East Lee County High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

East Lee County High School

715 THOMAS SHERWIN AVE S, Lehigh Acres, FL 33974

http://elc.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Tony Allen

Start Date for this Principal: 1/5/2018

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: D (33%)
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 Lee 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

East Lee County High School

715 THOMAS SHERWIN AVE S, Lehigh Acres, FL 33974

http://elc.leeschools.net/

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	Yes	94%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	85%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

To provide a relevant and rigorous learning environment that prepares all students to reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a world-class provider of academic, career, and technical education.

Our Motto is:
own-engage-represent

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
Robery, Melissa	Principal	
Castellano, Jill	Instructional Coach	
Hutto, Carolyn	Instructional Coach	
Biro, Tim	Assistant Principal	
Prentice, Karen	Assistant Principal	
Green, Ellen	Assistant Principal	
Stevens, Kristin	Assistant Principal	
Neal, Misty	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 1/5/2018, Tony Allen

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

86

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: D (33%)
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	421	457	409	358	1645
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	64	54	51	224
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	53	20	17	115
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	51	79	43	175
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	29	69	135
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	115	139	104	502
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	110	71	123	419

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	109	129	102	124	464

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	1	0	0	7	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	8	10	32

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	445	386	432	434	1697
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	64	106	91	335
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	46	37	22	150
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168	104	146	60	478
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214	198	230	120	762

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	154	120	167	441

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	445	386	432	434	1697
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	64	106	91	335
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	46	37	22	150
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168	104	146	60	478
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214	198	230	120	762

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	154	120	167	441

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	36%	55%	56%	23%	53%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	49%	51%	28%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	37%	42%	26%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	34%	50%	51%	29%	41%	49%
Math Learning Gains	39%	45%	48%	33%	34%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	43%	45%	38%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	51%	62%	68%	38%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	53%	67%	73%	41%	63%	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	34%	51%	-17%	55%	-21%
	2018	33%	51%	-18%	53%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	35%	48%	-13%	53%	-18%
	2018	25%	50%	-25%	53%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

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	48%	56%	-8%	67%	-19%
2018	33%	61%	-28%	65%	-32%
Compare		15%			

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	51%	64%	-13%	70%	-19%
2018	48%	62%	-14%	68%	-20%
Compare		3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	34%	59%	-25%	61%	-27%
2018	31%	60%	-29%	62%	-31%
Compare		3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	33%	50%	-17%	57%	-24%
2018	36%	53%	-17%	56%	-20%
Compare		-3%			

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	7	28	28	19	48	48	9	29		78	10
ELL	14	37	30	29	39	38	32	39		62	13
ASN				55							
BLK	34	42	32	30	41	56	48	49		81	17
HSP	35	40	29	33	35	30	48	52		79	28
MUL	43	46		45				60			
WHT	40	37	29	46	47		64	52		82	30
FRL	33	38	29	31	36	36	50	51		81	26
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	10	34	30	9	44	50	15	30		60	13
ELL	10	28	28	16	42	43	15	12		41	37
BLK	30	36	32	26	40	52	27	48		65	18
HSP	29	35	28	36	37	28	35	49		71	45
MUL	24	36		27							
WHT	38	45	48	41	42	47	52	56		75	41
FRL	29	37	30	34	37	34	34	49		69	36

				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	22	19	31	42	60	14	29		60	32
ELL	5	27	26	23	48	53	23	14		56	25
BLK	22	31	24	27	26	29	23	33		87	41
HSP	21	27	26	29	34	41	37	41		80	50
MUL	23	31		31	38			55			
WHT	31	31	29	32	34	33	52	50		74	44
FRL	22	28	26	30	32	36	38	39		82	45

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	33
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	462
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
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	55
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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
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	47
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Based on FY19 data: College and Career Acceleration is the lowest scoring data component. (26)
Contributing Factors: Admin focus on tested areas.
Trend: Score will increase due to a focus on MOS Bundle completion,increase in academy and industry certification opportunities, and added AICE course opportunities at the senior level,

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

Based on FY19 data: College and Career Acceleration showed the greatest decline. (36 to 26)
Contributing Factors: Admin focus on tested areas.
Trend: Score will increase due to a focus on MOS Bundle completion,increase in academy and industry certification opportunities, and added AICE course opportunities at the senior level,

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.

Based on FY19 data: Algebra I proficiency has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. (East: 35, State: 62)
Contributing Factors: Change in math progression plan (Liberal Arts Math 1 in 9th grade for low level students)

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

Based on FY19 data: Biology proficiency showed the most improvement. (36 to 50)
New Actions: New teacher hired with a history of high student achievement on the EOC, focus on standards-based instruction, intervention plan implemented, and common progress monitoring assessments.

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

The number of students performing at a Level 1 on a state assessment is an area of concern. 71% of our incoming freshmen have historically scored a Level 1 or 2 on their FSA ELA.

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

1. increasing ELA proficiency
2. increasing Algebra proficiency
3. increasing ELA learning gains
4. increasing College and Career Acceleration
5. increasing student attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Research shows that if student attendance improves, student achievement scores will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020-2021 school year, the ELCHS student attendance percentage will be higher than the percentage of the other district high schools and/or higher than the ELCHS percentage for the corresponding cycle in 2019-2020 in at least 6 out of 9 district cycles as measured by District Support Applications (DSA).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karen Prentice (karensb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

1) Two full-time social workers will provide support for students and families to prevent excessive absenteeism from school.

2) One part-time nurse will provide support to students and families with medical and health concerns that would cause a student to be absent from school.

3) Attendance processes will address attendance issues before they becomes excessive. Teachers call home after a student is absent three class periods and documents call in Castle. If a student reaches five absences, teachers email student names to the Attendance Outlook Group. The attendance secretary will notify social workers and administration and mail a formal attendance letter if a student reaches seven absences.

4) Attendance meetings will be scheduled with the students and families of students who have 10 or more absences to address excessive absenteeism and develop a support plan to encourage improved attendance.

5) Student recognition activities/ceremonies will be scheduled to recognize and reward students with excellent attendance.

6) Capturing Kids' Hearts 2 training will take place during SINI days. Strategies will continue to be instituted to support teacher-student relationships and increased student engagement to promote improved student attendance.

8) ModEL (Men of Distinction Exhibiting Leadership) Men and ELLE (Empowered Ladies Leading East) programs will promote student leadership and academic excellence.

Person Responsible	Karen Prentice (karensb@leeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When teachers are absent from school, students miss out on opportunities to learn from highly qualified instructors. Improved teacher attendance will correlate to increased student achievement scores.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020-2021 school year, the % of ELCHS teachers who are absent 10 or more days will decrease 3% from 18% to 15%. (This excludes teachers who are on FMLA leave.)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Robery (melissasr@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

1) The process developed in 2018-2019 to document teacher attendance will continue so excessive absences can be addressed in a timely and efficient manner.
2) Weekly exercise classes will be offered to promote a healthy lifestyle and support good attendance at work.
3) Teacher recognition activities will be scheduled to recognize and reward teachers with excellent attendance.
4) Monthly staff and family activities will be scheduled to promote a positive culture and relationships with other staff members to increase teacher engagement in our school.
5) The Culture Task Force, started in 2018, will continue with a focus on specific strategies to increase teacher engagement.

Person Responsible	Melissa Robery (melissasr@leeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If we can maximize instructional time for students, student achievement scores will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2019-2020 school year, there were 155 referrals for tardiness. During the 2020-2021 school year, the percentage of referrals for tardiness will decrease by 33%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karen Prentice (karensb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

1) Monthly professional development related to the support of classroom management and student engagement with be offered to teachers. If students want to be in class, there will be fewer tardies.
2) A school behavior plan will be used that clarifies the steps to document tardies to school and class.
3) Student recognition activities will be scheduled to recognize and reward students who are on time to class.
4) Capturing Kids' Hearts 2 training will take place during SINI days. Strategies will be instituted to support teacher-student relationships and increased student engagement to promote and support improved student behavior and attendance.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	64% of our 9th and 10th grade students did not meet proficiency levels in ELA in the 2018-2019 school year. 71% of our incoming 9th graders are below proficiency in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020-2021 school year, the learning gains for students in ELA will increase from 40% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karen Prentice (karensb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ELCHS teachers utilize the following highly effective instructional strategies: distributed summarizing, numbered heads/collaborative pairs, text-dependent questioning, and vocabulary instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A common instructional framework helps teachers reinforce the same ideas, use similar vocabulary, know how to link prior knowledge to current concepts, and create common assessments (Learning-Focused. (2018) Leading with an instructional framework. Boone, NC: Author.)

Action Steps to Implement

1) PLC facilitators will guide PLCs and support standards-based instruction.
2) After school tutoring will be offered to support students in need of academic support.
3) L25 students will be identified by teachers to ensure awareness of students' specific academic needs and better plan and instruct lessons that support their needs.
4) High yield instructional practices will be focused on and embedded into the school's instructional model.
5) PLCs will have common planning time and will be product driven.
6) Teachers in all content areas will observe each other to learn how others utilize strategies for classroom management and implement high yield instructional strategies.
7) USA Test Prep resources will be utilized to provide differentiated support to meet individual student needs.
8) Monthly professional development will be offered for teachers based on teacher and student needs.

Person Responsible   Karen Prentice (karensb@leeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	66% of our Algebra I and Geometry students did not meet proficiency levels in math during the 2018-2019 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020-2021 school year, the learning gains for students in math will increase from 39% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristin Stevens (kristins@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ELCHS teachers utilize the following highly effective instructional strategies: distributed summarizing, numbered heads/collaborative pairs, text-dependent questioning, and vocabulary instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A common instructional framework helps teachers reinforce the same ideas, use similar vocabulary, know how to link prior knowledge to current concepts, and create common assessments (Learning-Focused. (2018) Leading with an instructional framework. Boone, NC: Author.)

Action Steps to Implement

1) PLC facilitators will guide PLCs and support standards-based instruction.
2) After school tutoring will be offered to support students in need of academic support.
3) L25 students will be identified by teachers to ensure awareness of students' specific academic needs and better plan and instruct lessons that support their needs.
4) High yield instructional practices will be focused on and embedded into the school's instructional model.
5) PLCs will have common planning time and will be product driven.
6) Teachers in all content areas will observe each other to learn how others utilize strategies for classroom management and implement high yield instructional strategies.
7) USA Test Prep resources will be utilized to provide differentiated support to meet individual student needs.
8) Monthly professional development will be offered for teachers based on teacher and student needs.

Person Responsible Kristin Stevens (kristins@leeschools.net)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2018-2019 Biology proficiency level is 4% below the district average.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020-2021 school year, students will increase in proficiency in Biology by a total of 8%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ellen Green (ellenrg@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ELCHS teachers utilize the following highly effective instructional strategies: distributed summarizing, numbered heads/collaborative pairs, text-dependent questioning, and vocabulary instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A common instructional framework helps teachers reinforce the same ideas, use similar vocabulary, know how to link prior knowledge to current concepts, and create common assessments (Learning-Focused. (2018) Leading with an instructional framework. Boone, NC: Author.)

Action Steps to Implement

1) PLC facilitators will guide PLCs and support standards-based instruction.
2) After school tutoring will be offered to support students in need of academic support.
3) High yield instructional practices will be focused on and embedded into the school's instructional model.
4) PLCs will have common planning time and will be product driven.
5) Teachers in all content areas will observe each other to learn how others utilize strategies for classroom management and implement high yield instructional strategies.
6) USA Test Prep resources will be utilized to provide differentiated support to meet individual student needs.
8) Monthly professional development will be offered for teachers based on teacher and student needs.

Person Responsible	Ellen Green (ellenrg@leeschools.net)

#7. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2018-2019 the US History proficiency level was 9% below the district average.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020-2021 school year, students will increase in proficiency in US History by a total of 8%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ellen Green (ellenrg@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ELCHS teachers utilize the following highly effective instructional strategies: distributed summarizing, numbered heads/collaborative pairs, text-dependent questioning, and vocabulary instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A common instructional framework helps teachers reinforce the same ideas, use similar vocabulary, know how to link prior knowledge to current concepts, and create common assessments (Learning-Focused. (2018) Leading with an instructional framework. Boone, NC: Author.)

Action Steps to Implement

1) PLC facilitators will guide PLCs and support standards-based instruction.
2) After school tutoring will be offered to support students in need of academic support.
3) High yield instructional practices will be focused on and embedded into the school's instructional model.
4) PLCs will have common planning time and will be product driven.
5) Teachers in all content areas will observe each other to learn how others utilize strategies for classroom management and implement high yield instructional strategies.
6) USA Test Prep resources will be utilized to provide differentiated support to meet individual student needs.
8) Monthly professional development will be offered for teachers based on teacher and student needs.

Person Responsible	Ellen Green (ellenrg@leeschools.net)

#8. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students will be better prepared for college and/or a career upon graduation.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020-2021 school year, at least 90% of all seniors will have an opportunity to earn an industry certification, Dual Enrollment credit, or AICE or AP credit.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karen Prentice (karensb@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

1) A tracking system will be used to document student acceleration opportunities. School counselors and administrators will monitor the system and student conferences will be scheduled to determine the most appropriate acceleration option for each individual student.
2) A College and Career lab, staffed by a full-time educator, will be available to all staff and students to support college and career planning, the completion of scholarship and state/federal assistance applications, and the facilitation of quarterly college and career field trip opportunities that expose students to post-secondary opportunities.
3) Seniors will be enrolled in an AICE General Paper course to improve writing skills and raise expectations for students in English Language Arts.
4) The existing career and technical education (CTE) programs will be enhanced to provide additional career experiences and industry certification opportunities.
5) The Introduction to Teaching program will be added to the CTE program offerings for the 20-21 school year.

Person Responsible   Karen Prentice (karensb@leeschools.net)

#9. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged students will be areas of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY19.
Measurable Outcome:	All ESSA subgroup performance data will increase to 42% in FY21.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Robery (melissasr@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring data in all areas will be used to drive instructional decisions during PLCs to increase supports for ELL, SWD, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged students at East Lee County High School. Social Emotional learning opportunities will be utilized to increase social emotional wellness among our student body.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data driven decision making has been proven to be an effective strategy for increasing student achievement. PLCs teams can make stronger connections with students to increase attendance and decrease discipline, which will improve student achievement. It is also important to focus on social and emotional wellness for our student body to increase their ability to focus on learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data driven PLCs to drive instruction
2. Analysis of discipline and attendance data during PLCs to increase supports
3. Provide social and emotional wellness learning opportunities to increase ability to focus on learning

Person Responsible	Melissa Robery (melissasr@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team will continue to monitor and create systems to positively impact all areas of the school improvement.

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.

The School District of Lee County is working toward certification of Marzano's High Reliability levels which is intended to produce a system that has high reliability and becomes transformational in its approach to educating its students. When a school has met the criterion indicators for a specific level in the model, it consistently monitors those indicators and makes immediate corrections when school performance falls below acceptable levels. The first level of school effectiveness is a Safe and Orderly Environment that Supports Cooperation and Collaboration. Our school is currently working through PLCs in leadership to bring forward the knowledge at the school level to begin our study of the leading indicators: (1) The faculty and staff perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (2) Students, parents, and the community perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (3) Teachers have formal roles in the decision-making process regarding school initiatives. (4) Teacher teams and collaborative groups regularly interact to address common issues regarding curriculum, assessment, instruction, and the achievement of all students (5) Teachers and staff have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (6) Students, parents, and community have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (7) The success of the whole school, as well as individuals within the school, is appropriately acknowledged (8) The fiscal, operational, and technological resources of the school are managed in a way that directly supports teachers. As this knowledge is put into action, our school will work with teachers, students, parents, and community members to engage in and study the indicators to ensure that the school culture is inclusive and positive.

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: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Teacher Attendance	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	$0.00

8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education	$0.00
9	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00