Mt. Dora High School

2021-22 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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	63%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	B

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. We also believe in the ONE TEAM concept which has become culturally embedded in our school.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position 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.
Bracewell, Kyle	Assistant Principal	Facilities, ELA, Reading, Foreign Language, ROTC, School Safety, Guidance
Walker, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	ESE, CTE, Health, Attendance, FTE
Slack, Catherine	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, Math, Performing Fine Arts, ELL, MTSS
Schlotter, Liz	Reading Coach	Literacy Coach
Lannon, Anjanette	Graduation Coach	Graduation facilitator
Becker, Scott	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair
Kozlowski, Billye	Teacher, Career/ Technical	CTE Department Chair
Daily-Griffin, Dee	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Dwyer, Ted	Staffing Specialist	ESE School Specialist and ESE Department Chair
Eshbaugh, Ryan	School Counselor	Guidance Department Chair
Olson, Colin	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Scott, Andrew	Teacher, K-12	ROTC Commander and Electives Department Chair
Wilson, Randall	Behavior Specialist	PASS Teacher
Carlton, Patricia	Instructional Media	Media Specialist

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,060

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	288	305	261	245	1099
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	92	75	65	302
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	68	41	56	221
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	52	36	35	176
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	68	41	56	221

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	159	239	130	72	600

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	1	5	4	2	12

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/26/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				50%	50%	56%	47%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	46%	51%	52%	49%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	33%	42%	57%	44%	44%
Math Achievement				46%	44%	51%	50%	50%	51%
Math Learning Gains				38%	45%	48%	51%	47%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				28%	36%	45%	51%	41%	45%
Science Achievement				67%	68%	68%	62%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				76%	69%	73%	83%	72%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	50%	47%	3%	55%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	44%	48%	-4%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

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
2021					
2019	65%	66%	-1%	67%	-2%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	73%	67%	6%	70%	3%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	31%	52%	-21%	61%	-30%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	45%	49%	-4%	57%	-12%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

We used Lake Standards Assessments (LSA) data to compile this data.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53	62	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	43	40
	Students With Disabilities	43	46	40
	English Language Learners	40	45	41
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42	42	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	40	41
	Students With Disabilities	38	39	39
	English Language Learners	41	42	41
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59	48	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	50	58
	Students With Disabilities	60	52	59
	English Language Learners	50	42	49
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	42	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	40	42
	Students With Disabilities	37	39	39
	English Language Learners	40	40	41
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52	67	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	43	45
	Students With Disabilities	37	39	40
	English Language Learners	35	40	45
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44	66	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	50	58
	Students With Disabilities	45	52	53
	English Language Learners	32	43	44

Grade 12					
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students				
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities				
	English Language Learners				
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students				
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities				
	English Language Learners				
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students				
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities				
	English Language Learners				
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students				
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities				
	English Language Learners				

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	18	31	28	15	35	35	35	30		82	30
ELL	22	41	39	8	23	29	31	15		100	50
ASN	60										
BLK	42	54	42	25	32	18	25	45		93	37
HSP	31	35	37	17	25	25	45	47		93	67

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	48	38		47	38		69				
WHT	54	40	29	43	30	26	74	77		92	72
FRL	30	36	35	26	28	25	45	52		89	57

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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	563
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	39
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	60
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	45
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	54
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The Lowest Quartile for math was only at 24%. This was a decline from the previous year. We need to focus more on strategic intervention with the LQ students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math LQ learning gains declined again in 2020. Math LQ group fell to 24%, and ELA LQ fell from 57% in 2018 to 34% in 2019 and up one point to 35% in 2020. Again, not enough emphasis was put on tracking and monitoring the LQ students last year. 2020 resulted in 46% proficiency in ELA and only 32% in Math.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

COVID obviously had a tremendous impact on student learning and overall achievement. We need to focus on filling in the gaps caused by loss of learning. We had several students quarantined throughout the year as well. We will be utilized data to progress monitor our students this year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science showed the most improvement from 2018 to 2019, improving from 62% to 68% and while declined (all categories did), we surpassed both the district and state in science proficiency. 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.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Huddle Time played a factor in the science scores. The bio teachers used strategic intervention and common assessments to work collaboratively. Huddle Time is our intervention/enrichment time built in four days per week.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will utilize a variety of data sources to help create meaningful learning experiences during Huddle Time enrichment. Small group instruction/enrichment as well as mentoring will be used.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We will have monthly PLC's to help teachers accelerate learning for their students. We will also work with the Region 1 program specialists and collect and disaggregate data from our classroom learning walks.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We will continue CLW's and meet weekly as a leadership team. We will work collaboratively with the Region 1
Director and team to formulate a plan and monitor that plan for continuous progress.

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 46% to 62%, ELA LG from 39% to 50%, and ELA LQ LG from 35% to 50%; Math proficiency from 32% to 62%, Math LG from 28% to 50%, and Math LQ LG from 24% to 50%; Science proficiency from 61% to 70%; Social Science proficiency from 67% to 70% and increase all ESSA components to at least 41%.
Monitoring:	We will use data collected from CLW's, attend common planning and disaggregate common assessments across the curriculum.
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). PD held monthly and in collaboration with Region 1 team.
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:	1. Discuss the Instructional Framework and follow-up with monthly PD opportunities. 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
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 15% or less.
Monitoring:	We will disaggregate data from the monthly EWS reports released by the district.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kyle Bracewell (bracewellk@lake.k12.fl.us)
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.
Monitoring:	We will collect data from weekly CLWs. We will also get feedback from our Professional Development sessions, including motivational speakers and Huddle Time participation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marlene Straughan (straughanm@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 Marlene Straughan (straughanm@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Our school very high in drug/public order incidents. Index showed 3.65 per 100 students. Our suspension rate was rated high at 1.07 per 100 students. We ranked 'very low' for property incidents. This year we will continue to focus on our ONE TEAM theme, as well as utilize our PASS teacher for mentoring and restorative practice circles. Our SRO will also mentor students and continue to participate in the Ambassador program.

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.

This year our theme is One Team, 100 Years in the Making. This is the school's 100th Anniversary and we are working hard to continue building 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.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

We will include all stakeholders in our positive culture and environment. Through our SAC, athletic boosters and other groups, we will collect feedback and work collaboratively with our community members. We also offer a variety of events, including open house, CANE Expo and other social events to get our community involved.

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	$5,388.00

		Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		5100		0181 - Mt. Dora High School	Other		$1,500.00
				Notes: SAT Day for seniors			
		5100		0181 - Mt. Dora High School	Other		$2,488.00
				Notes: Classroom libraries and resources			
		5100		0181 - Mt. Dora High School	Other		$1,400.00
				Notes: Extra Duty Pay - Instructional			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems**					**$11,500.00**
		Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		5100		0181 - Mt. Dora High School	Other		$1,500.00
				Notes: Professional Development materials, motivational speakers and/or other school culture resources			
		5100		0181 - Mt. Dora High School	School Improvement Funds		$10,000.00
				Notes: SAC funding available for school improvements, resources, supplies, professional development and contracted guest speakers.			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation**					**$5,600.00**
		Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		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		$3,200.00
				Notes: Additional classroom supplies			
						Total:	**$22,488.00**