Lake Gibson Senior High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Gibson Senior High School

7007 SOCRUM LOOP RD N, Lakeland, FL 33809

www.lgbraves.com

Demographics

Principal: Ryan Vann

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (44%) 2014-15: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Lake 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)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vann, Ryan	Principal	
Deshazor, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	
Donahay, Debbie	Assistant Principal	
Diaz, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Whitaker, Sarah	Instructional Coach	
Fisher, Summer	Assistant Principal	
Jorge, Brent	Dean	Dean of Students Discipline PBIS
Ulch, David	Dean	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	567	498	406	383	1854
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	39	28	29	183
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	52	35	23	202
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	64	90	45	265
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187	130	113	62	492

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	89	60	41	15	205
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	22	12	9	62

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/27/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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 with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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 with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	41%	47%	56%	39%	44%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	46%	51%	39%	41%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	37%	42%	33%	33%	41%
Math Achievement	27%	43%	51%	24%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	34%	45%	48%	29%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	44%	45%	27%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	60%	58%	68%	55%	56%	65%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	60%	61%	73%	53%	60%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	567 (0)	498 (0)	406 (0)	383 (0)	1854 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	87 (147)	39 (120)	28 (128)	29 (153)	183 (548)
One or more suspensions	92 (74)	52 (50)	35 (47)	23 (40)	202 (211)
Course failure in ELA or Math	66 (0)	64 (0)	90 (0)	45 (0)	265 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	187 (178)	130 (144)	113 (144)	62 (78)	492 (544)

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	40%	45%	-5%	55%	-15%
	2018	40%	43%	-3%	53%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	37%	42%	-5%	53%	-16%
	2018	39%	42%	-3%	53%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	54%	3%	67%	-10%
2018	52%	59%	-7%	65%	-13%
Compare		5%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	57%	1%	70%	-12%
2018	62%	57%	5%	68%	-6%
Compare		-4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	21%	50%	-29%	61%	-40%
2018	22%	60%	-38%	62%	-40%
Compare		-1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	27%	53%	-26%	57%	-30%
2018	36%	41%	-5%	56%	-20%
Compare		-9%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	13	36	32	22	39		36	21		82	19
ELL	10	37	41	19				47		78	57
ASN	71	63		33						90	
BLK	31	42	33	21	31	31	37	49		91	43
HSP	39	45	37	29	40	60	63	63		90	63
MUL	35	38		13	40		64			76	69
WHT	46	48	42	31	33	40	67	62		90	56
FRL	32	41	35	23	34	46	46	52		88	51

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

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	553
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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

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

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

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

Math Achievement is where we performed the worst.

Factors that contributed to this low score include the fact that we had two teachers resign during the first week of school. Both teachers had 10 tested classes between them. Also, one of the teachers we hired to fill this void resigned in January, leaving this unit with 6 tested classes with 3 different teachers throughout the year. In addition to this, we had two other provisional substitutes and a first year teacher. Due these unforeseeable changes in math department staff, we had several tested subjects (Algebra 1B, Geometry, and Algebra) left with out qualified teachers.

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

Social Studies Achievement showed the greatest decline.

Due to a clerical mistake, all our AP US History and Dual Enrollment US History students were removed from our assessment list. As a result all of their scores did not count towards our achievement score. All of the AP and DE students did take the U.S. History EOC, however their scores were not calculated in our over Social Studies Achievement.
Based on our ESE subgroup data from 2019, achievement levels decreased by 27 points. Even though common summative assessments were given in the US History classes, data tracking, and reteaching were not implemented and closely monitored.

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.

Math and ELA Achievement had the largest gap between the school and state average. With Math Achievement, the amount of substitutes that were used throughout the year is the greatest contributor to the scores being deficient. Regarding ELA achievement, we had 492 Level 1 students throughout our school propulation. While the number of Level 1 students have decreased from the year prior,

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

Our lowest 25% in Math and our ELA Achievement improved the most.

In ELA, we strategically placed our strongest English and Reading teachers in the tested grade levels.
With the lowest 25% in Math we provided ESE support throughout the year. We also had one Math

teacher responsible for teaching a majority of the lowest 25%. She was able to concentrate her efforts to ensure these students were mastering the standards taught..

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

The major area of concern is the number of 1's earned in state wide assessments. The next area of concern is the number of students that are not in attendance for 90% of the school year. 548 students have missed more than 10%.

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

1. Improvement in overall Math Achievement
2. Raise ELA Achievement to the District level (6 points)
3. Increase our Science Achievement to 68% to catch up with the state percentage
4. Raise our Math learning gains to the District level (11 points)
5. Return to the norm in Social Studies Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Improvement in overall Math Achievement
Rationale	An increase in overall math achievement will have a positive impact on our students' abilities to make sense of problems and persevere in solving them, reason abstractly and quantitatively, and construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others, which are all skills that will be applied across the curriculum.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math Achievement on the Algebra and Geometry EOCs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matthew Diaz (matthew.diaz@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Graphical, Numerical, Algebraic, and Written representations in math. Common Assessments Increase collaboration among Peers LSI Focused Note-Taking Interactive notebooks Collaborative structures
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Common Assessments, Data Tracking & Collaborative planning are all a part of the highly effective PLC model (Dufour 2004) LSI - Target, task, and success criteria alignment
Action Step	
Description	Administrators have created a master schedule that supports collaboration among teachers and will actively monitor, participate, and coach during these collaborative planning sessions. During PLCs, the team will utilize common summative assessment data to enhance instructional strategies. We will ncrease SAO quality through regular reflection and the implementation of timelines for formative and summative assessments. Teachers are all using Math Nation to drive instruction.
Person Responsible	Matthew Diaz (matthew.diaz@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Return to the norm in Social Studies Achievement
Rationale	We have been increasing in social studies achievement however this year we dropped 2 points from the previous year. We intend to increase the effectiveness of our instruction particularly with our subgroups by using evidence-based strategies that were previously shown to improve our students' learning, and contributing to the increase of our scores prior to this year. We will put more emphasis on collaboration and progress monitoring throughout the year which will include weekly data chats during our PLC's.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase achievement on U.S. History EOC by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Summer Fisher (summer.fisher@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Focused note-taking Collaborative structures LSI (target-task alignment, success criteria) AVID strategies Common summative assessments and tracking of subgroup data
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The AVID Center LSI (Moore, Toth, & Marzano, 2017) Highly Effective PLC Model (Dufour, 2004)
Action Step	
Description	We will increase the effectiveness of PLC time by tracking and reflecting on subgroup data from common assessments. Teachers will encourage a culture among students of self-reflection on growth through increasing transparency by using learning targets and success criteria. Creation of a learning scale for each standard-based summative assessment to determine proficiency levels will guide reassessing and reteaching (also based on formative assessments throughout each unit).
Person Responsible	Summer Fisher (summer.fisher@polk-fl.net)

#3	
Title	Raise ELA Achievement to the District level (6 points)
Rationale	Literacy skills are critical to the well-being of our students within and beyond the courses they take in school. Increasing our ELA achievement levels will have a positive impact on our students' achievement in every other aspect of school and postsecondary opportunities.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase in FSA ELA growth and achievement levels
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Elizabeth Deshazor (elizabeth.deshazor@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Close reading strategies Common summative assessments LSI strategies Interactive notebooks Collaborative structures Small group instruction Gradual release of responsibility
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	LSI strategies (Moore, Toth, & Marzano, 2017) Close reading strategies and gradual release (Fisher & Frey) AVID

Action Step	
Description	Increase the effectiveness of PLC time by tracking and reflecting on subgroup data from common summative assessments. We are working to encourage a culture among students for self-reflection on progress and to increase transparency and communication by using learning targets and success criteria consistently. Planning will include enrichment tasks for students who are meeting the standards.
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Deshazor (elizabeth.deshazor@polk-fl.net)

#4	
Title	Raise our Math Learning Gains to the District level (11 points)
Rationale	Math Learning gains has an 11 point gap between the School and the district. Increasing in Math learning gains will also increase overall Math Achievement and in crease the learning gains of the lowest 25%

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Math Learning gains on the Algebra and Geometry EOC's
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matthew Diaz (matthew.diaz@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Graphical, Numerical, Algebraic, and Written representations in math. Common Assessments Increase collaboration among Peers LSI Focused Note-Taking Interactive notebooks Collaborative structures
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Common Assessments, Data Tracking & Collaborative planning are all a part of the highly effective PLC model (Dufour 2004) LSI - Target, task, and success criteria alignment

Action Step	
Description	We created a Master schedule that supports Collaboration among all math teachers and administration will actively monitor, participate, and coach during Collaborative planning sessions. We will support data tracking during PLCs through the use of common summative assessments; we will use this data to enhance instructional strategies by analyzing practice among teachers and corresponding student achievement data. We will increase SAO quality through regular reflection and the implementation of timelines for assessments, which will help drive our continuous improvement. The Collaborative teams are all using Math Nation to drive instruction.
Person Responsible	Matthew Diaz (matthew.diaz@polk-fl.net)

#5	
Title	Increase our Science Achievement to 68% to catch up with the state percentage
Rationale	The state science proficiency is 68% for high schools. Lake Gibson High School's science proficiency is 60%. Our intended outcome is to meet or exceed the state proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase our Science Achievement to 68 from 60 on the Biology EOC.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Debbie Donahay (debbie.donahay@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Common Assessments Increase collaboration among Peers LSI Focused Note-Taking Interactive notebooks Collaborative structures 5E
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Common Assessments, Data Tracking & Collaborative planning are all a part of the highly effective PLC model (Dufour 2004) LSI - Target, task, and success criteria alignment
Action Step	
Description	Administrators created a master schedule that supports collaboration among teachers and will actively monitor, participate, and coach during collaborative planning. Data tracking and reflection of common and formative assessments will occur during PLCs in order to enhance instructional strategies. Increasing SAO quality through regular reflection and the implementation of timelines for assessments will occur between administration and teachers. Teacher teams will utilize the 5E model to engage students and drive instruction.
Person Responsible	Debbie Donahay (debbie.donahay@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

Graduation Rate - Using the EWS to identify the students at risk of grading we will create an action plan for these students to assist them in achieving graduation.
College and Career Acceleration - Identify those that have yet to earn an acceleration point and work with these students to assist them in earning a point
Increase Proficiency in statewide assessments for our Students with Disabilities and Black students

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Teachers and administrators are willing to share the responsibility with parents for improving student academic achievement. This partnership will help students meet the State's academic achievement standards.

• Lake Gibson High School staff will continue to provide students with a high-quality curriculum as well as research based instructional strategies to ensure the best possible education for all students.

• Parents will be responsible for supporting their child's learning, monitoring attendance, homework, TV watching, and participating in decisions relating to their education. Parents can monitor grades, discipline, and attendance using the online Parent Portal tool.

• There will be on going communication between parents and teachers. The school will host a open house for parents to stay in touch. Lake Gibson High School is using social media platforms (school website, facebook, & twitter) to display all the positive news that occurs at the school.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Lake Gibson High School offers students counseling and guidance on an individual and group basis concerning personal, academic, college, and career decisions. The guidance counselors work closely with the administration, faculty, and parents to help each student develop fully his/her potential. Appointments maybe initiated by students or counselor, or referrals may be made by administration, faculty or parents.

Individual Counseling

Many times students will seek counseling or advice on a myriad of issues. Students who require extended or specialized counseling may be referred to professionals outside of the school setting.

Group Counseling

Counselors meet with various groups to discuss careers, colleges, test results and other pertinent topics. In addition, counselors meet with students who have identified or displayed common concerns such as self-esteem, separated families or grief.

College Counseling

College counseling begins immediately for students at Lake Gibson High School with the advisement of courses necessary for success in college. The introduction to the College Board program and the search for colleges that meet a student's criteria begins early in junior year. Students are aided in the college application process throughout senior year until suitable post secondary plans are in place.

College representatives are available to present information on their respective colleges.

Financial Aid Night

A financial aid advisor from a local college presents updated financial aid information and discusses the procedure for filling out the Financial Aid Form

Early Financial Aid Planning Presentation

This presentation is designed to help parents of freshmen students with college finances. An overview of the financial aid process is presented and various strategies for obtaining money for college are discussed.
Senior Scholarship Booklet

This booklet, updated yearly, lists and describes area scholarships available to graduating seniors.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Lake Gibson High School is part of Florida's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). This project provides technical assistance and professional development to targeted school districts across Florida. Participating Middle and High Schools receive the information, materials, and coaching necessary to implement content enhancement routines and learning strategies based on the identified needs of their students. Each school develops a plan to maintain the efforts after the SPDG funding has ended.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The Administrative team (Principal, Assistant Principals, and Dean of Students) meet with guidance counselors to review student data and identify areas of needs. The team reviews instructional strategies and resources to drive effective classroom instruction. In planning, teachers unpack Sunshine State Standards, utilize learning maps and learning focused strategies to assess student learning, and adjusting and refining the curriculum and instruction as needed. The Media Specialist and Technology Specialist maintain a resource inventory at Lake Gibson High School.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Annually the school will hold elective fairs with present and incoming students. Based on interest, the administration team will establish Course Selection Sheets and courses that will be offered to best meet student needs. The Guidance Department, ESE Specialist, Department Heads, lead teachers and APC's will then
articulate with feeder schools and assist students in signing up for courses and programs based on their Automatic Course Requests forms and based on student's interests. School Counselors will visit classes to
review the options for electives the students can take emphasizing the Dual Enrollment and Industry Certification classes we have to offer. They will distribute Course Selection Sheets and provide information about selecting courses for the following school year. These Course Selection Sheets are then sent home for parent review and signature.

On an annual basis, the school will review new course offerings at the state and district level to continue to offer rigorous and relevant coursework to meet the State Standards. Advance Placement courses are offered to Lake Gibson students to provide rigor in the curriculum and for students to have an opportunity to earn college credit.

Every Early Release day is college day in which the staff and students dress in their College gear. We are taking 4 trips to see various colleges through our AVID program yearly.

Our academies are constantly reaching out to local business partners for assistance and paid internships for our academy students.

Our business partners are also invited to be on our LGHS SAC committee which meets every other month.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improvement in overall Math Achievement	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Return to the norm in Social Studies Achievement	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Raise ELA Achievement to the District level (6 points)	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Raise our Math Learning Gains to the District level (11 points)	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase our Science Achievement to 68% to catch up with the state percentage	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00