Lemon Bay High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lemon Bay High School

2201 PLACIDA RD, Englewood, FL 34224

http://lemonbayhigh.com/

Demographics

Principal: Robert Murphy

Start Date for this Principal: 1/1/2003

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	64%
2019-20 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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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

Lemon Bay High School

2201 PLACIDA RD, Englewood, FL 34224

http://lemonbayhigh.com/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	34%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	16%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bedford, Bob	Principal	-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
Murphy, Robert	Assistant Principal	-Overseeing Curriculum and Instruction - Technology - Teacher Hardware - Peripherals - Administration - Data - Transportation - PPC - Student Surveys - Guidance - Registration - Parent Conferences

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		- 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
Henry, Michael	Assistant Principal	- Testing & Facilities - EOC - FSA - SAT Day -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
Young, Denise	Assistant Principal	-Overseeing Discipline & Activities - Dean Position & ISS Position - Discipline Grades 9-12 - Activities Calendar - Activities SOM - Activities Co-Curriculars (Band/Drama/ROTC) - Activities Field Trips

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		- 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. -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

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 1/1/2003, Robert Murphy

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
1

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	64%
2019-20 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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	305	238	216	232	991
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	26	13	20	107
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	26

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	0	0	0	0	

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	1	5	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/3/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	276	264	259	257	1056
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	64	37	42	239

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	0	0	0	0	

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	11	3	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	276	264	259	257	1056
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	64	37	42	239

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	0	0	0	0	

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	11	3	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	65%	62%	56%	54%	61%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	54%	51%	52%	55%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	45%	42%	48%	50%	41%
Math Achievement	65%	64%	51%	70%	64%	49%
Math Learning Gains	53%	56%	48%	52%	51%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	52%	45%	42%	47%	39%
Science Achievement	77%	72%	68%	77%	78%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	80%	73%	69%	78%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**				**Total**
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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	2019	68%	53%	15%	55%	13%
	2018	66%	53%	13%	53%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	61%	52%	9%	53%	8%
	2018	55%	53%	2%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

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**
2019	79%	71%	8%	67%	12%
2018	79%	69%	10%	65%	14%
Compare	0%				

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	76%	-2%	70%	4%
2018	73%	75%	-2%	68%	5%
Compare		1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	64%	-5%	61%	-2%
2018	60%	72%	-12%	62%	-2%
Compare		-1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	62%	8%	57%	13%
2018	68%	60%	8%	56%	12%
Compare		2%			

Subgroup Data

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	34	48	44	45	53		51	55		86	20
ELL	47	78	64	92	60		73				
HSP	57	57	52	67	55	60	76	77		100	75
MUL	76	69		71	64		73				
WHT	67	55	43	65	52	53	78	76		94	60
FRL	60	54	47	61	56	60	73	70		95	52
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

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
FRL	49	51	47	66	50	45	72	63		74	46

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	91
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	740
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	72
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	68
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	71
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	64
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	63
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Lemon Bay's ELA L25 data showed the lowest performance even though it was higher than both the state and county percentages and we increased our performance rate by 6% versus prior year. We are still searching for the proper strategies to meet the needs of these low readers.

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

Science showed the greatest decline moving from 80% to 77% proficiency. Again, Science is still well above both the state and county averages. The biggest factor in the decline may be the absence of a teacher for 6 weeks for health reasons.

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.

Lemon Bay outperformed the state in every category.

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

Lemon Bay showed the most improvement in the area of ELA L25. We are continually looking at strategies to enhance the learning needs of our students. We have focused solely on strategies that help students read and comprehend in all subject areas.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance continues to be the greatest concern not only for those students identified on EWS, but also the school as a whole. We continue to utilize programs and strategies that target increasing attendance at the high school.

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

1. ELA L25
2. Math L25
3. Graduation Rate
4. Acceleration
5. ELA Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase ELA L25 Learning Gains While Lemon Bay increased its ELA Learning Gains from 40% to 46%, we are still looking to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25 that make gains, especially in the 10th grade level.
Measurable Outcome:	The staff has set a goal to increase from 46% to 50%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will implement critical concepts and continue to review past data and current progress monitoring data and will meet with the ELA and Academic Strategies teachers relative to the data. We will continue to use our literacy initiative and we are trying a new SIM reading program in the 10th grade. We offer tutoring after school for additional help and we offer EOC cram sessions for students before state testing.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	While we made improvement, we were presented with an opportunity from SIMs to implement a new reading program in the 10th grade. Our teacher attended a 3 day training session in Orlando and is required to implement the program with fidelity.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Critical Concepts
2. Monitor Data
3. Attend training
4. implement program

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase Math L25 Learning Gains While our scores continue to be above the state average, we understand the importance of the L25 student plays in both L25 gains and regular gains.
Measurable Outcome:	The staff set a goal of 57% for L25 Learning Gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will utilize Critical Concepts, Algebra Nation, Student Think-Pair-Share and challenging word questions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We believe the implementation of Critical Concepts, Alg Nation, Think-Pair-Share and challenging word questions will help students prepare better both the Alg and Geom tests.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement Critical Concepts
2. Review prior year data with teachers once the BOY is completed
3. Review MOY data to look for growth
4. Continue to implement classroom strategies for students

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

While we are focused in certain areas, we continue to monitor the other priorities by meeting with teachers and monitoring data on a quarterly basis.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Building a positive school culture and environment is one of our main objectives at Lemon Bay. Positive school culture for teachers includes, but is not limited to, addressing their needs in the classroom and providing additional resources for them, celebrating monthly with food, and celebrating our successes with

events such as Palm Island, after school social gatherings and various other events. For students, it is our many clubs and activities on campus that directly involve students. Our use of the PBIS program as well as our Manta Pride program to recognize students. For the parents it is our school advisory committee and our many parent booster programs that help maintain a positive culture. Our relationship with the community is second to none. Each year our students donate thousands of hours to community service and in return, the community donates thousands of dollars to our many programs including our Community Academic Partners (CAPs) where the community raises money so that our struggling students can receive after-school tutoring help Monday through Thursday. Each year we invite 40-50 colleges, universities, tech programs to a career day at LBHS where all students take part in a college/career expo. For social services, we partner with Charlotte Behavioral Health to supplement our school social workers needs pertaining to student mental health.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	0051 - Lemon Bay High School	School Improvement Funds		$500.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	0051 - Lemon Bay High School	School Improvement Funds		$500.00
					Total:	$1,500.00