

Polk County Public Schools

Lakeland 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Lakeland Senior High School

726 HOLLINGSWORTH RD, Lakeland, FL 33801

<http://www.lakelandhighschool.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Arthur Martinez

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2020

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)	85%
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 (61%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (50%) 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	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Lakeland Senior High School

726 HOLLINGSWORTH RD, Lakeland, FL 33801

<http://www.lakelandhighschool.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	63%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Lakeland High School is to provide a rigorous and relevant education anchored in excellence and tradition.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lakeland High Schools' community of learners will continue to advance their potential for great achievement by engaging globally.

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
Martinez, Art	Principal	
LeVine, Kevin	Principal	
McKown, Lori	Assistant Principal	
Guenther, Leigh	Assistant Principal	
Westberry, Gary	Assistant Principal	
Marbra, Orientalial	Assistant Principal	
Teague, Nada	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach
Rawson, Samantha	Administrative Support	Success Coach
Jeske, Shellie	Administrative Support	Testing Coordinator
Goodson, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair
Maurer, Leila	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair
Pierce, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair
Woods, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair
Wilt, Shelly	Teacher, K-12	Reading Teacher
Sampson, Brittany	Teacher, K-12	Department Chair
Torres, Edynet	Teacher, K-12	ESOL Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/10/2020, Arthur Martinez

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

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)	85%
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 (61%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (50%) 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	TS&I
* 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	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
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	0	0		
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

Wednesday 6/10/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	0	0	0	0	0

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	
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	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	
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	60%	47%	56%	55%	44%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	46%	51%	46%	41%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	37%	42%	33%	33%	41%
Math Achievement	52%	43%	51%	40%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	55%	45%	48%	32%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	44%	45%	23%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	78%	58%	68%	60%	56%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	61%	73%	70%	60%	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	61%	45%	16%	55%	6%
	2018	55%	43%	12%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	58%	42%	16%	53%	5%
	2018	57%	42%	15%	53%	4%
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	76%	54%	22%	67%	9%
2018	71%	59%	12%	65%	6%
Compare		5%			
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	77%	57%	20%	70%	7%
2018	72%	57%	15%	68%	4%
Compare		5%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	36%	50%	-14%	61%	-25%
2018	52%	60%	-8%	62%	-10%
Compare		-16%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	53%	9%	57%	5%
2018	51%	41%	10%	56%	-5%
Compare		11%			

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	32	26	37	53		40	51		90	8
ELL	11	37	38	24			50	35		73	33
ASN	76	68					100			100	60
BLK	34	41	31	24	29	24	52	54		91	37
HSP	51	55	40	46	58	57	71	72		88	54
MUL	67	56		75			92	87		100	41
WHT	75	56	28	66	61	60	88	91		96	56
FRL	37	43	38	38	44	42	63	63		90	39
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	29	34	23	19	15	20	35	40		71	21
ELL	22	38	37	28	38		50	27		77	25
ASN	80	50						100			
BLK	31	38	28	26	37	39	44	53		81	25
HSP	53	43	42	48	39	38	69	67		88	53
MUL	68	60		69	50		100	61		88	67
WHT	71	58	47	63	43	32	83	84		92	67
FRL	42	43	36	37	35	32	58	59		84	44

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	8	24	24	20	38	28	9	35		64	14
ELL	3	34	38	19	36	36		43		63	60
ASN	68	63		75	47		90			92	73
BLK	29	31	30	20	23	22	36	50		75	36
HSP	51	46	29	37	33	27	53	70		78	58
MUL	53	46		38	30	36	55	41		86	44
WHT	70	53	41	50	36	18	72	78		91	65
FRL	37	34	30	23	26	25	39	52		79	39

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	31
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	636
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	81
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	42
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	74
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	68
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	49
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.

The lowest performing data component is Lakeland High School's English Language Arts (ELA) Lowest 25% Learning Gains. This is the only ELA component below the state and district average. Both ELA Achievement and ELA Learning Gains rose while ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% fell. This does not appear to be a trend based on previous years' data. The students identified as the lowest 25% typically have the lowest attendance rates and grads, and this was the case in the 2019-2020 school year (the closest year with available data for an entire school year). In addition, the student subgroup which performed the worst in this category were not ESE or ELL students. These students did not receive the additional supports that the other student demographic groups benefit from (such as additional instruction from an ESE or ESOL teacher/paraprofessional). Lakeland High School would benefit from creating targeted interventions for these students.

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

The school's ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains declined by 4%; however, this school grade component was the only area that declined. The data shows that this category is somewhat cyclical. That data varies by 4-5% each year and does not appear to be a trend based on past performance. The factors that contributed to this decline was discussed in the previous section.

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.

Although overall math achievement remained the same (52%), the Algebra E.O.C. achievement fell by 25% below the state average and 14% below the district average. The decline in Algebra E.O.C. scores were offset by the rise in Geometry E.O.C. scores. The 2019-2019 school year was the first year where the lower performing math students who were placed in Algebra 1A their 9th grade year and 1B in their 10th grade year took the Algebra 1 E.O.C. The lowest achievement scores were obtained in this student demographic. This group of students earned an Achievement Level of 1 or 2 on their 8th Grade Math FSA.

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

Math learning gains showed the greatest improvement over the previous year. Overall learning gains increased by 11% and the lowest 25% improved by 15%. The subgroup with the greatest gains included the Students with Disabilities. Their learning gains increased from 15% (2018) to 53% (2019). The school leveraged ESE teachers who were also certified in mathematics to assist in both Algebra and Geometry. The school also tracked the learning gains of both Algebra and Geometry students using district quarterly assessments as evidence of growth. Both Math and ESE teachers used available data to create targeted interventions for the lowest 25%.

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

The number of students receiving a level 1 on statewide assessments increased in Algebra and 9th/10th Grade ELA over the 2018 school year. However, only the percentage of students receiving a level 1 increased in Algebra. All other indicators show improvement (attendance at or below 90%, graduation rate, etc.).

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

1. English Language Arts Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile (all student subgroups)
2. Algebra End-of-Course Achievement (all student subgroups)
3. English Language Arts Achievement for English Language Learning and Students with Disabilities
4. Geometry End-of-Course Achievement for English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus English Language Arts Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile:
Description and Rationale: Lakeland Senior High School has been consistently improving in ELA Achievement and ELA Learning Gains

Measurable Outcome: ELA Learning Gains will increase by 10% for students taking the 9th and 10th grade ELA Florida Standards Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lori McKown (lori.mckown@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Targeted interventions will be created for our lowest performing students, and these targeted interventions will be extended to serve those student who fall into the middle achievement level as well. To create targeted interventions, stakeholders will need continued professional development as well as the ability to identify targeted students and their progress. Targeted interventions should include differentiation and small group instruction which will be monitored by the school's leadership team to ensure compliance and fidelity of the process. In addition, data chats with those involved in the process will take place to ensure that necessary adjustments to instructional practice will take place along the way.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These interventions will be designed and implemented to ensure that those students who did not make learning gains will receive a boost in their reading and literacy skills. Additionally, incorporating reading strategies across the curriculum will aid with literacy for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

Data chats with students will be conducted on a quarterly basis through English classes.

Person Responsible Leila Maurer (leila.maurer@polk-fl.net)

Literacy coach will conduct small group learning sessions with students.

Person Responsible Nada Teague (nada.teague@polk-fl.net)

Success coach will hold tutoring sessions and meetings with individual students.

Person Responsible Samantha Rawson (samantha.rawson@polk-fl.net)

Incorporation of reading strategies will be implemented across the curriculum to include, but no limited to, English, Social Studies, and Science..

Person Responsible Lori McKown (lori.mckown@polk-fl.net)

Professional development will be targeted to assist Non-Reading teachers (which will be lead by the Reading Department).

Person Responsible Shelly Wilt (shelly.wilt@polk-fl.net)

STAR data will be reviewed to track student progress and to target effectiveness of interventions.

Person Responsible Shellie Jeske (shellie.jeske@polk-fl.net)

Achieve 3000 level-set data will be reviewed to track students' gains in lexile levels to provide feedback to effectiveness of interventions.

Person Responsible Nada Teague (nada.teague@polk-fl.net)

Writing ongoing progress monitoring will be reviewed to track students' writing progress in order to target specific areas that require interventions.

Person Responsible Nada Teague (nada.teague@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Algebra EOC was identified as a significant opportunity for improvement across all student subgroups. A focus on unpacking standards and adhering to course content, combined with an intentional approach to assessments and monitoring student data are needed to create positive growth in this area.

Measurable Outcome: The percentage of students reaching an achievement level of 3 or higher on the Algebra EOC will increase by 14%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: All Algebra 1-A, Algebra 1-B, Algebra 1, and Algebra 1 Honors will collaboratively design instruction aligning with course standards with instructional outcomes. Although Algebra 1-A is not a tested subject, preparation for the Algebra 1 EOC occurs in this course for students taking Algebra as a two-year course sequence. Collaborative planning also includes progress monitoring and data analysis between the teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The data indicate that instructional outcomes do not match the standards tested on the Algebra 1 EOC. This evidence suggests a misalignment between instruction and course standards may exist. Anecdotal evidence consisting of past classroom observations corroborates this assumption.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development to increase Algebra teachers' skills with Unify during pre-planning week will allow teacher to properly identify student math proficiency levels and to establish learning gain goals for each student.

Person Responsible: Shellie Jeske (shellie.jeske@polk-fl.net)

Teachers of Algebra courses will plan collaboratively (during 6th period) to develop instructional materials, discuss data, and to create targeted/differentiated instruction on a weekly basis. They will use each other as resources as well as the district math coach when available.

Person Responsible: Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)

Algebra 1 classes will be maintained at the lowest number of students possible to ensure the highest quality of instruction per pupil possible.

Person Responsible: Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)

Administration will review lesson plans monthly to ensure instruction aligns with content standards

Person Responsible: Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)

Utilize Quarterly District Progress Monitoring to track progress of student performance in Algebra 1.

Person Responsible: Shellie Jeske (shellie.jeske@polk-fl.net)

Formative and summative classroom assessments will be implemented to inform the effectiveness of instructional decisions. The data gained from these assessments will allow teachers to make pedagogical adjustments. These assessments will be developed collaboratively during collaborative planning sessions.

Person Responsible Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)

Classroom observations will be conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of strategies developed in collaborative lesson plans.

Person Responsible Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)

Administrator in charge of the math department will work in consultation with the District-Based Math Coach to ensure that students gain familiarity with EOC question-types and test rigor.

Person Responsible Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Federal Percentage of Points Index indicates that ELL learners require additional support since this subgroup underperformed as a whole. Only 11% of ELL students demonstrated ELA achievement on the 9th and 10th grade FSA. 24% of ELL students reached math proficiency on the Algebra and Geometry E.O.C. assessments. Providing additional supports for this subgroup will increase this students group's performance in both English and Math. In the process, learning gains for this subgroup should also improve.
Measurable Outcome:	ELL student achievement in ELA will improve by 10% as measured by the 9th and 10th Grade ELA FSA. In addition, ELL students will improve math proficiency by 6% in both Algebra and Geometry as measured by the respective E.O.C. assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Leigh Guenther (leigh.guenther@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The LHS faculty and staff will provide continuous professional development in ESOL strategies and instructional delivery after students have been appropriately scheduled and supported.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Second language acquisition occurs in all classrooms and does not take place in isolation. Language, reading, and writing skills carry across content areas. Skills learned in social studies, science, and elective classes affect student performance in English and Math classes. A holistic approach provides students with more practice and opportunities to enhance academic language acquisition needed to be successful.
Action Steps to Implement	
ELL students will be appropriately scheduled into the Appropriate English/Reading course based on length of time in ESOL program and past student assessment data.	
Person Responsible	Lori McKown (lori.mckown@polk-fl.net)
Social Studies teachers will be provided ELL instructional strategies and training during common planning.	
Person Responsible	Brittany Sampson (brittany.sampson@polk-fl.net)
Science teachers will be provided ELL instructional strategies and training during common planning.	
Person Responsible	Cheryl Pierce (cheryl.pierce@polk-fl.net)
Math teachers will be provided ELL instructional strategies and training during common planning.	
Person Responsible	Lisa Woods (lisa.woods@polk-fl.net)
English teachers will be provided ELL instructional strategies and training during common planning.	
Person Responsible	Leila Maurer (leila.maurer@polk-fl.net)
Reading teachers will be provided ELL instructional strategies and training during common planning.	
Person Responsible	Shelly Wilt (shelly.wilt@polk-fl.net)
All LHS staff will receive ELL training during professional development work days provided by the school's ESOL teacher.	

Person Responsible Edynet Torres (edynet.torres@polk-fl.net)

The ESOL teacher and paraprofessional will provide small group/individual push-in support to ELL students in mainstream classrooms based upon student needs and performance.

Person Responsible Edynet Torres (edynet.torres@polk-fl.net)

The Literacy Coach will work in consultation with the ESOL teacher to conduct small-group pull-out instruction throughout the school year.

Person Responsible Nada Teague (nada.teague@polk-fl.net)

Algebra and Geometry teachers will create targeted interventions for ELL students based upon their class performance, progress on district assessments, and other assessment data.

Person Responsible Lisa Woods (lisa.woods@polk-fl.net)

The District-Based Math Coach will train math teachers in ELL instructional strategies during common planning throughout the year.

Person Responsible Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)

Administration will conduct classroom observations to ensure that ELL instructional strategies developed by the faculty are enacted with fidelity and to identify opportunities for additional instructional/faculty development.

Person Responsible Leigh Guenther (leigh.guenther@polk-fl.net)

Administration will review lesson plans to ensure that ELL strategies have been considered by all subject area teachers.

Person Responsible Leigh Guenther (leigh.guenther@polk-fl.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Federal Percentage of Points Index indicates that ESE students require additional support since this subgroup underperformed as a whole in the 208-2019 school year. The lowest areas of performance occurred in Mathematics Achievement (level 3 or higher on Algebra/Geometry EOC), ELA Achievement (level 3 or higher on 9th/10th Grade ELA FSA), ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile, and ELA Learning Gains. All of the categories fell below 40%.
Measurable Outcome:	Each performance category defined above (ELA Achievement, ELA Learning Gains, ELA Learning Gains for Lowest 25%, and Mathematics Achievement) will increase by at least 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ESE teachers will focus on student learning objectives in both ELA and Math instruction to ensure their assigned students demonstrate greater proficiency. ESE teachers will take ownership of student assessment performance and monitoring of student data that are needed to create positive learning growth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	ESE teachers juggle a myriad of responsibilities and students with varying needs. The emphasis on meeting documentation requirements for IEP compliance has directed ESE teachers' attention away from student performance on state assessments and learning growth. In addition, they are required to possess knowledge across a wide array of subjects which limits their abilities to become experts in any one particular subject area. The action steps outlined below will help LHS' ESE teachers in reaching the evidence-based strategy identified above.

Action Steps to Implement

ESE teachers will be provided Unify training so that they can properly identify the specific support required for their students. Unify will be utilized to determine which students did not make learning gains and which subject areas students failed to make learning gains. Unify will also be utilized to identify which test content areas (for example, statistics in Algebra 1 EOC) student struggled.

Person Responsible Shellie Jeske (shellie.jeske@polk-fl.net)

ESE teachers will be given adequate time to co-plan with English and Math teachers on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)

Data chats will be conducted on a quarterly basis between the administrators responsible for English and Math and the ESE teachers. Data will be gathered from the ESE teacher and the regular education teachers' anecdotal notes/running records, grade book, formative and summative assessments, as well as district quarterly progress monitoring.

Person Responsible Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)

Incentives will be provided by the ESE teachers for students who demonstrate gains in reading literacy or algebraic reasoning/skills on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible Samantha Rawson (samantha.rawson@polk-fl.net)

Areas of improvement will be identified and targeted by the ESE teacher in consultation with the general education teacher.

Person Responsible Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)

ESE teachers will be schedule to support students with disabilities based on their strength in either mathematics or English/Reading. This will allow each ESE teacher to specialize in a content core area and better serve students.

Person Responsible Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)

ESE department will meet monthly to review student data and to discuss/resolve barriers to student success.

Person Responsible Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Lakeland High School will continue to work on its Career and College Acceleration category. LHS will work to provide students with more dual enrollment opportunities and more industry certification choices to provide acceleration opportunities not previously afforded to some students. In order to accomplish this goal, teachers with the correct credentials will be to be placed in the correct courses and facilities will need to be improved. This process will take longer than one school year to accomplish.

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.

In March of each year, we hold a meeting for all incoming 9th-grade students called "Freshmen Forum". This meeting allows parents and students an opportunity to receive information about Lakeland High School. They are also given the opportunity to meet with teachers and guidance counselors, as well as the change to tour our campus. At Orientation, parents and students meet the teachers and explore the various organizations at our school. Our School Advisory Council (SAC) is open for any parent to attend. Notices of these meetings appear on the school web site, are posted on the marquee, and are announced through social media.

Other options of communications are:

1. Freshmen Parent night for incoming 9th Graders
2. School Web Site
3. Parent Portal - provides parents and students real time grades and attendance information in addition to school announcements.
4. Quarterly school newsletter.
5. Electronic Surveys for parents/students.
6. Open House
7. Facebook and Twitter Feeds for Parents and Students
8. Individual Teacher Remind Accounts

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00