

Polk County Public Schools

Lake Gibson Senior High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 9/1/2016

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI

* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	Yes	90%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vann, Ryan	Principal	
Deshazor, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	
Diaz, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Whitaker, Sarah	Assistant Principal	
Hicks, Derek	Assistant Principal	
Harris, Daphne	Instructional Coach	
Jorge, Brent	Dean	
Williams, Olivia	Behavior Specialist	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 9/1/2016, Ryan Vann

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

23

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

107

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,111

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

13

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

25

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	552	524	516	411	2003
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	216	154	153	147	670
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	80	62	30	296
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	44	80	73	225
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219	155	157	67	598
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190	86	211	183	670
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	233	239	177	185	834

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	54	48	24	2	128
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	26	18	8	76

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/12/2022

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	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

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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	29	25	1	73

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	40%	41%	51%				41%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	43%						46%	46%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						38%	37%	42%
Math Achievement	24%	35%	38%				27%	43%	51%
Math Learning Gains	40%						34%	45%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						43%	44%	45%
Science Achievement	54%	26%	40%				60%	58%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	51%	39%	48%				60%	61%	73%

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

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
2022					
2019	57%	54%	3%	67%	-10%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	58%	57%	1%	70%	-12%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	21%	50%	-29%	61%	-40%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	27%	53%	-26%	57%	-30%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	34	30	7	32	37	26	24		88	43
ELL	15	37	35	10	47	58	30	25		90	50
ASN	46	38									
BLK	33	43	35	15	27	42	39	40		98	56
HSP	37	40	35	22	44	57	49	46		94	58
MUL	48	50		27	30			55		93	64
WHT	45	46	39	30	46	50	65	60		95	67
FRL	32	41	36	21	41	52	49	40		95	59
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

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
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
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	550
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

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%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	42
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	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	52
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 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	54
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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 first major area of concern is the number of students that are not in attendance for 90% of the school year; 670 students missed more than 10% of instructional time during the 2021-2022 school year. This is a contributing factor to our next area of concern, which is math and ELA proficiency. Approximately 670 of our current students (32% of our population) scored a level 1 on their math assessment last year, 190 of those being incoming 9th graders. Approximately 598 students (28% of our population) scored a level 1 on their ELA assessment last year, 219 of those being incoming 9th graders.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA scores demonstrate a need for improvement. Our learning gains decreased by 1 percentage point and our averages in all 3 categories of ELA data are below the district average. We dropped drastically in science achievement from 59% to 43% proficiency.

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

Our ELA team last year was strong and collaborative planning was effective. We improved on 2 of the 3 data points for ELA. However, that 1% drop in learning gains will be addressed by guiding our teachers (of all level students) in analysis of their students' trend data. All of our teachers will be tracking student data through the FAST assessment and ensuring they are scaffolding instruction to meet the needs of all levels of students, including those who are proficient. We will aim for all students to show gains without scores slipping this year. Science deficiencies last year are a direct result of losing a qualified teacher in the beginning of the year. Although these incidents are not always foreseeable, we have strategically scheduled teachers this year to avoid disruptions to student learning as much as possible.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our math scores in every category (achievement, gains and L25 gains) improved drastically. Most notably, our math learning gains increased from 19% to 40% and our L25 learning gains increased from 21% to 52%.

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

Collaborative planning and coaching were strengthened in our math department last year. We also welcomed new teachers to our staff, who provided high quality instruction. A collaborative effort and

continuous cycle of improvement, including feedback from an administrator and district math coach, supported this improvement in math proficiency and gains.

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

Rigor and engagement (specifically in a 1:1 tech environment) 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. Weekly in collaborative planning, 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, every day. 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.

New BEST Standards instruction training for ELA and Math teachers
Training/workshops for advanced curriculum.
Continued PLCs and implementation of high engagement classroom strategies
AVID strategy workshops (and podcasts)
Specific district provided and administrator prescribed PD for new teachers based on needs observed

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 PLCs to address student retention and attainment of standards. There will be additional focus on rigor and engagement in our classes, as well as increased scrutiny of our standards-based instructional alignment.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

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

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

This need is based on administrative observations, limited increases in proficiency on state assessments, and a trend of lower proficiency levels when compared to the state averages. Additionally, we have transitioned to BEST standards in math and ELA, and it is critical in this first year that our instructional practice is aligned to the new standards.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

State data will show a minimum of +1% proficiency increase for all grades/ content assessed as well as 10% of the students just below proficiency ("bubble" or high level 2s) becoming proficient.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring data offered through the district and state level assessment platforms will be used to ensure students are mastering benchmarks being taught after planning is properly implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1. Monitor students engaged in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectations using Standards Walkthrough Tool (SWT).
2. Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Learning Arc Construction Framework.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Common Assessments, Data Tracking and Collaborative planning are all part of a highly effective PLC model (DuFour 2004). Monitoring the engagement levels of students in the aligned experiences created by teachers is part of a continuous cycle of improvement. The standards walkthrough tool and learning arc construction framework have been vetted by district curriculum specialists to improve standards alignment.

Action Steps to Implement
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

(1) Standards walkthrough tool (SWT) monitoring; create a calendar for leadership team calibration walks.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(1) Train leadership team on walkthrough tool in the first 2 calibration walks.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(1) Conduct calibration walks until team shows 90%-100% consistency with rationale.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(1) Add SWT data review to the leadership team meeting agenda (weekly).

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(1) Establish protocol to review data including evidence in SWT.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(1) Monitor impact between data review from SWT and planning.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(2) Collaborative planning with follow the Arc Framework.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(2) Create master schedule that includes intentional collaborative planning teams.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(2) Leadership team will train on the Arc Framework, then assign and train planning facilitators.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(2) Add planning results findings to leadership team meeting agenda.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(2) Conduct planning protocol on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(2) Review planning results finding with the leadership team routinely.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(2) Conduct correlation analysis between SWT findings and benchmarks planned for using Arc.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

In order to improve our proficiency in all state-assessed areas, we will need to take a critical look at how we are differentiating our lessons for all learners to achieve growth/proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Administration will see an improvement (from beginning of year baseline observations) of teacher performance on EPCs 1e and 2e (relating to differentiation) throughout the year. We will track growth of the students that our math and reading interventionists target, and those students will improve their math/ELA achievement by an average of 10% by the end of the year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Administrators will monitor their observation data for individual teachers, looking for an upward trend in the effective use of differentiation strategies. Administration will analyze the progress monitoring data of students targeted by our reading and math interventionists.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

(1) Math and Reading Interventionists will target students to provide tier 3 support.
 (2) Teachers will analyze formative and summative student data and proactively modify plans for teaching during PLCs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Title 1 funds have provided our school with a new opportunity to hire both a reading and math interventionist. These two positions will maximize achievement for our tier 3 students. With the implementation of 1:1 devices and new methods of progress monitoring, we will have more immediate formative data to analyze during PLCs and respond to the needs of our students.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

(1) Interventionists will analyze data to determine for which students they will provide tier 3 interventions.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(1) Interventionists will create a schedule for support and plan for tracking student growth.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(1) Administrators will monitor support provided by interventionists and student growth data.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(2) Administrators will attend collaborative planning to support formative data analysis and teacher response to the needs of individual students. Administrators will lead teachers in researching strategies for differentiation.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(2) Administrators will monitor individual teacher growth on EPCs 1e and 2e and provide specific feedback for growth.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Administrative observations indicate a need for improvement in student engagement. A high number of disruptive behavior and skipping referrals also indicates a need for improvement. When students are engaged in the learning process, they are more likely to attend class, remain in class and show proficiency and/or growth on state assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Administration will see an improvement (from beginning of year baseline observations) of teacher performance on EPC 2c (relating to student engagement) throughout the year. We will see a decrease of 5% skipping and disruptive behavior referrals in our quarterly discipline data.

Administrators will monitor their observation data for individual teachers, looking for an upward trend in student engagement. Administration will analyze discipline data monthly and quarterly.

Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

- (1) AVID Schoolwide strategies for student engagement and efficacy
- (2) Schoolwide transition to 1:1 devices for students

Polk is an AVID district and promotes schoolwide adoption of AVID strategies (WICOR) for rigor and engagement. Many of our teachers have had AVID training and we plan to leverage their expertise and build even more teacher capacity in the effective use of AVID strategies. As the district goes 1:1 student devices, we will be using technology to intentionally engage students in the learning process, gradually transferring ownership of learning to the student.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- (1) AVID team training over the summer, development of AVID site team goals and calendar established for monthly site team meetings.

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

(1) AVID site team meets monthly to discuss which strategies for engagement to share with our respective teams. One strategy shared per month via face-to-face after-school workshops and weekly PLCs.

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

(1) Administration will support the implementation of a monthly WICOR strategy for engagement by attending PLCs and discussing how the strategy can be written into lesson plans.

Person Responsible Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

(2) Administration will follow the district plan for 1:1 device roll-out. Students will have devices by the end of the 1st quarter, after completing the district-developed Schoology course.

Person Responsible Derek Hicks (derek.hicks@polk-fl.net)

(2) Administration will follow the district plan for 1:1 device teacher training on designated dates throughout the year, ensuring our teachers are receiving the appropriate PD to be successful with their 1:1 classroom instruction.

Person Responsible Derek Hicks (derek.hicks@polk-fl.net)

(2) Instructional coach and technology team will share information and strategies relating to increasing student engagement in the 1:1 device classroom during PLCs throughout the year.

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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

n/a

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

n/a

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

n/a

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

n/a

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

n/a

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

n/a

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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 Brave Award 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 Brave Awards 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 Brave Award

nominees 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 contribute to an 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 and staff.

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

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 campus-wide 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.