Evidence of Completion

End of year data along with teacher reflection and discussion

G1.B2 Students are not reading enough across the content areas

G1.B2.S1 Implementing close reading strategies across content areas

Action Step 1

After professional development on close reading strategy teachers will implement across all content areas.

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, AP's, CRT and all instruction staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Daily

Evidence of Completion

Teacher reflections shared with PLC's, classroom walk thoughts and observations, benchmark assessments and classroom data

Facilitator:

Principal, AP's, CRT

Participants:

All instructional staff at LNHS

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B2.S1

Classroom walk throughs and observations, lesson plans,

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, AP's, CRT

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Benchmark and classroom data

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S1

Benchmark and classroom data; review data with teachers

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, AP's, CRT

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Reviewing available data for success; student artifacts

G2. To integrate writing with reading in order to prepare students for college and career.

G2.B1 Teachers may not be able to provide timely feedback to ensure student success

G2.B1.S1 Provide teachers with instructional strategies that focus on student feedback embedded in ongoing professional development sessions

Action Step 1

School Wide Professional Development on Effective Feedback for Writing

Person or Persons Responsible

CRT and Academic Dean

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Lesson Plan Template, Classroom Walk-throughs, Sample Student Artifacts

Facilitator:

CRT, Academic Dean

Participants:

All Faculty

Action Step 2

Providing support for essay writing skills in order to increase proficiency in FCAT Writing.

Person or Persons Responsible

CRT, Academic Dean, Assistant Principal, Grade 10 English Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Student writing samples, Orange Writes

Facilitator:

CRT, Academic Dean

Participants:

Grade 10 English Teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B1.S1

Classroom Data, Classroom Walk-Throughs

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principal, Resource Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing, throughout the year

Evidence of Completion

Classroom Data, Observation from Classroom Walk Throughs, Sample Student Artifacts

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S1

Oranges Writes, FCAT Writes, Writing across content areas

Person or Persons Responsible

All faculty

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Ask teachers to reflect on their practice to measure success and celebrate

G3. To close the achievement gap by increasing academic achievement among all student subgroups

G3.B1 Ineffective planning for subgroups

G3.B1.S1 Use existing data to identify and monitor the progress of subgroups

Action Step 1

School wide professional development on progress monitoring using performance matters

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Academic Dean

Target Dates or Schedule

Year Long

Evidence of Completion

Classroom walk-throughs; Lesson plans

Facilitator:

CRT and Academic Dean

Participants:

All faculty

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B1.S1

Lesson plans will be monitored for accommodations; Classroom Walk-throughs will observe implementations

Person or Persons Responsible

Assessing Administrators, Resource personnel

Target Dates or Schedule

ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Benchmark Exam; Classroom Data

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B1.S1

Classroom data, Benchmark Exams

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers, Resource Personnel

Target Dates or Schedule

Midpoint Marking Periods and End of Marking Period; Ongoing during MTSS meetings

Evidence of Completion

Final MTSS Meeting

G3.B1.S2 Identify effective strategies to engage students within the diverse subgroups

Action Step 1

Once students are identified, select and implement appropriate accommodations from resources provided that will ensure academic achievement and monitor student progress. using classroom data and Performance Matters.

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principals, Resource Teachers, and all Classroom Teachers.

Target Dates or Schedule

year long

Evidence of Completion

Classroom data and Benchmark Testing

Facilitator:

CRT

Participants:

All Faculty

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B1.S2

Lesson Plans, Participation in an active PLC, Classroom Walk-throughs

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principal, Resource Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Daily

Evidence of Completion

Classroom Data, Benchmark Data, Student Artifacts

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B1.S2

Classroom Data, and Benchmark Data

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal, Assistant Principal, Resource Personnel

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly MTSS Meetings

Evidence of Completion

Final meeting review of all data

Coordination and Integration

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Title I -- N/A

Title II funds will be used for Professional Development to support Math and Reading. The majority of funds will be used to support the continued implementation of the Tabor Rotation model in our math classes. For reading, Title II funds will be used to support content area literacy training.

Title III – Funds are used to in support of closing the achievement gap that exists among ELL students. Funds are used to purchase additional support for ELL students -- CCT and ELL paraprofessional. An International Scholars program has been established to provide additional support for our first year language acquisition students.

Title VI -- N/A

Title X – LNHS currently has 9 homeless students and we follow all McKinney Vento guidelines with regard to providing access to education and adhering to FERPA regulations for these students. Our SAFE coordinator maintains a record of these students and assists with resources for these students and families.

SAI – Funds are used to pay for a resource teacher to support teachers with instructional improvement and CCSS implementation.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

G1. To increase academic rigor in reading across all content areas

G1.B1 Lack of knowledge of reading strategies across all content areas

G1.B1.S1 School wide professional development on reading strategies

PD Opportunity 1

Close Reading, Academic Rigor, and Text Complexity professional developments during teacher's planning period. Teachers will be given an overview, view a model presentation and be given an opportunity to practice.

Facilitator

Principal and CRT

Participants

All instructional staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Teachers will share reflections on the practice with PLC's

G1.B2 Students are not reading enough across the content areas

G1.B2.S1 Implementing close reading strategies across content areas

PD Opportunity 1

After professional development on close reading strategy teachers will implement across all content areas.

Facilitator

Principal, AP's, CRT

Participants

All instructional staff at LNHS

Target Dates or Schedule

Daily

Evidence of Completion

Teacher reflections shared with PLC's, classroom walk thoughts and observations, benchmark assessments and classroom data

G2. To integrate writing with reading in order to prepare students for college and career.

G2.B1 Teachers may not be able to provide timely feedback to ensure student success

G2.B1.S1 Provide teachers with instructional strategies that focus on student feedback embedded in ongoing professional development sessions

PD Opportunity 1

School Wide Professional Development on Effective Feedback for Writing

Facilitator

CRT, Academic Dean

Participants

All Faculty

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

Lesson Plan Template, Classroom Walk-throughs, Sample Student Artifacts

PD Opportunity 2

Providing support for essay writing skills in order to increase proficiency in FCAT Writing.

Facilitator

CRT, Academic Dean

Participants

Grade 10 English Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Ongoing

Evidence of Completion

Student writing samples, Orange Writes

G3. To close the achievement gap by increasing academic achievement among all student subgroups

G3.B1 Ineffective planning for subgroups

G3.B1.S1 Use existing data to identify and monitor the progress of subgroups

PD Opportunity 1

School wide professional development on progress monitoring using performance matters

Facilitator

CRT and Academic Dean

Participants

All faculty

Target Dates or Schedule

Year Long

Evidence of Completion

Classroom walk-throughs; Lesson plans

G3.B1.S2 Identify effective strategies to engage students within the diverse subgroups

PD Opportunity 1

Once students are identified, select and implement appropriate accommodations from resources provided that will ensure academic achievement and monitor student progress. using classroom data and Performance Matters.

Facilitator

CRT

Participants

All Faculty

Target Dates or Schedule

year long

Evidence of Completion

Classroom data and Benchmark Testing

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
G3.	To close the achievement gap by increasing academic achievement among all student subgroups	\$7,000
Total		\$7,000

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Professional Development	Total
Title II	\$7,000	\$7,000
Total	\$7,000	\$7,000

Budget Details

Budget items identified in the SIP as necessary to achieve the school's goals.

G3. To close the achievement gap by increasing academic achievement among all student subgroups

G3.B1 Ineffective planning for subgroups

G3.B1.S1 Use existing data to identify and monitor the progress of subgroups

Action Step 1

School wide professional development on progress monitoring using performance matters

Resource Type

Professional Development

Resource

Funding Source

Title II

Amount Needed

\$7,000