

Lake Wales Charter Schools

Lake Wales Senior High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Lake Wales Senior High School

1 HIGHLANDER WAY, Lake Wales, FL 33853

<http://lwcharterschools.com/lwhigh>

Demographics

Principal: Anuj Saran

Start Date for this Principal: 9/17/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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

N/A

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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Lake Wales Senior High School

1 HIGHLANDER WAY, Lake Wales, FL 33853

<http://lwcharterschools.com/lwhigh>

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 PK, 9-12	Yes	52%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	58%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

Creating a vibrant internationally minded community where students are encouraged to seek a life of inquiry, reflection, and merit.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lake Wales High School will become a school of excellence where students of all backgrounds will achieve their full potential in a wide range of academic, cultural, and personal development that will enable them to become contributing members of society.

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
Dunson, Donna	Principal	Donna Dunson-Principal. Ms. Dunson will provide a common vision for the use of the data-based decision making while modeling the problem-solving process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure for implementation of our MTSS/Rtl; ensures that the schools based team is implementing MTSS/Rtl; conducts assessment of MTSS/Rtl skills of school staff; ensures implementations of support and documentation; ensures and participates inadequate professional learning to support MTSS/Rtl school-wide; ensures resources are assigned to those areas in most need; and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS/Rtl plans and activities.
Saran, Anuj	Assistant Principal	Anuj Saran - Assistant Principal. Mr. Saran will assist Ms. Dunson in providing a community vision for the use of data-based decision making, assist in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of MTSS/Rtl, further assist Ms. Dunson in the assessment of MTSS/Rtl skills, assist with the implementation of intervention support and documentation, professional learning and communication with parents concerning MTSS/Rtl plans and activities. He heads the IB program and manages the school budget.
Barcenas, Anna	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Barcenas will assist Ms. Dunson in providing a community vision for the use of data-based decision making, assist in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of MTSS/Rtl, further assist Ms. Dunson in the assessment of MTSS/Rtl skills, assist with the implementation of intervention support and documentation, professional learning and communication with parents concerning MTSS/Rtl plans and activities. She also manages the career academies and staff evaluation.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 9/17/2020, Anuj Saran

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

70

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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	431	450	379	313	1573
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	18	14	7	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
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	119	103	87	76	385
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	94	40	42	291

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	20	16	7	6	49

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	22	35	31	1	89
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	53	47	19	149

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/17/2020

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	444	405	379	352	1580
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	23	28	16	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	9	1	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	118	103	87	439

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	33	25	21	12	91

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	35	42	48	5	130
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	65	47	36	261

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	444	405	379	352	1580
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	23	28	16	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	9	1	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	118	103	87	439

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	33	25	21	12	91

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	35	42	48	5	130
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	65	47	36	261

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	52%	0%	56%	48%	0%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	0%	51%	47%	0%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	0%	42%	34%	0%	41%
Math Achievement	54%	0%	51%	39%	0%	49%
Math Learning Gains	54%	0%	48%	37%	0%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	0%	45%	32%	0%	39%
Science Achievement	61%	0%	68%	65%	0%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	58%	0%	73%	60%	0%	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	51%			55%	-4%
	2018	56%			53%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	53%			53%	0%
	2018	52%			53%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

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	60%	0%	0%		
2018	59%	0%	0%		
Compare		1%			
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	56%	0%	0%		
2018	62%	0%	0%		
Compare		-6%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	0%	0%		
2018	60%	0%	0%		
Compare		-13%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	0%	0%		
2018	49%	0%	0%		
Compare		9%			

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	20	49	50	28	43	50	16	35		95	30
ELL	13	46	50	28	60	62	29	50		61	29
ASN	93	62									
BLK	34	51	49	41	52	47	45	46		95	31

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
HSP	43	49	48	45	53	74	54	61		88	51
MUL	48	52		52	44		55				
WHT	66	56	50	67	57	63	73	64		93	58
FRL	41	49	45	48	55	62	52	55		91	44
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	11	36	39	31	39	45	34	56		76	7
ELL	19	31	26	26	26	27	45	30		79	11
ASN	92	69									
BLK	33	47	43	41	46	45	35	41		86	21
HSP	52	52	42	46	37	38	54	65		84	36
MUL	46	27		59	23		47			85	36
WHT	64	57	58	67	47	50	72	72		90	49
FRL	45	49	45	51	46	44	51	56		85	31
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

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	59
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	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	646
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	45
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	78
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	49
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	57
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	50
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	65
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	55
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.

ELA achievement level for ELL students is at 13%. An influx of students from the region impacted by hurricane Irma. English is not their first language and many had to sit for the test within weeks of being here.

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

There was a 16 point decline in the science scores for ELL students. Same reason as above.

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.

The Social studies achievement at 58% was 15% lower than the state average of 73%. The scores have fluctuated over the years and we had new teachers. Moving forward more PD and focus on progress monitoring should resolve the issue.

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

There was a 16% increase in the Math lowest 25%. This component increased from 45% to 61% and was the highest in Polk County. Hiring academic coaches (college students) to work with the lowest group and splitting the algebra 1 class for the lowest group into Algebra 1a and Algebra 1b.

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

We have 131 level 1 students in the 9th grade and 55 with two or more indicators; this appears to be the weakest in-coming cohort.

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

1. Maintain the B grade
2. Increase science achievement
3. Increase FSA ELL score for ELL students
4. Continue to increase the learning gains for ELA and Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase AL 3+ achievement level for Biology EOC. We are ranked #71 out of 171 Title 1 High Schools in Florida with a pass rate of 61%. The highest in Polk County is 78% and the state average is 68%. Since our graduation rate for 2019-20 is at 95% (unofficial), which is much higher than other title 1 high schools, we feel we need to work on the science achievement level. It is also an area that will help us become an A school.

Measurable Outcome: The Biology EOC pass rate will increase by at least 3% and go from 61% to 64%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Anuj Saran (anuj.saran@lwcharterschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: We are using a two pronged strategy. First, for those enrolled in a class with the Bio EOC exam this year, we have hired academic coaches to provide 1:1 tutoring either during blocks built into the master schedule or provide online tutoring after school hours. Second, for 9th grade students who are level 1 and 2 on FSA ELA, we For 9th grade with those in Environmental science hyper-focus in 1/2 of the Ecology content, 10th grade with integrated science hyper-focus on 1/2 Ecology and select topics in Biology, and for 11th grade who are enrolled in Biology which has more instructional time in difficult topics in Biology.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Marzano Haystead (2009): Meta Analytic Synthesis of Studies Conducted at Marzano Research Laboratory on Instructional Strategies. We looked at the effect size of different strategies and the two highest effect sizes are for "Tracking Student Progress (34% Gain) and Setting goals/Objectives (25% Gain). Based on his research, these two strategies have the highest impact on student success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Academic coach will be available for additional tutoring
2. Providing more hands-on experimental experiences for this specific group by having an academic coach as a lab coordinator.
3. Courses on complete pre-test/post-test and data used to drive instruction modification.

Person Responsible: Vanessa Revelo (vanessa.revelo@lwcharterschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	Increase ELL ELA achievement level. The data shows that the AL for ELL students on the FSA ELA test declined from 19% to 13% between 2018 and 2019. All trends should be upward with continuous school improvement so we need to reverse this trend.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Increase FSA ELA achievement level or learning gains for ELL students or learning gains by 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anuj Saran (anuj.saran@lwcharterschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Mastery Learning and Marzano's work.</p> <p>Strategy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building Vocabulary - Hired an ESOL Para to run pull out sessions with the identified LY student list focused on building vocabulary and implementing the two additional strategies below. 2. Tracking Student Progress - ESOL Para will track student progress on Reading Plus, work with the ELA teacher and help students meet learning goals set by the teacher in conjunction with the student. 3. Setting goals/Objectives - The ELL teacher and the ESOL para will set goals and objectives with the ELL students to improve their FSA ELA achievement level or make learning goal
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Marzano Haystead (2009): Meta Analytic Synthesis of Studies Conducted at Marzano Research Laboratory on Instructional Strategies. We looked at the effect size of different strategies and the three highest effect sizes are for "Tracking Student Progress (34% Gain) and Setting goals/Objectives (25% Gain) and Building Vocabulary (20% gain) Based on his research, these two strategies have the highest impact on student success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hire ESOL Para and share student data with her
2. Provide time and a space for pull out sessions
3. Provide collaborative planning time to design and implement the plan
4. Track student progress using the progress monitoring tools for FSA ELA

Person Responsible Vanessa Revelo (vanessa.revelo@lwcharterschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

For Math, LWHS has partnered with Khan Academy as a district partner - we are one of 11 districts nation wide. Our teachers are receiving PD from Khan academy and AP - Anuj Saran is monitoring student progress with the department head - Katrina Childress on a weekly basis. The goal is fill gaps and increase math achievement level or learning gains by 3%.

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.

Lake Wales High School has various Parent Involvement events planned for this school year, such as Annual Meeting-Open House; College Fair; College Admissions Seminar and an information session focused on necessary requirements for each grade level. Our target is to increase the number of parents attending these events.

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: Instructional Practice: Science				\$36,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	150-Aides	1721 - Lake Wales Senior High School	Other		\$18,000.00
			<i>Notes: Private donation to fund an academic coach to provide extra instructional time for the more difficult content topics in biology. Creating opportunities for a reteaching and a deeper understanding of content information for those students enrolled in the course with lower FSA ELA, Reading, and Math scores.</i>			
	5100	150-Aides	1721 - Lake Wales Senior High School	Other		\$18,000.00
			<i>Notes: Private donation fund an academic coach focused on students sitting for the Biology EOC to provide tutoring in school and after school - in person or online assistance.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$27,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	150-Aides	1721 - Lake Wales Senior High School	General Fund		\$27,000.00
			<i>Notes: ESOL Para</i>			
Total:						\$63,000.00