

Polk County Public Schools

Lake Gibson Senior High School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Gibson Senior High School

7007 SOCRUM LOOP RD N, Lakeland, FL 33809

www.lgbraves.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	No	64%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	C	C	C*

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Polk County School Board on 1/15/2019.

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.

Lake Gibson High School's mission is to graduate all students to be college and career ready by providing rigorous, student-centered instruction along with a variety of acceleration opportunities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Lake Gibson High School is to graduate responsible and productive citizens with strong critical thinking and academic skills by providing a rigorous, dynamic, comprehensive curriculum delivered in partnership with the community, family and a competent, qualified staff in a safe and caring environment.

Teachers and staff work hard to provide the best educational experience for students. Parent partnership is a top priority and is essential for student success. Lake Gibson Senior High School has a rich tradition of outstanding student achievement and provides a sound, standards-based education, while promoting high moral character of all students.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Vann, Ryan	Principal
Deshazor, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal
Donahay, Debbie	Assistant Principal
Campbell, John	Dean
Diaz, Matthew	Assistant Principal
Whitaker, Sarah	Instructional Coach
Fisher, Summer	Assistant Principal

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

1. Principal Ryan Vann
 - Team Leader
 - AP's
 - Deans Resource Officer
 - Grad Coach
 - Literacy Coach
 - Principal Secretary
 - Finance Secretary
 - All
 - Business
 - TV

- ART
 - Drama
 - Family Ed
 - Health
 - ROTC
 - AG
- Observations
Evaluations
Hiring
Collaborative Planning Meetings
Coaching – Non Evaluative Observations
SIP Goals

Duties

Between Classes - Main Entrance
Lunch - Daily Eats line 2
After School - Parking lot

2. APC

Elizabeth Deshazor

- ALT Leader
 - Curriculum Issues
 - Graduation Rate (School Grade)
 - AP/Dual Enrollment
-
- Guidance
 - Testing Coordinator
 - LEA Facilitator
 - Guidance Secretary
 - Terminal Operator
 - English
 - ESOL
 - Foreign Language
-
- Master Scheduling
 - AP/DE enrollment scheduling
 - ESOL
 - Data Generation
 - Data Dissemination
 - Testing
 - Report Cards/Int
 - Grad Rate Report
 - Observations
 - Collaborative Planning Meetings
 - Coaching – Non Evaluative Observations
 - SIP Goals
 - Performance Matters
 - LSI

Duties

Between Classes - upstairs malfunction junction
Lunch - Hot lunch line 2
After School - Bus Ramp

3. APA

Debbie Donahay

- Facilities
- Master School Calendar
- Industry Certifications
- Custodians
- Food Service
- Network Manager
- Main Office Secretary 1
- Dean Secretary
- Paras
- LEA Facilitator
- School Nurse
- Science
- ESE
- Learning Center/ISS
- Graduation
- Observations
- Instructional Equipment/Sup
- Dropout prevention Safety Nets
- ESE/ELL/At Risk Students (monthly updates)
- Inventory
- Administrative Meetings
- Decal Checks Schedule
- Observations
- Collaborative Planning Meetings
- Coaching - Non Evaluative Observations
- SIP Goals
- Performance Matters
- LSI

Duties

Between Classes - Guidance
Lunch - Daily eats line 1
After School - Bus Ramp

4. APII 11

Matt Diaz

- AVID
- Discipline 10th, 12th
- College and Career Acceleration (School Grade)
- SIP Schedule
- Testing Coordinator
- Coaches
- Athletic Director & Secretary
- Main Office Secretary II

- Math
- PE
- Music
- Lesson Plans
- Textbooks
- Discipline
- Discipline Data
- Work Orders-Athletics, Gym, PE, Music/Band
- Building Usage
- Observations
- Collaborative Planning Meetings
- Coaching – non evaluative Observations
- SIP Goals
- Performance Matters
- LSI

Duties

Morning duty - Parking lot
Between Classes - math building
Lunch - Hot lunch line 1
After School - Parking lot

5. APII 10

Summer Fisher

- AVID
- Discipline 9th & 11th
- Attendance
- MTSS
- Deans
- Media Specialist
- Literacy Coach
- Attendance Secretary

- Reading
- Social Studies
- PEC
- NetConnect
- PLCs/PD
- Cohorting Model
- New Teacher Program
- Observations
- Coaching Non – Evaluative Observations
- SIP Goals
- Performance Matters
- LSI

Duties

Morning duty - Parking lot
Between Classes - upstairs media center
Lunch - Patio
After School - Bus Ramp

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	120	128	153	548
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	50	47	40	211
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	178	144	144	78	544
Behind in Math or ELA Credits	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	75	56	2	234
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	74	66	101	324

Date this data was collected

Friday 8/31/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	138	140	10	421
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	43	30	2	139
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	112	141	46	336
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202	195	238	121	756

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	14	2	7	60	

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	138	140	10	421
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	43	30	2	139
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	112	141	46	336
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202	195	238	121	756

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	14	2	7	60	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Algebra is our lowest performance level.

Yes, this year although it increased our score was still lower than expected.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

College and Career acceleration.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Algebra, the state average is 63 and our is 30.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

U.S. History in the last 3 years has gone from 48 to 53 to 62

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

The teachers in this subject are passionate about the content and improvement on the test.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	40%	46%	56%	39%	44%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	41%	47%	53%	43%	45%	46%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	39%	44%	41%	37%	38%
Math Achievement	38%	44%	51%	22%	32%	43%
Math Learning Gains	37%	42%	48%	25%	31%	39%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	38%	45%	32%	35%	38%
Science Achievement	56%	65%	67%	48%	54%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	62%	63%	71%	48%	64%	69%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	147 (133)	120 (138)	128 (140)	153 (10)	548 (421)
One or more suspensions	74 (64)	50 (43)	47 (30)	40 (2)	211 (139)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (37)	0 (112)	0 (141)	0 (46)	0 (336)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	178 (202)	144 (195)	144 (238)	78 (121)	544 (756)
Behind in Math or ELA Credits	101 (0)	75 (0)	56 (0)	2 (0)	234 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	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	2018	40%	43%	-3%	53%	-13%
	2017	41%	43%	-2%	52%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2018	39%	42%	-3%	53%	-14%
	2017	37%	40%	-3%	50%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

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
2018	52%	59%	-7%	65%	-13%
2017	52%	51%	1%	63%	-11%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	62%	57%	5%	68%	-6%
2017	52%	56%	-4%	67%	-15%
Compare		10%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	22%	60%	-38%	62%	-40%
2017	23%	43%	-20%	60%	-37%
Compare		-1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	36%	41%	-5%	56%	-20%
2017	21%	34%	-13%	53%	-32%
Compare		15%			

Subgroup Data

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	18	30	20	48	43		34	46		68	32
ELL	13	39	24	25	29		42	26		69	44
ASN	44	36									
BLK	31	36	25	35	30	9	47	55		82	54
HSP	39	45	29	31	32	20	57	63		81	59
MUL	52	38					30			77	70
WHT	45	42	28	43	43	35	61	64		84	63
FRL	35	39	24	35	32	23	51	57		79	58
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	8	28	25	8	21	16	30	16		51	30
ELL	4	25	36	10	36	32	18	36		74	58
ASN	47	47		28	33		64				
BLK	26	34	24	17	24	22	42	35		79	55
HSP	39	35	32	26	33	29	57	56		81	74
MUL	53	50		15	33		50	44		85	9
WHT	45	44	39	27	30	29	59	60		79	69
FRL	33	36	30	20	30	35	50	46		74	62

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	ELA score improvemet
Rationale	Increase our overall ELA achievement, learning gains and, learning gains with the lowest 25% 3%.
Intended Outcome	Our intended out come is to increase our 3 cells in ELA by 3% points
Point Person	Elizabeth Deshazor (elizabeth.deshazor@polk-fl.net)
Action Step	
Description	Schoolwide writing initiative will be incorporated into all lessons. Set learning targets that meet the standards.
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Deshazor (elizabeth.deshazor@polk-fl.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Walthroughs, Collaboritive planning, PLC's,
Person Responsible	Sarah Whitaker (sarah.whitaker@polk-fl.net)
Activity #2	
Title	Algebra/math proficiency increase
Rationale	Algebra is our lowest performing area. Any increase in these cells will have a great affect on our overall performance as a school.
Intended Outcome	Increase Algebra 1 test scores by 3%.
Point Person	Matthew Diaz (matthew.diaz@polk-fl.net)
Action Step	
Description	Collaborative Planning / on pace, Common Assessments Intensive tutoring and remediation Setting learning targets to the depth of the standards
Person Responsible	Matthew Diaz (matthew.diaz@polk-fl.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Collaborative Planning, PLC's, Walkthroughs
Person Responsible	Matthew Diaz (matthew.diaz@polk-fl.net)

Activity #3	
Title	College & Career & Graduation rate increase
Rationale	Continued increase of our College & Career Acceleration and Graduation rate.
Intended Outcome	Increase College & Career Acceleration to 70% Graduation Rate increase to 86 %
Point Person	Matthew Diaz (matthew.diaz@polk-fl.net)
Action Step	
Description	Identify those that have yet to earn a Acceleration point and work with these students to get them a point. Use the early warning system in order decrease the number of students that do not graduate
Person Responsible	Matthew Diaz (matthew.diaz@polk-fl.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Monthly administrative meetings discussing our Early Warning System. Monthly administrative meetings identifying and planning to increase our C&C acceleration
Person Responsible	Matthew Diaz (matthew.diaz@polk-fl.net)
Activity #4	
Title	Increase Attendance / Decrease Absences
Rationale	Increased Attendance will directly increase our School's performance
Intended Outcome	Reduce Absences schoolwide
Point Person	Summer Fisher (summer.fisher@polk-fl.net)
Action Step	
Description	Increasing engagement in the classroom / relationship Administration in classrooms Prepared teachers
Person Responsible	Summer Fisher (summer.fisher@polk-fl.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Monthly Administrative attendance meetings and phone calls home
Person Responsible	Matthew Diaz (matthew.diaz@polk-fl.net)

Activity #5	
Title	Decrease Discipline referrals
Rationale	Decreased Discipline will raise attendance and raise School Performance
Intended Outcome	Increase Attendance, School Performance, and Decrease referrals.
Point Person	Debbie Donahay (debbie.donahay@polk-fl.net)
Action Step	
Description	Discuss changes to our cell phone policy. Use Positive referrals - focus on positive behavior. Use more school wide rewards. Change the structure of the Learning Center.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Weekly meetings with discipline team to discuss discipline numbers.
Person Responsible	Debbie Donahay (debbie.donahay@polk-fl.net)

Activity #6	
Title	LSI in alignment to our SIP Goals
Rationale	In order to begin the school-wide implementation process for LSI, our team has identified several tasks, identified with bullets below.
Intended Outcome	LSI school wide
Point Person	Sarah Whitaker (sarah.whitaker@polk-fl.net)
Action Step	
Description	<p>Target 1: Lead a vision for rigor in a community of practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our LSI team will deliver information, including purpose, goals, and expectations to our staff. This will be done during our Professional Learning Communities (PLC) meeting amongst the various departments. • Our Academic Leadership Team will combine forces with the LSI team and will meet monthly. <p>Target 2: Forge a vision that is ethical and creative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All classroom teachers will be provided with a poster size copy of the Marzano Taxonomy levels diagram to be posted in each classroom. This will serve as a reminder of the rigor expectations and can be used to model expectations for the students. <p>Target 3: Take decisive and risk assumptive actions to achieve a vision of rigor (Action 1: Target-Task Alignment)</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through collaborative planning groups and PLC time, the teachers will develop strategies to achieve Target-Task Alignment. Common language will be use across content and grade levels to describe learning targets for each class. Through common subject collaboration, formative and summative assessments will be developed to bring rigor into ALL CLASSROOMS. • Administration will be visiting classrooms to track rigor using the LSI tools available. These “rigor walks” are non-evaluative tools to assess levels of rigor that currently exist in classrooms on campus. This data, once developed, will be used to assess needs amongst departments.
	<p>Target 4: Build capacity to influence others and sustain the vision of rigor through deliberate practice (Trend Tracker introduction)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See TARGET 3. • Along with administration, the LSI team will observe and work/model best practices within their individual departments to increase rigor.
Person Responsible	Summer Fisher (summer.fisher@polk-fl.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Walkthroughs, Collaborative planning, PLC's, LSI/ALT team meetings,
Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)