Lake Gibson Senior High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Gibson Senior High School

7007 SOCRUM LOOP RD N, Lakeland, FL 33809

www.lgbraves.com

Demographics

Principal: Ryan Vann

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Lake Gibson Senior High School

7007 SOCRUM LOOP RD N, Lakeland, FL 33809

www.lgbraves.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	Yes	80%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Lake Gibson High School is rooted in communicating clear learning targets that drive rigorous instruction, which will lead to growth in student ownership of learning.

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
Whitaker, Sarah	Assistant Principal	
Diaz, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Vann, Ryan	Principal	
Deshazor, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	
Hicks, Derek	Assistant Principal	
Jorge, Brent	Dean	
McDonald, Kevin	Dean	
Harris, Daphne	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach
Haynes, Eric	Administrative Support	AD
Bazunu, Antionette	Administrative Support	Success Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/24/2021, Ryan Vann

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.*
1

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

99

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,037

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

14

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

28

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	527	578	507	424	2036
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136	140	116	2	394
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	75	46	0	219
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	73	81	5	252
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	530	22	43	2	597
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	247	227	168	0	642

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	305	286	204	2	797

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	18	29	25	1	73

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/24/2021

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	565	568	478	381	1992
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	46	27	55	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	43	26	19	138
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	43	10	11	81
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	17	31	21	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193	144	113	99	549
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	122	102	71	469

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	11	32	15	10	68

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	12	19	18	7	56
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	37	33	12	91

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	565	568	478	381	1992
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	46	27	55	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	43	26	19	138
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	43	10	11	81
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	17	31	21	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193	144	113	99	549
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	122	102	71	469

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	11	32	15	10	68

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
								Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	19	18	7	56
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	37	33	12	91

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				41%	47%	56%	40%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	46%	51%	41%	47%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	37%	42%	26%	39%	44%
Math Achievement				27%	43%	51%	38%	44%	51%
Math Learning Gains				34%	45%	48%	37%	42%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	44%	45%	28%	38%	45%
Science Achievement				60%	58%	68%	56%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				60%	61%	73%	62%	63%	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	40%	45%	-5%	55%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	37%	42%	-5%	53%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

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	57%	54%	3%	67%	-10%
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	58%	57%	1%	70%	-12%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	21%	50%	-29%	61%	-40%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	27%	53%	-26%	57%	-30%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA & Math utilized the STAR Renaissance assessments
Biology & US History utilized the district created quarterly assessments

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	11	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	10	21
	Students With Disabilities	0	2	7
	English Language Learners	0	0	13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14	28	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	25	8
	Students With Disabilities	9	17	9
	English Language Learners	11	7	5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	80	77	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	78	74	59
	Students With Disabilities	33	50	0
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11	11	15
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	6	12
	Students With Disabilities	4	8	7
	English Language Learners	13	25	13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3	13	15
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	13	11
	Students With Disabilities	0	4	8
	English Language Learners	0	0	6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	65	58	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	46	35
	Students With Disabilities	57	57	67
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	89	50	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	100	25	40
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	18	22
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	11	20
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	8
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1	10	9
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	8	13
	Students With Disabilities		0	0
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28	17	17
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	13	18
	Students With Disabilities	9	0	19
	English Language Learners	33	0	20
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	64	38	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	56	30	44
	Students With Disabilities	33	20	22
	English Language Learners	33	14	13

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	8	
	Economically Disadvantaged	5		
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	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	9	24	18	11	18	15	23	18		93	44
ELL	12	34	40	5	12	18	27	35		96	67
ASN	47	46		27							
BLK	27	37	34	11	21	22	43	30		98	60
HSP	36	49	36	15	18	19	61	47		97	73

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	56	52		21	21		75				
WHT	44	43	30	17	19	23	63	53		98	70
FRL	28	37	29	12	17	19	49	43		96	69

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

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	30	20	48	43		34	46		68	32
ELL	13	39	24	25	29		42	26		69	44
ASN	44	36									
BLK	31	36	25	35	30	9	47	55		82	54
HSP	39	45	29	31	32	20	57	63		81	59
MUL	52	38					30			77	70
WHT	45	42	28	43	43	35	61	64		84	63
FRL	35	39	24	35	32	23	51	57		79	58

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	501
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	37
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	40
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
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	46
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	45
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	46
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	41
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 major area of concern is the number of 1's earned in statewide assessments. The next area of concern is the number of students that are not in attendance for 90% of the school year. 548 students missed more than 10% of instructional time during the 2019-2020 school year, the last "normal" year of record.

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

On the FSA, Math and ELA Achievement had the largest gap between the school and state average. Math Achievement is where we performed the worst.

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

With Math Achievement, the amount of substitutes that were used throughout the year is the greatest contributor to the scores being deficient. Factors that contributed to this low score include the fact that we had two teachers resign during the first week of school. Both teachers had 10 tested classes between them. In addition, one of the teachers we hired to fill this void resigned in January, leaving this unit with 6 tested classes with 3 different teachers throughout the year. In addition to this, we had two other provisional substitutes and a first year teacher. Due these unforeseeable changes in math department staff, we had several tested subjects (Algebra 1B, Geometry, and Algebra) left without qualified teachers. New actions to address this concern include strategically placing qualified teachers in tested subjects in our master schedule, as well as providing additional support to those teachers who need it.

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

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

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

In ELA, we strategically placed our strongest English and Reading teachers in the tested grade levels. With the lowest 25% in Math we provided ESE support throughout the year. We also had one Math teacher responsible for teaching a majority of the lowest 25%. She was able to concentrate her efforts to ensure these students were mastering the standards taught.

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

Rigor will be a focus of our school wide professional development this year. We will be focusing on how teachers can remediate individual students while also accelerating learning for those students who have mastered standards. Monthly, in planning period teams, we will take a close look at what practical rigorous instruction looks like in the classroom and how we can achieve that in every class on our campus. Additionally, our AP and DE teachers will seek professional development opportunities to improve their skillsets and grow those programs.

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.

Standards based instruction aligned with BEST training for ELA and Math teachers.
Training/workshops for advanced curriculum.
Continued PLCs and implementation of high engagement classroom strategies.

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

Classroom instructional supports and grading practices will be monitored, and trainings will be provided through PLC's to address student retentions and attainment of standards. There will be additional focus on students that were retained and needed to take credit recovery and/or attend summer school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is to increase Black/African American proficiency levels. This focus area was identified as critical based on the state data indicating a significant decrease in proficiency levels between 2018 and 2019 as well as this subgroup having the greatest gap between school and state averages.
Measurable Outcome:	Black/African American proficiency levels will increase by 3% in the areas of ELA achievement, Math achievement, Social Studies and College and Career Acceleration.
Monitoring:	Data from progress monitoring assessments throughout the year (STAR, district quarterlies) will be used to gauge success on a quarterly basis in administrative meetings. Administration will also conduct regular checks on college/career acceleration opportunities and which students are taking advantage of those and why. Action steps will be developed and fluid as we gather data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Antionette Bazunu (antionette.bazunu@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data tracking and data-driven instruction Small group instruction Increasing acceleration opportunities for students in this subgroup
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Common Assessments, Data Tracking & Collaborative planning are all a part of the highly effective PLC model (Dufour 2004)

Action Steps to Implement

Analysis of progress monitoring data (Performance Matters, quarterly assessments, STAR, common assessments)

Person Responsible	Daphne Harris (daphne.harris@polk-fl.net)

Vertical and horizontal teacher collaboration to identify trends and best practices

Person Responsible	Sarah Whitaker (sarah.whitaker@polk-fl.net)

Strategic scheduling of students with a variety of academies, programs and certification opportunities

Person Responsible	Sarah Whitaker (sarah.whitaker@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is to increase SWD proficiency levels. This focus area was identified as critical based on the state data indicating a significant decrease in proficiency levels between 2018 and 2019 as well as this subgroup having the greatest gap between school and state averages.
Measurable Outcome:	SWD proficiency levels will increase by 3% in the areas of ELA achievement, Math achievement, Social Studies and College and Career Acceleration.
Monitoring:	Data from progress monitoring assessments throughout the year (STAR, district quarterlies) will be used to gauge success on a quarterly basis in administrative meetings. Administration will also conduct regular checks on college/career acceleration opportunities and which students are taking advantage of those and why. Action steps will be developed and fluid as we gather data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Derek Hicks (derek.hicks@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data tracking and data-driven instruction Small group instruction Increasing acceleration opportunities for students in this subgroup
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Common Assessments, Data Tracking & Collaborative planning are all a part of the highly effective PLC model (Dufour 2004)

Action Steps to Implement	
Analysis of progress monitoring data (Performance Matters, STAR, common assessments)	
Person Responsible	Derek Hicks (derek.hicks@polk-fl.net)
Collaboration with ESE teacher push-in support teachers and general ed teachers	
Person Responsible	Derek Hicks (derek.hicks@polk-fl.net)
Strategic scheduling of SWD students with a variety of academies, programs and certification opportunities	
Person Responsible	Derek Hicks (derek.hicks@polk-fl.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increased student attendance rates will give the students more chances to be engaged with the content. It has been shown, the more students are engaged with content, results in higher comprehension of the material. Attendance data shows that 8% of the student population missed 10% or more of their classes during the 19-20 school year, the last "normal" year. Last year during the pandemic, attendance declined further due to eLearning, quarantines and other outside factors. Therefore, attendance this year is even more imperative in order to bridge learning gaps that may exist due to the loss of learning during the pandemic.
Measurable Outcome:	We expect to see a decrease from 8% to 5% or less of students who are missing 10% or more of their classes.
Monitoring:	Monthly monitoring of attendance will be conducted through FOCUS reports.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brent Jorge (brent.jorge@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive Behavior interventions such as "Brave Bucks" and "Positive Referrals" incentive programs will be implemented to improve our overall attendance goals. Parent contact and a campaign to increase awareness of the importance of attendance will also be implemented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These positive behavior interventions encourage students to exhibit our school goal oriented behaviors. Community organizations donated gift cards and coupons as incentives for our students who display positive school behavior. Teachers used both programs to promote positive school behavior through sending positive referrals or by rewarding students with Brave Buck currency to be redeemed through our PBIS store and recognition on social media outlets. Through these programs students strive to demonstrate positive behavior throughout campus and contributed to ongoing positive learning environment.

Action Steps to Implement

Braves Bucks as an incentive will be given to students who are in attendance and participating in class.

Person Responsible	Kevin McDonald (kevin.mcdonald@polk-fl.net)

Positive referrals will be used as an incentive for students who are in attendance and participating in class.

Person Responsible	Brent Jorge (brent.jorge@polk-fl.net)

Discretionary unit will be tasked with pulling attendance reports and contacting home when students are identified as having missed 5 days of school. We will also monitor tardies and call home.

Person Responsible	Eric Haynes (eric.haynes@polk-fl.net)

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.

According to SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, the latest data available is for the 2019-2020 school year. At Lake Gibson High School there were 5.6 incidents of crime, violence and disruptive behaviors per 100 students in 2019-2020, which is considered very high among high schools in Polk County. This rate is greater than the state average of 3.3 incidents per 100 students. Violent incidents (1.98 incidents per 100 students) and Drug/Public Order incidents (3.59 incidents per 100 students) were very high compared to the state average, However, property incidents (0 incidents) were very low comparatively. The suspension rate for 2019-2020 was slightly more than 25 incidents per 100 students, giving Lake Gibson High a rating of very high among high schools. School discipline data for the 2020-2021, according to Polk County Public School's Focus portal, showed that skipping was by far the number one infraction (531 incidents), followed by disruptive behavior (144 incidents) and insubordination (131 incidents). For the 2021-2022 school year, the goal of administration is to continue to build a culture that will encourage students to be on their best behavior on campus, on social media and in the community. Data will be monitored and used to provide professional development opportunities for teachers who are having classroom management issues.

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.

Lake Gibson High School is proud of our school culture and environment, and we have plans in place to continue on a path of improvement in this area. Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) methods are implemented through school programs such as our Positive Referral and Brave Bucks incentive programs.
We have seen the positive impact these programs have on students who may have otherwise fallen through the cracks. In order to be more inclusive and make sure all groups of students are recognized, we are creating silos to pull positive referrals from. For instance, we will encourage sports teams, academies, clubs and organizations to refer a student every month. We will also be intentional in the way we communicate the purpose of this program to our teachers. We will continue to have community organizations donate gift cards and coupons as incentives for our students who display positive school behavior. Teachers use both programs to promote positive school behavior through sending positive referrals or by rewarding students with Brave Buck currency to be redeemed through our PBIS store and recognition on social media outlets. Through these programs students strive to demonstrate positive behavior throughout campus and

contributed to ongoing positive learning environment. Additionally, LGHS offers mentorship to new teachers through the campus induction program, new teacher ambassador and reading coach. We also have a Sunshine Committee which hosts regular events like coffee socials, lemonade stands, holiday parties, and more. This committee recognizes birthdays, new babies and marriages and provides support to teachers and staff members who are experiencing tragedy or loss. We also use our social media presence to increase dissemination of positive information throughout the community. On campus, we make strategic use of bulletin boards to send messages of encouragement to students.

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

Teachers promote a positive culture beginning in their classrooms. They build relationships with their students, connecting with their individual needs, and seeking out resources to meet those needs. Collaboration with colleagues and participation in our campus activities improves culture as well. Students' roles in our positive culture include development of self-advocacy skills, informing and organizing themselves for success. Parents stay informed through teacher contact, FOCUS portal and social media. They support the events of students on campus. Community members also support campuswide events such as Rise of the Great Pumpkin, athletic events and more. Community members also assist with fundraising. Lastly, our non-classroom teacher staff members build relationships with students and support the learning environment in their individual specialized ways.