

Lake County Schools

Mt. Dora High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mt. Dora High School

700 N HIGHLAND ST, Mount Dora, FL 32757

<https://mdh.lake.k12.fl.us//>**Demographics****Principal: Marlene Straughan**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (49%) 2014-15: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Lake County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mt. Dora High School

700 N HIGHLAND ST, Mount Dora, FL 32757

<https://mdh.lake.k12.fl.us//>

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 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	45%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	B	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Mission of Mount Dora High School is to provide the best education to all students while encouraging and enabling each to grow personally and academically.

Provide the school's vision statement.

“Caring About the Needs of Every Student” reflects the motto and the vision of MDHS. Our mission is to provide the best education to all students and enable each to grow personally and academically. We will endeavor to equip each student with the attitude and aptitude for continuing individual growth and education, both of which are necessary to succeed in the increasingly more difficult and competitive American job market.

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
Boone, Rhonda	Principal	Oversight of school functions in curriculum and instruction, budget, physical plant and day to day operations Science and Career Technical Education
Walker, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	ESE, ELL, MTSS, ELA, Health, Attendance, FTE
Bracewell, Kyle	Assistant Principal	Physical Plant, Social Studies, Electives
Slack, Catherine	Assistant Principal	Guidance, Master Schedule, Math, Performing Fine Arts
Becker, Scott	Teacher, K-12	
Campbell, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	
Carlton, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	
Daily-Griffin, Dee	Teacher, K-12	
Dwyer, Ted	Teacher, ESE	
Eshbaugh, Ryan	School Counselor	
Kozlowski, Billye	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Olson, Colin	Teacher, K-12	
Schlotter, Liz	Teacher, K-12	
Scott, Andrew	Teacher, K-12	
Lannon, Anjanette	Teacher, K-12	
Clinkscapes, Sharia	School Counselor	Mental Health Liason
Wilson, Randall	Teacher, K-12	Positive Alternative to School Suspension teacher

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	0	284	310	276	257	1127
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	59	51	55	201
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	10	11	4	47
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	56	56	178
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	108	72	40	287

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	108	123	112	103	446

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		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	11	26

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

63

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

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	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	26	28	15	100	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	62	50	32	219	

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	33	20	13	22	88

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	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	26	28	15	100
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	62	50	32	219

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	33	20	13	22	88

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	50%	50%	56%	41%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	46%	51%	46%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	33%	42%	41%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	46%	44%	51%	44%	44%	49%
Math Learning Gains	38%	45%	48%	43%	41%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	36%	45%	34%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	67%	68%	68%	59%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	69%	73%	71%	69%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	284 (0)	310 (0)	276 (0)	257 (0)	1127 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	36 (0)	59 (0)	51 (0)	55 (0)	201 (0)
One or more suspensions	22 (1)	10 (1)	11 (1)	4 (0)	47 (3)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (31)	66 (26)	56 (28)	56 (15)	178 (100)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	67 (75)	108 (62)	72 (50)	40 (32)	287 (219)

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	50%	47%	3%	55%	-5%
	2018	43%	46%	-3%	53%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	44%	48%	-4%	53%	-9%
	2018	49%	49%	0%	53%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

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	65%	66%	-1%	67%	-2%
2018	58%	61%	-3%	65%	-7%
Compare		7%			
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	73%	67%	6%	70%	3%
2018	79%	69%	10%	68%	11%
Compare		-6%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	31%	52%	-21%	61%	-30%
2018	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
Compare		-18%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	45%	49%	-4%	57%	-12%
2018	46%	50%	-4%	56%	-10%
Compare		-1%			

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	19	38	30	37	50	27	31	44		79	11
ELL	4	24	24	30	32		50			70	
ASN	92	67									
BLK	25	38	25	29	37	36	38	59		86	21
HSP	36	42	35	42	40	33	62	69		90	55
MUL	38	44		33	16		83				
WHT	59	50	35	53	41	25	74	82		87	69
FRL	36	37	25	39	39	36	58	62		81	48
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	23	51	43	41	48		33	57		50	27
ELL	14	43	44	38	55		40			70	
ASN	77	75									
BLK	23	46	57	19	23	33	32	72		64	28
HSP	39	53	55	49	52	50	55	82		86	37
MUL	57	69									
WHT	55	52	57	58	57	58	71	86		86	72
FRL	40	51	54	43	44	46	52	82		74	39
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	9	34	39	18	21	7	24	39		54	27
ELL	18	50	45	29	45						
ASN	60			70							
BLK	21	36	39	30	40	25	37	27		81	16
HSP	31	44	40	38	41	43	52	64		79	50
MUL										75	
WHT	49	49	45	48	45	32	65	80		84	55
FRL	28	38	38	37	41	38	50	62		72	35

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	587
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	80
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	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50

Hispanic Students	
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	43
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	58
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	47
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.

ELA and Math Lowest 25% showed the most need for improvement. In ELA we had teacher turnover in one of two ELA classes, additionally we were focused on proficiency achievement. We had indicators on LSA for greater success. Math we shifted our focus from learning gains to proficiency and used LSA data to address student progress. The indications from LSA did not translate to results on the EOC.

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

ELA and Math Learning Gains showed our biggest decline both over all and in the lowest quartile. After significant growth in this area in 17-18, we shifted focus to proficiency in our planning and professional development and credits towards graduation. We had staff turnover and local

assessment data that gave us different indicators of success than what was achieved. LSA progress monitoring gave us false indicators of student proficiency with the standards.

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 Lowest 25% shows the greatest gap compared to the state average. We placed students in LAM1 prior to Alg1 if their 8th grade Math FSA indicated that students were a Level 1 or 2 for the 17-18 school year. These students were unable to count in the learning gains because they did not have a state test the previous year.

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

Science Achievement on the Bio EOC went up. We focused on standards based instruction and feedback from the LSA quarterly and mid year assessments to guide remediation opportunities for instruction. This year our Biology teachers are working to align classroom based assessments to the standard for additional proficiency indicators

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

Our attendance rate is lower than previous years and our multiple course failure rate improved but is still high. We have begun an attendance committee this year to improve parental and student support when struggling to attend school. We also will continue to provide PD by supporting a culture of redo's and make-ups in standards based instruction and grading.

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

1. Lowest Quartile in ELA
2. Lowest Quartile in Math
3. Safety and Security
4. Professional development using district instructional framework
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Lowest Quartile ELA
Rationale	Students in the lowest 25% in ELA grade 9 and 10 overall lags below the state average 8% (5% grade 9 and 9% grade 10). In collaboration with the Administration, Instructional and Non-instructional staff we determined that a focused remediation in ELA will occur 2x per week for 30 min with our lowest 30%. Additional supports and interventions will be provided for our SWD and ELL students in the classroom a minimum of 2x per week.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our school will raise from 34% lowest quartile learning gains to 43% meeting the state average median over the past two years.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kimberly Walker (updikek@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards based remediation
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Pinpointing points of confusion, skill deficiency and strategic intervention within the tested standards for ELA will allow for structured interventions to be implemented for remediation and support.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify standards/ strands deficiency from state and local assessments 2. Plan small group/individual interventions using technology supports with Khan Academy 2x per week 3. Progress monitor movement on the standards for individual students 4. Utilize Support in classroom 2x per week for ELL and SWD 5. After school/ Saturday tutoring available 6. SAI funds will be used to support programs for lowest quartile
Person Responsible	Kimberly Walker (updikek@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Lowest Quartile Math
Rationale	Lowest quartile in Math lags 17% below the state average. In collaboration with the Administration, Instructional and Non-instructional staff we determined that a focused remediation in Algebra and Geometry will occur 2x per week for 30 min with our lowest 30%. Additional supports and interventions will be provided for our SWD and ELL students in the classroom a minimum of 2x per week.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The lowest quartile in Math will rise from 28% to meet the state average at 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Catherine Slack (slackc@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards based remediation
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Pinpointing points of confusion, skill deficiency and strategic intervention within the tested standards for Algebra 1 and Geometry will allow for structured interventions to be implemented for remediation and support. Teachers will collaborate with teachers from other high schools in region monthly to share best practices and analyze student success and remediation using local assessments.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. Identify standards/ strands deficiency from state and local assessments 2. Plan small group/individual interventions using technology supports with Algebra Nation, Khan Academy and IXL 2x per week 3. Progress monitor movement on the standards for individual students 4. Utilize Support in classroom 2x per week for ELL and SWD 5. After school/ Saturday Tutoring available 6. Teacher collaboration with other schools 7. SAI funds will be used to support programs for lowest quartile
Person Responsible	Catherine Slack (slackc@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Providing an Instructional Framework: Purpose in Common Planning
Rationale	By providing an instructional framework with a focus on purpose teachers in common planning will plan for learning opportunities that utilize best practices for teaching and learning. Our instructional staff will focus on purpose. When PURPOSE is understood by both the student and the teacher progress can be monitored towards achieving the intent of the standard.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on the purpose 100% of our teachers will purposely plan for PURPOSE in their classrooms. Learning Walks will be monitored for evidence of purpose. Students will show proficiency on standards and teachers can plan focused interventions to move students to intent of standard.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rhonda Boone (booner@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Common planning/ assessment
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Learning walks and observations will be used to monitor the implementation of purpose in our common planning planning to support teaching and learning. We will use the District Instructional Framework handouts and trainings for support.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PD for Instructional Framework: Focus on Purpose 2. Common Planning for instruction with purpose 3. Walkthroughs and Feedback with Purpose as a look for 4. Monitor standards based progress
Person Responsible	Rhonda Boone (booner@lake.k12.fl.us)

#4	
Title	Safety and Security
Rationale	By focusing on safety and security we will be providing an environment for all students to learn and make gains.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	MDHS will conduct 100% of the required drills and professional development for all staff.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kyle Bracewell (bracewellk@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Participation in drills to practice. Participation in PD provided by agencies and district in Safety and Mental Health.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Participation in training provided by MDPD, LCSO and EOC agencies for Active Shooter. Participation in mental health trainings
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff PD for Active Shooter 2. Staff Mental Health PD (Kognito and Youth Mental Health First Aid) 3. Student Mental Health First Aid training 4. Safety Drills 5. Speakout Hotline 6. School Guardian and SRO for school day and summer academic supports
Person Responsible	Kyle Bracewell (bracewellk@lake.k12.fl.us)
#5	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	By focusing on student attendance we will improve the average daily attendance and more students will be able to learn and grow
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase our annual attendance from 82% to 90%. (196 students missing 10% or more of the days in SY 18-19 to 113 in SY19-20).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kimberly Walker (updikek@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilizing attendance committee to set attendance contracts and child study team
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By involving the attendance team, timely and frequent communication will occur with students, parents and guardians and barriers to attend will be discussed and problem solved.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Weekly analysis of student attendance 2. Attendance contracts for students exceeding absences and tardies of four through Q1, six through Q2, seven through Q3 and 8 through Q4 3. Weekly monitoring of compliance with the attendance contract 4. Case study team initiated for students with 10 or more absences
Person Responsible	Kimberly Walker (updikek@lake.k12.fl.us)
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).

Acceleration- Additional opportunity for Seniors to earn an industry certification, expansion of dual enrollment on campus for 10th graders with a 3.5 GPA

Grad Rate- 11th and 12th graders needing ELA FSA/ ALG 1 proficiency are scheduled in remediation classes, Schoolday issued SAT in Fall and Spring for 12th grade, 11th grade PSAT in fall and SAT in Spring, 10th grade PSAT, PERT opportunities monthly for 11th and 12th for concordant scores. SAT/ ACT tutoring on designated Saturdays and after school 2x per week. SAT/ ACT prep materials will be provided through SAI. Ready Time in school remediation 2x per week. After School and Summer Credit Recovery program will be used to assist students in obtaining credits for graduation. SAI funds will be used to support programs for lowest quartile.

SWD subgroup- Students are scheduled with Support/ Learning Strategies in compliance with the program and IEP. Students data will be monitored weekly by ESE team and real time intervention plans created for those with warning indicators. Academic Tutoring and SAT/ACT tutoring available after school 2x per week and designated Saturday's. Ready Time in school remediation 2x per week. SAT/ ACT prep materials will be provided through SAI. After School and Summer Credit Recovery program will be used to assist students in obtaining credits for graduation. SAI funds will be used to support programs for lowest quartile

ELL sub-group- 9th and 10th grade ELL students who are non-speakers are scheduled into Developmental Language Arts class, ELL students receive support of ELL TA in their Math, Science and Social Studies at least 1x per week. Rosetta Stone will be implemented with fidelity. Academic Tutoring and SAT/ACT tutoring available after school 2x per week and designated Saturday's. SAT/ ACT prep materials will be provided through SAI. Ready Time in school remediation 2x per week. After School and Summer Credit Recovery program will be used to assist students in obtaining credits for graduation. SAI funds will be used to support programs for lowest quartile

Black/African American sub-group- Focus on early interventions such as attendance team, course failures and the MTSS process for those showing indicators of need for additional support. Academic Tutoring and SAT/ACT tutoring available after school 2x per week and designated Saturday's. SAT/ ACT prep materials will be provided through SAI. Ready Time in school remediation 2x per week. After School and Summer Credit Recovery program will be used to assist students in obtaining credits for graduation. SAI funds will be used to support programs for lowest quartile