Lakeland Senior High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lakeland Senior High School

726 HOLLINGSWORTH RD, Lakeland, FL 33801

http://www.lakelandhighschool.com/

Demographics

Principal: Arthur Martinez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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

Lakeland Senior High School

726 HOLLINGSWORTH RD, Lakeland, FL 33801

http://www.lakelandhighschool.com/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	67%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Martinez, Art	Principal	
McKown, Lori	Assistant Principal	
Marbra, Orienthial	Assistant Principal	
Westberry, Gary	Assistant Principal	
LeVine, Kevin	Principal	
Teague, Nada	Reading Coach	
Jeske, Shellie	Administrative Support	
Wilt, Shelly	Teacher, ESE	
Goodson, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	
Campbell, Tyler	Teacher, K-12	
Craig, Deborah	Teacher, K-12	
Pierce, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	
Sampson, Brittany	Teacher, K-12	
Gaynair, Bruce	Graduation Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/15/2021, 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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

119

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,931

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/29/2021

2020-21 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	

2020-21 - 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	548	513	444	10	1515
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	102	103	9	349
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	42	36	0	178
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	24	74	10	192
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176	122	105	2	405
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	

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	239	179	140	6	564

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	7	16	9	3	35

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				60%	47%	56%	58%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	46%	51%	50%	47%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	37%	42%	38%	39%	44%
Math Achievement				52%	43%	51%	52%	44%	51%
Math Learning Gains				55%	45%	48%	41%	42%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	44%	45%	36%	38%	45%
Science Achievement				78%	58%	68%	72%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				78%	61%	73%	73%	63%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	61%	45%	16%	55%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	58%	42%	16%	53%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

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
2021					
2019	76%	54%	22%	67%	9%

CIVICS EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

HISTORY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	77%	57%	20%	70%	7%

ALGEBRA EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	36%	50%	-14%	61%	-25%

GEOMETRY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	62%	53%	9%	57%	5%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

For English Language Arts proficiency, Lakeland High School administered STAR Reading to all grade levels. District Quarterly assessments were used to estimate proficiency in Mathematics (Algebra 1A, Algebra 1B, Algebra 1, and Geometry), Biology, and Us History. Not all grade levels were enrolled in all of these courses.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54	55	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	39	37
	Students With Disabilities	21	20	17
	English Language Learners	4	11	15
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	47	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	34	28
	Students With Disabilities	7	15	19
	English Language Learners	17	22	22
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	85	82	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	77	34	53
	Students With Disabilities	73	14	22
	English Language Learners	87	54	54
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13	29	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	10	19
	Students With Disabilities	12	10	10
	English Language Learners	6	12	11
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41	33	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	30	31
	Students With Disabilities	41	33	32
	English Language Learners	51	36	29
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	85	82	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	77	34	53
	Students With Disabilities	73	14	22
	English Language Learners	87	54	54
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61	62	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	52	52
	Students With Disabilities	38	48	47
	English Language Learners	63	64	60

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27	19	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	17	25
	Students With Disabilities	26	17	25
	English Language Learners	10	9	11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	57	61	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	55	56
	Students With Disabilities	30	33	31
	English Language Learners	57	61	61
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	85	82	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	77	34	53
	Students With Disabilities	73	14	22
	English Language Learners	87	54	54
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	61	62	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	52	52
	Students With Disabilities	38	48	47
	English Language Learners	63	64	60

Grade 12					
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students	25	26	29	
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	27	27	
	Students With Disabilities	11	17	17	
	English Language Learners	10	12	15	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A	
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	17	28	21	13	20	30	31	41		86	19
ELL	16	43	41	15	21		35	48		88	46
ASN	67	69								100	80
BLK	26	30	22	16	20	28	47	53		91	39
HSP	41	45	30	23	22	14	61	58		91	59

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	60	43		29	10		75	86		92	82
WHT	71	55	36	43	24	23	78	81		94	78
FRL	36	36	22	17	19	16	53	58		87	51

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			25
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
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	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	541
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	93%
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%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	79
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The 2018-2019 data indicates that overall students performed better on the FSA and EOCs than in the prior year. The only school grade component to fall was ELA Lowest 25th% percentile (-4%). Every other school grade component improved or remained the same (ELA Achievement = +2%, ELA Learning Gains = 3%, Math Achievement = 0%, Math Learning Gains = +14%, Math Lowest 25%= +15%, Science = +11%, Social Studies = +5%). Most grade levels and student subgroups mirrored the overall trends. All subgroups (except two) declined in ELA Achievement and ELA Learning Gains. All but one subgroup improved in mathematics achievement and science. In general, the trends for the 2018-2019 school year data indicate learning growth in most areas.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

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. The student subgroups which performed the worst in this category were ESE or ELL students (the only two subgroups below the 41% threshold for the ESSA Federal Index). While all subgroups need attention in the areas of ELA achievement, ELA learning gains, and lowest 25%, the ESE or ELL students would benefit the most from learning in these areas.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The students identified as the lowest 25% typically have the lowest attendance rates and grades, and this was the case in the 2020-2021 school year. In addition, the student subgroup which performed the worst in this category were ESE or ELL students. Lakeland High School would benefit from creating targeted interventions for these students. More specifically, the literacy coach and ESE teachers/ELL teachers would create small group pull out sessions for those students in these subgroups underperforming. In addition, the attendance manager would need to work with social worker, guidance counselors and teachers to target those students with chronic attendance issues at the beginning of the school year. ESE and the ELL teachers could also work on building relationships to encourage struggling students to attend school regularly and perform better in the classroom.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math learning gains showed the greatest improvement. 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). However, the overall Algebra EOC performance continues to lag behind both the state (-25%) and the district (-14%) despite the math learning gains. The Geometry EOC performance made-up the difference to allow overall math proficiency to remain the same year-to-year.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The school leveraged ESE teachers to assist in both Algebra and Geometry. The ESE teachers assigned only focused on supporting students in these content areas. This allowed them to become content experts. 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%. The interventions included small group instruction as well as pull out for those students with significant learning gaps.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The gains that were made with ESE and ELL students in math learning gains should be implemented within the ELA classrooms. ELA teachers should be aligned with students based on past FSA ELA performance and teaching experience with these student subgroups. In addition, the ESE teachers should also become content experts and improve their professional practices to aid students struggling with Reading and Writing performance. ELL students will also need be stretched. Those LEP students

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers, support personnel and administration will be provided professional development in ESOL and ESE strategies during teacher work days and faculty meetings to target these subgroups. In addition, the faculty and staff at Lakeland High School will receive further training in how to identify students in the lowest 25% and how to track learning gains made over the course of the year for all students subgroups.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The school leadership team will collectively meet and monitor student performance over the course of the school year. Adjustments and additional interventions will be made based on available data and feedback from the faculty. This may lead to additional professional development opportunities or the identification of other barriers to overcome.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	English Language Arts Learning Gains for the Lowest 25th Percentile: Lakeland Senior High School has 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.
Monitoring:	The Reading Coach and Testing Coordinator will work together jointly to bring relevant progress monitoring data to the school's leadership team at least twice per quarter to track those students in the lowest 25%. Performance matters will track writing progress monitoring as well as STAR data. The reading coach will also bring achieve 3000 data to help guide decision-making.
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 in the middle achievement level as well. To crated targeted interventions, stakeholders will need continued professional development as well as the ability to identify targeted students and monitor 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 the necessary adjustments to instructional practices 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	Tyler Campbell (tyler.campbell@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 to address any attendance barriers and to point students to appropriate socioemotional resources that could hinder success in the classroom.

Person Responsible	Bruce Gaynair (bruce.gaynair@polk-fl.net)

Reading strategies implemented in, but not limited to, English, Social Studies, and Science classrooms to promote literacy skills.

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

STAR Reading data and Writing Progress Monitoring will be tracked student progress and to monitor the effectiveness of the action steps.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 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%.
Monitoring:	The testing coordinator and math department chair will use performance matter to track student progress on district tests and quarterly assessments. The data will be brought to the school leadership team at least twice per quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gary Westberry (gary.westberry@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All Algebra 1-A and Algebra 1 teachers will collaboratively design instruction aligning with course standards and instructional outcomes. Although Algebra 1-A is not a tested course, preparation in this course prepares struggling students for success in Algebra 1. Collaborative planning also includes progress monitoring and data analysis by 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. Anecdotal evidence consisting of past classroom observations corroborates this assumption.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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. Only 11% of ELL students demonstrated ELA proficiency on the 9th and 10th grade FSA. 24% of all ELL students reached math proficiency on the Algebra and Geometry End-of-Course assessments. Providing additional supports for this subgroup will increase performance in both Math and English. In the process, learning gains should also improve.
Measurable Outcome:	ELL student achievement in ELA will improve by at least 10# as measured by the 9th and 10th Grade ELA FSA. In addition, math proficiency will improve by 6% in both Algebra and Geometry as measured by the respective end-of-course assessments.
Monitoring:	The testing coordinator and ESOL teacher will work collaboratively to monitor ELL students progress. They will use Performance Matters to assess growth and opportunities for targeted intervention using the data provided by progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lori McKown (lori.mckown@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 for academic language acquisition.

Action Steps to Implement

ELL students will be appropriately scheduled in to English and Reading courses based on testing data and time in the ESOL program.

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

Social Studies teachers will be provided ELL instructional strategies during planning.

Person Responsible	Brittany Sampson (brittany.sampson@polk-fl.net)

Science teachers will be provided LEL instructional strategies and training during 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)

ELL students classified as TIer C will be cohorted in Reading and English classes so that the ESOL para will be able to push into classrooms for assistance.

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

Tier A and B ELL students will be placed in English through ESOL classes with an ESOL teacher for more intensive instruction.

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

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

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

Administration will conduct classroom observations to ensure that ELL instructional strategies developed by the faculty and enacted with fidelity. Additional opportunities for instructional/faculty development also be assessed during these classroom observations.

Person Responsible Art Martinez (arthur.martinez@polk-fl.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Federal Percentage Points of Index indicates that ESE students require additional support since this subgroup underperformed as a whole in the 2018-29 school year. The lowest areas of performance occurred in Mathematics Achievement, ELA Achievement, ELA Learning Gaines 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 the Lowest 25%, and Mathematics Achievement) will increase by at least 5%.
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	ESE teachers will focus on student learning objectives in both ELA and Math instruction to ensure that 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 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. Addressing these barriers 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 assigned caseload of 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 used to identify which test content areas (for example, statistics on the Algebra 1 EOC or circles on the Geometry EOC) each student struggled the most.

Person Responsible	Shellie Jeske (shellie.jeske@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)

ESE teachers will be given adequate time to co-plan with English and Math teachers on a weekly basis. Also ESE teachers will be scheduled to support either English or math (not both) in order to build proficiency in a content area to better assist students.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to Safe Schools for Alex, Lakeland Senior High School's (LHS) school incident rating is in the moderate range. LHS reported 2.8 incidents per 100 students during the 2019-20 school year, which is below the statewide average of 3.3 incidents reported per 100 students. Overall, LHS is ranked 236 out of 505 High Schools in the state of Florida as it pertains to this data. Further, the data is broken down into the four categories of: violent incidents, property incidents, drug/public order incidents, and reported suspensions. Out of these four categories, LHS is considered in the high range for both violent incidents and reported suspensions. LHS reported 1.38 violent incidents per 100 students, leaving a statewide ranking of 347 out of 505, and had an average of 20.7 suspensions per 100 students, which is ranked at 389 of 505. With these numbers being comparatively high, it brings to attention that at LHS during the 2021-22 school year there will be an emphasis throughout the campus on these two areas to decrease the incidents and suspensions.

Majority of the incidents reported that fell under the violent incident category at LHS were students receiving discipline for fighting. To prevent these numbers from rising this upcoming school year, LHS will be intentional with addressing this concern with both students and staff members. All students at LHS will participate in anti-bullying lessons. Students will also be welcomed to come into the discipline office and fill out an incident report regarding concerns about students and altercations. When these concerns are brought forth preventatively by students, it will be addressed by the administration with a conflict resolution meeting which will bring together all students involved in the report, then will include communication with teachers and staff regarding the matter, and communication with both parent(s) and/or guardian(s). A conflict resolution meeting will also be held with students after a fight has occurred to ensure there are no recurring incidents. Finally, LHS staff will all be trained on and monitored for having open communication, especially for preventative purposes, with the discipline/administration team; LHS staff will be asked to call and/or email the discipline/administration team when they hear word of a conflict between students or a possible violent incident arising.

Regarding the suspensions at LHS- the high rating comes from a combination of 162 In-School Suspensions and 274 Out-Of-School Suspensions throughout the 2019-20 school year. For the 2021-22 school year, LHS is implementing a school-wide discipline matrix which follows the Polk County School Code of Conduct to align with progressive discipline steps. The use of this matrix across the entire discipline/administration team allows for additional discipline steps to be in place prior to the consequence of suspending students; these additional steps include but are not limited to work detail, detention, and teacher managed behaviors. Additionally, all teachers will be given a copy of this matrix, so they are familiar with the progressive discipline steps. All the discipline/administration team will be utilizing the same matrix in a collaborative manner which will allow for schoolwide discipline to be progressive.

In order to monitor the decrease of the violent incidents and suspensions at LHS, discipline data will be pulled on both a monthly and quarterly basis. This data will be analyzed by the discipline/ administration team on at least a monthly basis and discussion will be had surrounding the current data and comparing it to the data from the 2019-20 school year. The discipline/ administration team will also discuss the progress of current strategies in place to encourage a decrease in the data within the violent incidents and suspension categories and adjustments will be agreed upon by the team as needed and communicated to the staff.

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.

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

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Art Martinez, Principal – Principal has the task of setting the mission and vision for the school year. As the top administrator at the school site, it is the principal's task to create and nurture a staff community that is goal-focused, positive, and supportive. Principal must establish a culture of trust between administrative team and the instructional support staff.

Administrative team members – The administrative team must embrace the mission and vision of the principal and therefore, promote the mission and vision and engage staff with that in mind. The administrative team is an extension of the principal and must also endeavor to create a positive, supportive, and trust-worthy relationship with instructional staff. These members work directly with teachers and must maintain a balance of understanding staff levels of experience and needs, as well as maintaining their authority as the leadership team at the school.

Reading Coach/Academic Coach – The Reading Coach at LHS extends beyond the reading department. This coach interacts not only with the reading department, but with all new teachers as well as teachers new to the school. It is the responsibility of the reaching coach to provide support for teachers. This support includes conversations that are private, mentoring, and being that person who continually encourages, assists with working through concerns, teaching tasks, and challenges -both academic-related as well as job-related stressors. This assistance is not limited to new teachers and teachers new to the school, but rather, extends to all instructional staff on an as-needed basis.

Department Heads – Department heads are liaisons between administration and department members. Department heads are an integral facet of promoting a positive culture and environment at the school as they "lead" their team members through the process of instruction, instructional changes that come from the District, and the team unity of the department. They, too, act as a sounding board within their team, a conduit for questions and concerns to be addressed through them to administration as well as directives coming from administration to the teams. Department heads are the ones who set the mission, vision, and expectations for the department. It is incumbent upon them to unify the department or team to work together as a unit for the best possible student achievement outcomes.

Parents/Guardians – Parents and guardians are essential, perhaps the most essential of the stakeholders. They provide the stability, consistency, structure, nurturing, and guidance on appropriate ways to behave and interact with peers, teachers, coaches, and the community at large. They are responsible for promoting and investing in the well-being and success of their children. Parents and guardians serve as advocates for their children as they matriculate through the school system, from beginning to end. They are the ultimate support for their children as they meet all needs: Social-emotional, dietary, disciplinary, celebratory, financial, as well as the installation of the moral code and belief systems.