

Lake County Schools

Mt. Dora High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Mt. Dora High School

700 N HIGHLAND ST, Mount Dora, FL 32757

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/23/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Straughan, Marlene	Principal	Assist with all grades Departments: ELA, Reading, Guidance Assignments: Literacy Coach, Guidance Secretaries, Data Clerks, Mental Health Liaison (MHL), Fundraisers, School Budgets, SAI, SIP, School Newsletter, Discipline, Community Partnerships
Bence, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	10th grade class Departments: Social Studies, Foreign Language Assignments: Media Center, Lab Facilitator, TA's, Food Service, Textbooks, Discipline, Teacher Quality Retention (TQR), Clubs, Art/Craft Fairs
Hay, Michael	Assistant Principal	11th grade class Departments: Science, ROTC, PE Assignments: PASS, Custodians, Discipline Clerk, Discipline, School Safety, Athletics, Facilities, Master Calendar, Supervision Schedules
Slack, Catherine	Assistant Principal	12th grade class Departments: Math, Performing Arts Assignments: Grad Facilitator, Testing Coordinator, Testing (AP/State), Master Schedule, Dual Enrollment, CJ Collegiate Academy, Technology/Social Media, Field Trips, Parking, Volunteers
Walker, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	9th grade class Departments: CTE, ESE Assignments: Clerical Office Staff, ESE Clerk, School Nurse, Discipline, Attendance, Bus Duty, Health Coordinator, SAC, Industry Certifications, CJ Collegiate Academy
Becker, Scott	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair
Belanger, Erik	Instructional Technology	Testing Coordinator and Tech Con
Capstraw, Kimberly	School Counselor	Mental Health Liaison
Daily-Griffin, Dee	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Dwyer, Ted	Staffing Specialist	ESE School Specialist and ESE Department Chair
Harrell, Lorrie	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair
Kozlowski, Billye	Teacher, Career/Technical	CTE Department Chair

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lannon, Anjanette	Graduation Coach	Graduation Facilitator
Olson, Colin	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Schlotter, Liz	Reading Coach	Literacy Coach
Scott, Andrew	Teacher, K-12	ROTC Instructor and Electives Department Chair
Wilson, Christie	School Counselor	Guidance Department Chair, oversees guidance and 504s, Dual Enrollment and 12th grade class.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The leadership team reviews the stakeholder surveys (conducted by the district). These surveys were submitted by students, parents and community stakeholders. After completing the SIP, it is presented and shared with the SAC for feedback and approval.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The leadership team meets on a weekly basis throughout the school year. We also give data presentations and updates, and review our SIP goals during SAC meetings. The plan can be updated as needed based on data collected from CLW's, student assessments and other data collecting methods.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	79%
Charter School	No

RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	486	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	462

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	49	45	50	48	45	51	46		
ELA Learning Gains				52			39		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			35		
Math Achievement*	51	40	38	40	33	38	32		
Math Learning Gains				47			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			24		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	64	62	64	53	38	40	61		
Social Studies Achievement*	68	62	66	72	41	48	67		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	95	90	89	97	59	61	92		
College and Career Acceleration	71	61	65	71	64	67	66		
ELP Progress	74	56	45	47			73		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	613
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	97

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	61			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	61			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	2	
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	50			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	51			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	49			51			64	68		95	71	74
SWD	22			26			33	43		29	6	
ELL	33			36			20	20		38	7	74
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			33			41	63		45	6	
HSP	44			47			56	52		57	7	76
MUL	38			54			57	46			4	
PAC												
WHT	59			58			73	78		80	6	
FRL	36			45			49	59		63	7	76

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	48	52	41	40	47	45	53	72		97	71	47
SWD	20	26	22	22	34	39	25	50		93	30	
ELL	3	35	40	21	46	47	25	29		86	67	47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	42	37	35	56	33	52	71		93	33	
HSP	37	50	40	33	40	40	42	63		94	70	46
MUL	49	45		41	39		56	70				
PAC												
WHT	58	55	45	46	50	56	61	77		99	80	
FRL	37	43	36	33	46	48	47	62		96	62	54

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	46	39	35	32	28	24	61	67		92	66	73
SWD	18	31	28	15	35	35	35	30		82	30	
ELL	22	41	39	8	23	29	31	15		100	50	73

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN	60											
BLK	42	54	42	25	32	18	25	45		93	37	
HSP	31	35	37	17	25	25	45	47		93	67	76
MUL	48	38		47	38		69					
PAC												
WHT	54	40	29	43	30	26	74	77		92	72	
FRL	30	36	35	26	28	25	45	52		89	57	64

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	53%	44%	9%	50%	3%
09	2023 - Spring	46%	44%	2%	48%	-2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	48%	51%	-3%	50%	-2%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	54%	49%	5%	48%	6%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	60%	3%	63%	0%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	60%	6%	63%	3%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that had the lowest performance was math, specifically Geometry. The current state released results show that Geometry remained the same at 41% proficiency as compared to the year before. Our math overall proficiency was at 47%. On a positive note, our overall math proficiency (Algebra 1 and Geometry) increased 7 percentage points, but is still the lowest performing component for MDHS.

It should be noted, however, this is raw data and does not include the first time test takers from the fall and winter testing windows, which will increase this number. It also still includes students not present both FTE surveys. We did have a new teacher last year, and attendance was a real concern (36% of our students missed 10% or more of the total school days), so these are contributing factors to the proficient performance.

We need to focus more on strategic intervention with the LQ students for both math and ELA this year since learning gains will once again be factored in.

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

United States History did have a decline, going from 72% to 65% proficiency. The state assessment used to determine this need was the US History EOC. In February, 2023, our high-achieving U.S. History teacher left MDHS to pursue other avenues, leaving our students without a certified teacher for several weeks. While this is a contributing factor, more directly effecting student performance include alignment of student tasks, resources, implementation gaps and teacher (new teacher) knowledge of standards.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

We are actually above the state average in most areas. The largest gap when compared to the state average would be Alg. 1 (we're at 53% and the state is only at 25% for first time test takers in high school). There is also an 8-point gap in graduation rate (we're at 95% while the state is at 87%). While

these are positive gaps for us, we do have a negative gap of 5 percentage points when compared to the state average in 9th grade Reading. We're only at 46% proficient for our 9th graders in the 2022- 2023 school year. This is a concern for us and something we will focus on improving this year.

We lost a lot of instructional time due to attendance issues among our students and staff. Some of the other contributing factors were implementation gaps, teacher knowledge of standards and misalignment of tasks. We need to push attendance and give attendance incentives to ensure students come to school. We also need to continue PD for our teachers and have collaborative plan time with fidelity. Huddle Time will also need to be continued and used effectively. We also had two new teachers for 9th grade ELA at MDHS last year.

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

The area that improved the most was Biology. This went from 53% to 63% on the Biology EOC state assessment. We did have a new Biology teacher last year, but he came with an extensive background and very knowledgeable on the Biology EOC. We also went from having 4 different teachers teaching one or more Bio classes to only two teaching full lines of Bio. This clearly made a huge difference as they were able to collaborate and plan, as well as use data-driven decisions when it came to placing students in Huddle Time sessions.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Our overall ESSA score for Students with Disabilities was 36% of the possible points. This is below the threshold of 41% and an obvious concern for our school. This subgroup was reported at 20% proficiency for ELA, 22% for math, and 25% for science. Another area of concern is that our ELL population was only 3% proficient in ELA, yet nearly 50% in math.

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

Our highest priorities for the 2023-2024 school year include:

1. Increasing the SWD accountability component to at least 41%
2. Ensuring Huddle Time (intervention) is used with fidelity. We are increasing this to 4 days per week.
3. Working with not only our ESE population, but our ELL population to increase proficiency, especially in ELA.
4. Working with our LQ students throughout the year to monitor and increase learning gains.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

With high expectations, teachers will intentionally plan and focus on student learning; all students, including those with disabilities, can state what they are learning, why they are learning it, and how they have learned it. We had one subgroup below 41% -- SWD. This subgroup was only at 36% and has been identified for 2 years.

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, especially students with disabilities. This area of focus not only supports our goal of increasing overall proficiency, but targets the one ESSA component that is below 41% which is Student's with Disabilities (SWD). This component was at 36% last year and is the only one identified, down from three components the year before.

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 only one group below 41% and will focus on improving student achievement in the subgroup of SWD. We will:

- o Hold all students to high academic standards and require they attend intervention 4 times per week.
- o Prepare ALL students for success in college and career.
- o Guarantee that steps are taken to help all students at MDHS.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Build capacity in the Marzano elements as evidenced by CLW's; Increase student achievement in ELA proficiency from 50% to 62% (and increase learning gains), Math proficiency from 47% to 62% (and increase learning gains), Science proficiency from 63% to 65%; Social Science proficiency from 65% to 75% and increase the ESSA component of SWD to at least 41% (currently at 36%). Also maintain all other ESSA components with a minimum threshold of 41%.

Monitoring:

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

We will use data collected from CLW's, attend common planning and disaggregate common assessments across the curriculum as well as mentor and progress monitor students with disabilities.

We continuing monitoring our Learning Strats classes, we have focused instruction on the essential standards with purposeful planning, and we are strategic in focusing our ESE students in Huddle Time for a more focused intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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. We will also provide support and PD from the district and other resources, including Solution Tree.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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 and why they are learning it. We will also utilize data from the district and state assessment throughout the year as a monitoring tool. PLC Institute will help in guiding teachers on best practices for collaboratively planning and using Huddle Time (intervention time 4 days per week) with fidelity.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Develop common understanding around the district instructional framework through PD.
2. PD throughout the year, including PD Day in August, 2023 with Dr. Emily Feltner and Lake County Schools district personnel in September, 2023. These PD sessions covered standards-based instruction, collaborative planning and best practices in intervention time. PD will be conducted quarterly.
3. Adhere to common planning and PLC schedule and give support during instructional time and common plan. Common planning time is weekly.
4. Conduct weekly classroom learning walks and monitor data trends.
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. We meet weekly to discuss this data.
7. Identify SWD to progress monitor and mentor to increase the ESSA component to at least 41%. Data chats occur monthly.

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

By When: By August, 2023 and ongoing throughout the year by May, 2024.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

1. Discuss the Instructional Framework and follow-up with monthly PD opportunities.
2. PD for faculty and staff throughout the year. This includes, but not limited to: Dr. Emily Feltner, Solution Tree, and Region 1 support team.
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
7. Collaborate with Region 1 district personnel to discuss best practices and participate in CWL's and feedback

Measurable Outcome:

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

We aim to reduce incidents of disruptive behavior by 25%. 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 20% or less. Our attendance rate last year was 36% with 10 or more days. Since COVID, attendance has been a real issue and concern. This year we will form an attendance committee to identify steps to take to achieve a needed decrease in the number of missed school days.

Monitoring:

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

We will disaggregate data from the monthly EWS reports released by the district.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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, teachers and administrators. We will continue to utilize our ambassador program to mentor and support students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

By When: August, 2023 with continuous monitoring through May, 2024.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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. We will increase the use of intervention time from 2 to 4 days per week starting in August, 2023.

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 state released school grade data. 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. With newer BEST standards, teachers will need additional support and PD to help deliver instruction and ensure students are prepared for the new state assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increased overall proficiency in all tested areas, increase support for both teachers and students as evidenced by increases in performance data and classroom learning walk data; increased opportunities for enrichment time, strategies and support. Our goal for improvement is to be at 62% proficiency for ELA and Math, and at least 72% in Science (Biology) and Social Studies (US History).

Monitoring:

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

We will collect data from weekly CLWs utilizing the district released learning walk tool and dashboard. We will also get feedback from our Professional Development sessions, including motivational speakers (Dr. Emily Feltner) and Huddle Time participation (this will be for monitoring our intervention time and the impact it's having on student achievement). We will meet at least quarterly with the Region 1 team to discuss classroom trends and data, as well as receive feedback and instructional support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will create and establish a schedule for Huddle Time in the master schedule for all students across all curriculum. This includes a 30-minute intervention/enrichment time 4-days per week starting in August, 2023.

The strategy is allowing multiple opportunities on a weekly basis for students to attend intervention time based on their academic needs. We will use this time with fidelity and follow up with collaborative sessions to disaggregate data. Huddle Time (intervention) will be monitored through CLW's and data trends collected. Teachers will also disaggregate data during common planning to analyze the impact of this time. CLW's will occur on a weekly basis. In addition, the Region 1 team has committed to walking Huddle Time every quarter and giving feedback on their observations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. 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)

By When: August, 2023 and continuing throughout the year by April, 2024.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Our school is not Title 1, but we do receive SAI dollars and create a plan to ensure resources are allocated based on needs. We do have one ESSA subgroup identified -- SWD at 36% -- but want to create an environment where all students have the resources they need to be successful. Our budgets and plans are reviewed by the school leadership team and then presented to our SAC for vote and approval. The plans are then submitted to the district office for review and approval.

Our leadership team includes administration, school counselors, MHL, grad facilitator, testing coordinator/tech con, ESE School Specialist, Literacy Coach, SRO/school guardian. We also have a 'Guiding Coalition' who meet at least quarterly to ensure resources are allocated based on needs. As part of our SAI budget for the 2023-2024 school year, we've allocated test prep materials, online resources, tutoring availability (including a SAT/ACT boot camp), classroom libraries and other classroom resources requested by our teachers. Our SIP is also reviewed and approved by our SAC and district personnel. We also plan to increase technology on our school campus this year.