

Charlotte County Public Schools

Lemon Bay High School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	11
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	12

Lemon Bay High School

2201 PLACIDA RD, Englewood, FL 34224

<http://lemonbayhigh.com/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	47%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	15%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	B	C	A*

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/9/2018.

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Lemon Bay High School is to inspire students, teachers, and parents to form a community of learners to promote excellence through a varied curriculum, to provide the tools necessary to foster positive contributions to our society, and instill a commitment to academic and personal achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Enter to Learn. Go Forth to Serve.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title
Bedford, Bob	Principal
Murphy, Robert	Assistant Principal
Henry, Michael	Assistant Principal
Young, Denise	Assistant Principal

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Bedford:

- Setting School Vision and academic priorities with input from stakeholders
- Co-Chairing of Lemon Bay Leadership Council (Partnership in Performance Council)
- Formal and Informal Classroom Observations
- Administration Walkthroughs
- Master Schedule
- PPC
- Staffing
- Facilities Planning
- Budget
- SIP Plan
- Student Learning Plan
- SAC
- Capital Outlay
- Staff Handbook
- Purchasing
- Progress Monitoring/Coaching
- Discipline Appeals
- Awards Program
- Senior Awards
- Underclass Awards

- Keys
- NET teachers
- Technology
- Athletics
- Athletics Director
- Rules/Regs/Policies
- Asst. AD
- Calendar
- PLC/s
- Facilitating the leadership of departments through department chairs
- Establishing and maintaining key community stakeholder relationships
- Acting as appellate decision-maker in terms of academics, discipline, and athletics
- Evaluating English and Math Department instructional staff members and several others

Young:

- Overseeing Activities
- Activities Calendar
- Activities SOM
- Activities Co-Curriculars (Band/Drama/ROTC)
- Activities Field Trips
- Facilities
- Capital Outlay
- Facilities Needs
- School Use Requests
- Inspections
- Keys
- Custodians
- School Support
- Cafe/Free & Reduced
- Transportation/Buses & Vans
- SAT Team
- Attendance
- Appeals/ Drivers License
- Support PPC
- Reporting
- Weekly Grades
- Progress Reports
- Report Cards
- Professional Development
- SAC Evaluation
- PLCs
- Evaluating Social Studies Department instructional staff members, Career Tech Department instructional staff members and several others
- Acting as liaison with district office in matter of construction, security, and student safety
- Coordinating community organization goals and needs with those of the school
- Coordinating the implementation of state- and county-mandated curriculum initiatives
- Attending and implementing state and county Career and Tech education initiatives, policies, and protocols
- Discipline
- IND Units - ESE
- Grade 12
- Plagiarism

Henry:

- Discipline 9-11
- Technology
- Teacher Hardware
- Peripherals
- Administration
- Facilities
- LBPAC Sound/Lighting
- Inventory
- Technology
- Music Instruments
- Attendance
- Tardies
- Daily Teacher Attendance
- SERT
- Discipline
- Behavioral Unit - ESE
- ISS
- Evaluating ROTC, Foreign Language, PE and Fine Arts instructional staff members and several others

Murphy:

- Overseeing Curriculum and Instruction
- Testing Coordinator
- EOC
- FSA
- AP/PSAT/ACT Plan
- BOY/MOY/EOY
- PERT
- Technology
- Teacher Hardware
- Peripherals
- Administration
- Data
- Transportation
- PPC
- Student Surveys
- Guidance
- Registration
- Parent Conferences
- ESE/ESOL Coordinator
- Advanced Placement
- Post-Secondary Articulation
- Textbooks
- APC Meetings
- Acting as administrative second-in-command in absence of principal
- Overseeing Discipline for all students
- Grades 9 - 12
- Behavioral Units -ESE
- Acting as liaison between Department of Learning at the district office and the school

- Coordinating school Fire Drill policies, protocols, and procedures
- Coordinating school Crisis Plan and associated policies, protocols, and procedures
- Coordinating the implementation of state- and county-mandated curriculum initiatives
- Evaluating Science Department instructional staff members, ESE Department instructional staff members and several others

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	43	33	54	163
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	13	25	12	76
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	4	13	5	46
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	41	45	33	149

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	50	32	28	152	

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	13	3	6	22	
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	6	0	22

Date this data was collected

Tuesday 8/14/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	44	39	19	127	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	50	48	44	166	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	28	28	20	103	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	44	44	38	199	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	76	71	31	223

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	44	39	19	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	50	48	44	166
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	28	28	20	103
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	44	44	38	199

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	76	71	31	223

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

ELA L25 LG combined 9th and 10th grade were down from 48%(2017) to 40%(2018). No this is not a trend. Both 9th grade and 10th grade L25 LG had decreases, however, 9th ELA L25 LG was 50%, while 10th Grade ELA L25 LG was 30%.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

ELA L25 LG decreased 8% points from 2017 (48% to 40%).

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

ELA L25 LG was the only data point that was below the state average. 40% versus the state average of 44%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Math L25 LG had the biggest improvement, increasing 13% from 42% (2017) to 55% (2018). We have experienced a 3 year improvement trend: 33% (2016), 42% (2017), 55%(2018).

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Math Looping Sequence
Data Meetings with Math
FOCUS - Instructional Practice

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	61%	62%	56%	50%	58%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	57%	53%	46%	50%	46%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	47%	44%	35%	44%	38%
Math Achievement	64%	67%	51%	45%	51%	43%
Math Learning Gains	52%	59%	48%	34%	43%	39%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	57%	45%	33%	39%	38%
Science Achievement	80%	74%	67%	68%	70%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	80%	71%	71%	80%	69%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	33 (25)	43 (44)	33 (39)	54 (19)	163 (127)
One or more suspensions	26 (24)	13 (50)	25 (48)	12 (44)	76 (166)
Course failure in ELA or Math	24 (27)	4 (28)	13 (28)	5 (20)	46 (103)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	30 (73)	41 (44)	45 (44)	33 (38)	149 (199)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2018	66%	53%	13%	53%	13%
	2017	55%	52%	3%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2018	55%	53%	2%	53%	2%
	2017	54%	54%	0%	50%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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
2018	79%	69%	10%	65%	14%
2017	76%	72%	4%	63%	13%
Compare		3%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	73%	75%	-2%	68%	5%
2017	69%	72%	-3%	67%	2%
Compare		4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	60%	72%	-12%	62%	-2%
2017	65%	59%	6%	60%	5%
Compare		-5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	68%	60%	8%	56%	12%
2017	68%	58%	10%	53%	15%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

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	39	46	40	46	42		65	62		89	29
HSP	68	66		68	58		81	63		100	36
MUL	54	50		60							
WHT	61	57	40	64	52	58	80	76		93	55
FRL	56	54	38	61	53	63	73	65		93	43
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	10	30	35	18	19	10	38	35		74	23
ASN	50										
HSP	49	51		55	41	25	70	65		73	55
WHT	56	52	48	71	53	43	79	70		85	45
FRL	49	51	47	66	50	45	72	63		74	46

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title ELA Learning Gains L25

Rationale Lemon Bay had a decrease of L25 learning gains from 48% to 40%. 9th grade 50% / 10th grade 30%. Focus will be on increasing 10th grade.

Intended Outcome The school staff has set a goal to move from 40% to 48% this year.

Point Person Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Action Step

Description Review past data and provide current L25 data to teachers.
10th Grade will start Kahn Academy with Academic Strategies

Person Responsible Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Review BOY/MOY data with teachers and provide reflection time to discuss barriers.

Person Responsible Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Activity #2	
Title	Math Learning Gains L25
Rationale	Math L25 Learning gains were good 55% overall (Alg - 57%, Geom 53%) however we need to continue to focus and improve in this area.
Intended Outcome	School Staff goal is 58%.
Point Person	Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Action Step	

Description	Teachers were provided previous year data and current year data with the amount of points needed to achieve a learning gain. Big Rock for LBHS is relationships with students and better understanding the individual needs of the students.
Person Responsible	Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Teacher data meetings after MOY. Teacher Walkthroughs.
Person Responsible	Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Activity #3	
Title	Closing the Achievement Gap in ELA
Rationale	Focus on sub groups of students who have traditionally under preformed on ELA test as compared to their counterparts.
Intended Outcome	Decrease the achievement gap for African American (Decrease from 18 to 11) and Hispanic students(Decrease from 9 to 5) as compared to white students, decrease the achievement gap for SWD (Decrease from 42 to 27) versus Students without disabilities.
Point Person	Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Action Step	
Description	Leadership PD around Achievement Gap. Review data with teachers, FOCUS on instructional practices
Person Responsible	Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Data Days and Walkthroughs
Person Responsible	Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Part V: Budget	
Total:	\$4,448.95