

The School District of Lee County

Lehigh 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	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Lehigh Senior High School

901 GUNNERY RD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

<http://lsh.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Darya Grote

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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

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	23

Lehigh Senior High School

901 GUNNERY RD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

<http://lsh.leeschools.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">86%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">85%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

Mission: To improve teaching and increase student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: To be a World Class High School.

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
Corey, Jackie	Principal	As principal of the school, Mrs. Corey is responsible for the general oversight of everything on campus and is a strong presence in all aspect of our school culture. She ensures that all teachers are hired for heart and care about our students and their success. She ensures that all students have the ability to be successful based on their education. Her main role is to ensure that direction, instruction and guidance is provided to achieve our goals and develops strategies and systems to achieve this success.
Chiorello, Cyndi	Assistant Principal	Monitors Lessons plans, grading, and evaluations of the English and Reading Departments Supports: Cambridge, Dual Enrollment and AP Programs, completes master schedule, course registrations, scheduling and academic concerns, textbook adoptions, graduation and senior awards. Guidance Department/Academic Advising Administrator
Krevinko, Timothy	Assistant Principal	Monitors Lessons plans, grading, and evaluations of the Science, History and JROTC Departments Supports: Custodial Staff, Media Center, Building/Facilities, Safety Drills, Critical Research and the new construction program
Szafran, Amy	Assistant Principal	Monitors Lessons plans, grading, and evaluations of the Math, History, Center for the Arts and AVID Departments Supports: Guidance, Testing, Center for the Performing Arts, Professional Development, APPLES teachers and the School Improvement Plan
Young, Veronica	Assistant Principal	Supports Behavior, interventions and student services.
Farrell, Liam	Assistant Principal	Supports Behavior, interventions and student services.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, Darya Grote

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.*

1

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

117

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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	549	709	535	531	2324
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	59	68	53	227
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	94	99	61	293
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	52	17	8	78
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	44	37	53	137
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	169	129	119	564
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	168	76	179	554

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	114	175	113	139	541

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	1	0	0	4	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	9	9	42

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	0	598	598	610	457	2263
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	89	126	109	425
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156	190	95	135	576
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	114	132	28	395
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223	260	197	66	746

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	179	195	156	83	613

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	15	15
Students retained two or more times	0	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	598	598	610	457	2263
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	89	126	109	425
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156	190	95	135	576
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	114	132	28	395
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223	260	197	66	746

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	179	195	156	83	613

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	15	15
Students retained two or more times	0	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	48%	55%	56%	49%	53%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	49%	51%	41%	45%	49%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	37%	42%	25%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	39%	50%	51%	40%	41%	49%
Math Learning Gains	38%	45%	48%	34%	34%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	43%	45%	32%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	48%	62%	68%	75%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	61%	67%	73%	55%	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	46%	51%	-5%	55%	-9%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	47%	48%	-1%	53%	-6%
	2018	50%	50%	0%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	47%	56%	-9%	67%	-20%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	88%	61%	27%	65%	23%
Compare		-41%			
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	60%	64%	-4%	70%	-10%
2018	58%	62%	-4%	68%	-10%
Compare		2%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	39%	59%	-20%	61%	-22%
2018	38%	60%	-22%	62%	-24%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	37%	50%	-13%	57%	-20%
2018	42%	53%	-11%	56%	-14%
Compare		-5%			

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	18	29	22	15	34	31	22	27		87	15
ELL	7	30	31	17	42	44	23	24		69	21
ASN	68	37		75			64				
BLK	41	43	31	36	38	46	41	57		93	37
HSP	49	48	33	37	37	37	46	58		90	48
MUL	70	55		40	21		57	69			
WHT	60	50	40	49	40	50	66	79		92	70
FRL	42	42	32	33	36	41	40	51		91	46

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	16	30	28	15	20	21	64	25		56	14
ELL	13	43	41	20	31	29		13		64	41
ASN	84	75									
BLK	45	48	38	38	31	36	87	47		88	38
HSP	49	51	38	41	36	28	92	63		86	52
MUL	63	61		47	54						
WHT	66	50	36	49	23	19	91	77		83	62
FRL	48	49	37	40	33	29	89	56		85	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	10	15	14	19	32	31	53	25		58	14
ELL	8	29	28	23	27	26		20		72	35
ASN	79	57		60	40						
BLK	39	36	24	35	34	38	67	41		88	43
HSP	50	42	28	39	33	30	71	55		86	45
MUL	61	41		46	27		91				
WHT	61	46	21	50	40	29	90	75		89	58
FRL	43	38	25	35	32	30	75	50		85	41

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	49
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	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
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	32
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	61
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	45
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	49
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	52
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	60
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	46
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.

According to the 3rd quarter data, Math Bottom 25% Learning Gains (mainly Algebra 1) is our lowest performing component. This data is a trend for this school year, as well as the 18-19 school year data. This year, we have increased the number of students sitting in Algebra 1 (tested) class so the number of B25 students has increased in the tested area.

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

The Bottom 25% of math students Learning gains is also currently, the largest decline from the previous year. Due to the removal of Liberal Arts math class, all students are placed into Algebra 1, increasing the denominator of B25 students but not necessarily increasing the numerator.

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.

We have a large gap in performance of LY & LF students. We are consistently receiving LY students and struggle to get them on track for graduation and test performance when they enter high school already behind and with a language barrier. We have worked to incorporate more ESOL training and practices for all teachers and being creative with the scheduling of our incoming LY students where able.

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

Our US History data is very promising and showing a lot of improvement in comparison to last year. Our US History data for 3rd quarter, shows that our students are already at 68% proficient which is an increase of 20% points from last years EOC data. With that in mind, it is very promising that our data will continue to improve with the remaining time for instruction from the end of 3rd quarter til EOC time. Our teachers have embraced and incorporated many Reading strategies in their content area which has really helped to improve their performance as well as working with the World History team to scaffold back to ensure that they are hitting the same reading strategies and instruction to assist this year for next year.

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

Increase number of SWD students and Mobility Rate

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

1. increase Parent Involvement
2. Increase Math Performance
3. Increase LY and LF Performance
4. Increase Graduation Rate

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Attendance in class is one of the highest indicators of performance and ability.

Measurable Outcome: For the 2020-2021, 85% of students (1,976 of 2,324 students) will maintain an attendance rate higher than 90% as measured by daily attendance records by May 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Veronica Young (veronicayo@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Sound and reasonable attendance policies will be implemented in order to foster self-discipline in students while building a positive school climate and community. Students will have the ability to see their attendance in Castle and focus on a daily basis and positive trends will be celebrated with students that have had high absences in the past.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students will know in advance the expectations that are set forth for them. They will be supported along the way and build relationships with those around them to ensure that they are on the right track.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Attendance monitored by teachers, counselors and social worker
2. Students with 3 or more absences in a class will be contacted first by teacher, then counselor and finally by social worker
3. Students with more than 9 absences will lose credit for class but will have the ability to earn the credit back by completing an attendance contract

Person Responsible: Veronica Young (veronicayo@leeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: For the 2019-2020 school year, we had 75% of students (1687 of 2263 students) have a clean discipline history with no suspensions of any type, In school or out of school.

Measurable Outcome: For the 2020-2021 school year, we will maintain or increase our students receiving no suspensions of any type at 75% (1743 of 2324 students) as measured by Castle data by May 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Liam Farrell (liamcf@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Interventions will take place both inside and outside of the classroom to support students and teachers to ensure that both students learn the necessary social and emotional skills to be beneficial to them upon leaving high school. Behavior Improvement plans will be developed for each student that reaches 5 or more referrals for minor infractions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: A behavior intervention plan (BIP) is a plan that's designed to teach and reward positive behaviors. This can help prevent or stop problem behaviors in school and improve in an area of need, in this case behavior.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Training will be held for teachers during pre-school week on ways to implement intervention strategies in the classroom.
2. Intervention/Culture PLC will meet monthly to discuss concerns in the classrooms and how to assist
3. Student Services Administrators and Deans will meet with students that are close to being suspended for minor infractions
4. Behavior Specialist will develop a BIP for the students that are at 5 or more referrals

Person Responsible Liam Farrell (liamcf@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: For the 2018-2019 school year, we had 39% of students (360 of 923 students) performing proficient or above on the Algebra and Geometry EOCs.

Measurable Outcome: For the 2020-2021 school year, we will increase our students performing proficient or above on the Algebra and Geometry EOCs to 42% of students as measured by the Algebra 1 and Geometry EOCs in May of 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Szafran (amysz@leeschools.net)

- Evidence-based Strategy:**
- Kagan structures
 - AVID strategies
 - Strong PLC's
 - Common planning
 - Common lessons
 - Common assessment
 - Data tracking by teachers and students
 - Flipped classrooms
 - Reading strategies through Brockton Model of Active Reading Open Response
 - Increased conceptual learning
 - Provide additional support for teachers
 - Learning stations in low level classrooms

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data will be collected and monitored quarterly from quarterly progress monitoring data collected by STAR Assessments. Teacher data will be shared and discussed in common PLC time and adjustments to curriculum will be made as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly PLCs
2. Optional Trainings to support implementation
3. Weekly Data chats with students

Person Responsible: Amy Szafran (amysz@leeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: For the 2018-2019 school year, we had 48% of students (571 of 1189 students) performing proficient or above on the FSA ELA Assessment.

Measurable Outcome: For the 2020-2021 school year, we will increase our students performing proficient or above on the ELA FSA Assessment to 51% of students as measured by the FSA ELA Assessment in May of 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cyndi Chiorello (cyndiac@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Strategically place teachers with increased experience and a history of higher performance in 9th and 10th grade English and Reading classes as well as provide additional coaching support to all teachers. School wide implementation of the Brockton Active Reading and Response Model with literacy coaching and common planning.

FY18 ELA FSA Overall learning gains increases by 10% from 41%-51% Common planning and PLC work down between the 9th and 10th grade reading and English teachers. Monitoring student performance on ELA standards using common google forms to drill down and spiral content

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data will be collected and monitored quarterly from quarterly progress monitoring data collected by STAR Assessments. Teacher data will be shared and discussed in common PLC time and adjustments to curriculum will be made as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Weekly PLCs
- 2. Optional Trainings to support implementation
- 3. Weekly Data chats with students

Person Responsible Cyndi Chiorello (cyndiac@leeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: For the 2018-2019 school year, we had 40% of students (257 of 643 students) performing proficient or above on the Biology EOC.

Measurable Outcome: For the 2020-2021 school year, we will increase our students performing proficient or above on the Biology EOCs to 43% of students as measured by the Biology EOC in May of 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Timothy Krevinko (timothyek@leeschools.net)

- Evidence-based Strategy:**
- * Kagan structures
 - AVID strategies
 - Strong PLC's
 - Common planning
 - Common lessons
 - Common assessment
 - Data tracking by teachers and students
 - Flipped classrooms
 - Reading strategies through Brockton Model of Active Reading Open Response
 - Increased conceptual learning
 - Provide additional support for teachers
 - Learning stations in low level classrooms

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data will be collected and monitored quarterly from quarterly progress monitoring data collected by STAR Assessments. Teacher data will be shared and discussed in common PLC time and adjustments to curriculum will be made as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly PLCs
2. Optional Trainings to support implementation
3. Weekly Data chats with students

Person Responsible: Timothy Krevinko (timothyek@leeschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with Disabilities and English Language Learner 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: Jackie Corey (jackielc@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring data in all areas will be used to drive instructional decisions during PLCs to increase supports SWD and ELL students at Lehigh Senior 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 Jackie Corey (jackielc@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Remaining school improvement priorities including the safety and security of students will be addressed through many different aspects during the year.

The implementation of a single entry point will assist in ensuring that no one is on campus without approval.

Monthly lock down drills for students and teachers to practice what to do in an emergency situation.

Teacher clock in and clock out protocol so we are able to monitor who is on campus in the instance of an actual lock down, to ensure that we have an accurate count of bodies on campus.

Project stop the bleed training, provided by our SROs to all departments on campus.

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: Discipline	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00