Mt. Dora High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 7/1/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
2019-20 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%)
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

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	57%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	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. It's our 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Straughan, Marlene	Principal	Oversight of school functions in curriculum and instruction, budget, physical plant and day to day operations. Departments include Science, Social Studies and PE
Walker, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	ESE, CTE, Health, Attendance, FTE
Bracewell, Kyle	Assistant Principal	Facilities, ELA, Reading, Foreign Language, ROTC, School Safety
Slack, Catherine	Assistant Principal	Guidance, Master Schedule, Math, Performing Fine Arts, ELL, MTSS
Becker, Scott	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair
Campbell, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair
Carlton, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	Media Specialist
Daily-Griffin, Dee	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Dwyer, Ted	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Chair
Eshbaugh, Ryan	School Counselor	School Counselor and department chair
Kozlowski, Billye	Teacher, Career/ Technical	CTE Department Chair
Olson, Colin	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Schlotter, Liz	Teacher, K-12	Literacy Coach
Scott, Andrew	Teacher, K-12	Electives Department Chair and ROTC instructor
Lannon, Anjanette	Teacher, K-12	Graduation facilitator
Wilson, Randall	Teacher, K-12	Positive Alternative to School Suspension teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Marlene Straughan

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
2019-20 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%)
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]().	

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	289	303	275	244	1111
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	59	48	31	183
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	18	5	7	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	28	25	9	91
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	27	25	12	93
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	76	54	22	200
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	90	60	35	230

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	167	179	177	144	667

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	13	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4	5	18

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/25/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	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	36	59	51	55	201
One or more suspensions	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	66	56	56	178
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	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	4	4	7	11	26

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	
Number of students enrolled	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	36	59	51	55	201
One or more suspensions	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	66	56	56	178
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	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	4	4	7	11	26

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**	
	(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	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

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
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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.

The Lowest Quartile for math was only at 28%. This was a significant decline from the previous year. While this is from the 2019 assessment window, it's obvious there was not enough strategic intervention used with the LQ students.

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

Both Math and ELA LQ groups declined significantly. Both components had a 23 point decrease. Math LQ group fell from 51% to 28%, and ELA LQ fell from 57% in 2018 to 34% in 2019. Again, not enough emphasis was put on tracking and monitoring the LQ students last year.

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.

The Math LQ component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state was at 45% and MDHS was only at 28%. In addition to a lack of monitoring these students, intervention time was not utilized to its fullest potential, leading to a decline in several areas, especially the LQ groups.

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

Science showed the most improvement from 2018 to 2019, improving from 62% to 68%. There was greater involvement in Hi-Q and Robotics than there has traditionally been. The Biology teachers also utilized common planning and collaborative plan time.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

We had 183 students who missed 10 or more days of school. Another concern is the 667 students with two or more indicators, an increase from 446 the year before. In addition, there were 230 level 1's on the Math FSA EOC.

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

1. Increase learning gains for the Lower Quartile
2. Increase overall ELA achievement
3. Increase overall Math achievement
4. Be over 90% for graduation rate

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

With high expectations, teachers will intentionally plan and focus on student learning; students can state what they are learning, why they are learning it, and how they have learned it.

If we monitor and support our focus on purpose and provide common planning, then teachers will intentionally plan and evaluate student assessments and work products. If we support the district's instructional framework, then teachers will understand and utilize modeling, guided instruction, collaborative and independent learning with high expectations for all students. This area of focus supports our goal of increasing overall proficiency and learning gains in all areas, as well as targeting the three ESSA components that are below 41%.

Subgroups considered for ESSA's Federal Index include: White, Black/ African America, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, Multiracial, Pacific Islander, Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Economically Disadvantaged. We currently have three (3) groups below 41% and will focus on improving student achievement in these subgroups: ELL, SWD and African American. We will:
o Hold all students to high academic standards;
o Prepare all students for success in college and career;
o Guarantee that steps are taken to help students

Measurable Outcome:

Build capacity in the Marzano elements as evidenced by CLW's; Increase student achievement in ELA proficiency from 50% to 62%, ELA LG from 47% to 50%, and ELA LQ LG from 34% to 50%; Math proficiency from 46% to 62%, Math LG from 38% to 50%, and Math LQ LG from 28% to 50%; Science proficiency from 67% to 70%; Social Science proficiency from 76% to 79% and increase all ESSA components to at least 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marlene Straughan (straughanm@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Create a common planning schedule for teachers to intentionally plan with support from leadership, including academic coaches. Common planning, PLC's and collaborative planning days will have clearly defined protocols, planning time frame and expected outcomes. Monitoring will be done through attending common planning and gathering data from CLW's.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

By creating a common planning schedule, teachers will be able to collaboratively plan and create grade appropriate assignments that will drive strong instruction, promote deep engagement and bolster high expectations. Students will have daily opportunities to read, write, think and talk through authentic literacy and teachers will utilize a variety of strategies including modeling, guided instruction, purpose, collaborative and independent learning. This will be evidenced through student data and CLW's. Student data includes tallying how many students are able to answer the what they are learning, why they are learning it and how they know they learned it. We will also utilize data from the LSA's and FSA monitoring tool.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Discuss the Instructional Framework
2. PD on Purpose: focus is on student learning
3. Adhere to common planning and PLC schedule and give support during instructional time and common plan

4. Conduct weekly classroom learning walks
5. Utilize all resources, both personnel and other during Huddle Time (strategic intervention and enrichment time)
6. Work with academic coaches to improve in EWS areas and graduation rate

Person Responsible	Marlene Straughan (straughanm@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With high expectations, we will create a culture that ensures a safe and equitable environment for all students. If we implement, monitor and support positive behavior support systems, then we will foster a safe and equitable learning environment for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase positive support behaviors through strategies and classroom operating procedures; increase trust in law enforcement through interaction with SRO; decrease the number of student referrals; reduce the number of students meeting the EWS indicators for suspensions each quarter. We expect a decrease of 25% in the number of referrals and students missing 10 or more days to 10% or less.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will utilize a variety of problem solving skills to teach students to embrace diversity and build healthy relationships that will last well into adulthood. Students will work with the MHL, school counselors, teacher and administrators. We will utilize our ambassador program to mentor and support students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We will see more positive behaviors by establishing clearly identified protocols and expectations while in common areas and offering a variety of incentives for good behavior. Supports will also be in place including counseling and mentoring (resources include SRO, school counselors, Mental Health Liaison and PASS teacher).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Meet routinely to disaggregate data and measure impact of utilized resources
2. Safety and attendance committees meet routinely to discuss findings and/or concerns
3. Identify students and create a schedule for the mentoring program
4. Conduct regular drills for school safety

Person Responsible	Kyle Bracewell (bracewellk@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With high expectations, teachers will understand, plan and use Huddle Time (intervention and enrichment time) strategies to meet the needs of all students in all content areas. If we monitor and support Huddle Time, then we will meet the needs of all students across each content area. This area of focus was identified as a critical need based on the need to increase overall proficiency in all areas as evidenced by FSA/EOC scores. This impacts student learning and success by meeting the needs of students through differentiation and strategic intervention and enrichment. We will also ensure students in CTE have opportunities to achieve industry certifications.
Measurable Outcome:	Increased overall proficiency in all tested areas and increase in learning gains for all students, including those in the lower quartile as evidence by the FSA/EOC assessments; increase support for both teachers and students as evidenced by increases in performance data and classroom learning walk data; increase the number of 3's and 4's on the FSA to 5's and maintain students scoring a 5 by continued enrichment time, strategies and support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Walker (updikek@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will create and establish a schedule for Huddle Time in the master schedule for all students across all curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By having specific time scheduled during the day for intervention and enrichment, students and teachers alike will get additional support in all content areas. Leadership will conduct weekly CLW's to measure the impact of the Huddle Time. We will meet weekly to discuss data and summative/formative student assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create Huddle Time (intervention/enrichment) time within the master schedule
2. Develop and utilize administrative schedule for attending and supporting Huddle Time
3. Conduct weekly classroom learning walks with leadership team
4. Meet weekly to disaggregate data and identify students in need of supports
5. Utilize flex time manager

Person Responsible Catherine Slack (slackc@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

As a leadership team, we will focus on utilizing Huddle Time to its fullest potential. This time will allow for intervention and enrichment time for all students across the curriculum. We will also ensure a positive and safe learning environment and build of culture of mutual trust and respect; this will increase morale, student achievement and attendance. We will work as ONE TEAM!

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

This year our theme is ONE TEAM. We are working hard to build a positive environment centered around the philosophy we have to work as a team to accomplish our goal of becoming an A school. We are involving all stakeholders and building a culture of mutual trust and respect. We have completed several beautification projects on campus and allowed the students to have more of say in their high school experiences. We will communicate effectively and efficiently to include all stakeholders; this includes our website, newsletters, social media pages and school-sponsored events.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$6,900.76
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100		0181 - Mt. Dora High School	Other		$1,500.00
			Notes: SAT School Day for seniors			
	5100		0181 - Mt. Dora High School	Other		$3,000.00
			Notes: Classroom libraries			
	5100		0181 - Mt. Dora High School	Other		$1,400.76
			Notes: Extra Duty Pay - Instructional			
	5100		0181 - Mt. Dora High School	Other		$1,000.00
			Notes: Algebra Nation Alg. 1 practice workbooks			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				$5,587.24
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100		0181 - Mt. Dora High School	Other		$1,600.00

			Notes: SAT/ACT workbooks			
	5100		0181 - Mt. Dora High School	Other		$800.00
			Notes: Dictionaries			
	5100		0181 - Mt. Dora High School	Other		$3,187.24
			Notes: Additional classroom supplies			
					Total:	**$12,488.00**