Lake Placid High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Placid High School

202 GREEN DRAGON DR, Lake Placid, FL 33852

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~lph/

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Tunning M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%)
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 Highlands 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

Lake Placid High School

202 GREEN DRAGON DR, Lake Placid, FL 33852

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~lph/

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 PK, 9-12	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Highlands 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.

Recognizing that education is a major component in preparing students to become productive members in a diverse society, the staff at Lake Placid High School, in cooperation with our stakeholders, is committed to providing an educational setting focused on "Empowering the Leaders of Tomorrow."

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Empowering the Leaders of Tomorrow"

Lake Placid High School's vision statement is supported by its core beliefs.
We Believe that
• All students can learn
• All people have value and can add value
• Embracing diversity strengthens communities
• Family is the first and most powerful influence on a persons life
• Individuals are responsible for their choices and actions
• Honesty and integrity are vital
• Lifelong learning is essential for individuals and communities to flourish

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
Tunning, Kevin	Principal	
Rapp, Holly	Assistant Principal	
Irwin, David	Other	
Grizzell, Katherine	Teacher, K-12	
Sohn, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Ramirez, Jose	Teacher, K-12	
Elliott, Sharla	Teacher, K-12	
Peeples, Vann	Math Coach	
Corley, Jennifer	Reading Coach	
Rich, Kelsey	Teacher, K-12	
Shattler, Starla	Teacher, K-12	
Morgan, Scott	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Kevin Tunning M

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

820

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

5

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

10

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	284	186	187	170	827
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	72	59	64	261
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	32	24	17	112
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	38	29	19	163
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	49	38	24	167
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	47	41	27	193
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	41	34	18	168
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	125	69	82	41	317

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	33	15	4	0	52
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5	5	1	29

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/12/2021

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	243	168	180	172	763
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	27	43	31	144
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	40	26	18	145
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	36	50	46	227
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	53	57	25	261
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	38	55	24	191
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	25	30	14	127

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	110	53	59	37	259

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	25	9	7	2	43
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5	6	8	35

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	243	168	180	172	763
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	27	43	31	144
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	40	26	18	145
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	36	50	46	227
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	53	57	25	261
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	38	55	24	191
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	25	30	14	127

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	110	53	59	37	259

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	25	9	7	2	43
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5	6	8	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				43%	44%	56%	41%	43%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	46%	51%	45%	47%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	35%	42%	36%	34%	44%
Math Achievement				43%	45%	51%	48%	47%	51%
Math Learning Gains				49%	44%	48%	48%	44%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	44%	45%	43%	41%	45%
Science Achievement				63%	56%	68%	58%	55%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				73%	65%	73%	67%	65%	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	45%	46%	-1%	55%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	41%	43%	-2%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

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	61%	54%	7%	67%	-6%
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	75%	63%	12%	70%	5%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	29%	52%	-23%	61%	-32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	55%	5%	57%	3%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Common Lit for ELA grades 9-12
iReady for Algebra grades 9-12 (No progress monitoring for Geometry grades 9-12)
SBHC baseline for Biology grades 9-12 (No baseline 3 data)
SBHC baseline for US History grades 9-12 (No baseline 1 or 3 data)

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	157/35%	172/37%	180/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	21/14%	25/8%	25/32%
	English Language Learners	4/0%	4/0%	8/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	129/18%	127/13%	124/19%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	20/5%	22/0%	17/0%
	English Language Learners	6/33%	7/14%	8/13%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46/0%	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/0%	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	0/0%	N/A	N/A
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	1/0%	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	1/0%	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	149/36%	165/59%	180/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	/%	/%	/%
	Students With Disabilities	23/17%	23/48%	25/44%
	English Language Learners	5/0%	4/0%	6/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	71/15%	74/16%	73/10%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	15/13%	16/2%	16/13%
	English Language Learners	5/0%	5/20%	4/0%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	115/0%	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	18/0%	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	5/0%	N/A	N/A
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	6/0%	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 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	114/53%	123/45%	134/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	20/35%	22/27%	21/38%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/0%	2/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	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
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	3/0%	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged		N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	1/0%	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	N/A	89/0%	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	14/0%	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	1/0%	N/A

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	112/15%	113/10%	125/9%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	11/9%	15/7%	15/7%
	English Language Learners	3/0%	2/0%	2/0%
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	20	21	20	21	22	20	17			83	20
ELL	20	36		36							
BLK	14	37	29	16	30	36	21			83	10
HSP	34	47	41	36	41	41	52	55		90	55
MUL										60	

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
WHT	43	47	36	42	38	28	51	64		89	54
FRL	29	44	37	30	35	28	40	55		85	46
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	23	31	14	29			33	40		67	6
ELL											
BLK	22	37	27	16			36	46		67	29
HSP	40	40	37	46	53		62	68		85	47
WHT	49	51	43	46	55	47	68	84		76	49
FRL	35	43	35	41	47	62	55	65		79	41
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	11	34	35	28	54		21	18		32	
ELL	6	18	17								
BLK	13	41	50	32	31		40	35		69	17
HSP	37	40	32	45	44	39	51	73		76	43
WHT	49	52	32	55	55	55	67	70		79	36
FRL	34	44	38	45	48	44	49	66		71	37

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	31
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	510
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
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	47
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	49
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	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

9th grade ELA is inconsistent, math is concerning.
10th grade ELA is stagnant/stable, math is concerning.
ELA and MATH subgroups are underperforming except SWD which shows growth in both areas.

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

Algebra 1 and 9th grade ELA need improving. SWD in ELA and African American in math are subgroups of concern.

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

Algebra 1 had a first time algebra instructor new to LPHS. PLC meetings and diversifying algebra instruction among three teachers will help improve this area. We have had little consistency with teachers teaching 9th grade ELA. PLC meetings and diversifying instruction among six ELA teachers may help with improving scores.

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

10th grade ELA

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

We had strong instructional personnel and teachers who use their progress monitoring data to adjust instruction.

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

PLC and daily use of AVID strategies

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.

AVID professional developments will be offered throughout the year. We will focus on engagement and continued support from admin and coaches with PLC. IPG feedback will be utilized as well.

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

Continuing PLC work and IPG walks

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Algebra 1 EOC showed a decline from 29% to 20%. Students had unfinished learning due to COVID.
Measurable Outcome:	Algebra 1 proficiency will increase from 20% to 41% for 2021-22.
Monitoring:	IPG walk-throughs, PLC common assessments, Stocktake process
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vann Peeples (peeplev@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of AVID strategies such as WICOR to increase student engagement and rigor in the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID, Advancement Via Individual Determination, is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization established in 1980. During the 2017-18 school year, AVID impacted more than 2 million students, providing academic and social support to ensure students' success in high school, college, and careers. AVID is recognized as an effective evidence-based strategy in the nation, Florida, and Highlands County.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use PLC common assessment data to drive instruction for creating lesson plans and remediation.
2. Use PLC common assessment data to drive instruction for creating lesson plans and remediation for African-American students.
3. Follow the MTSS process to monitor student interventions.
4. Analyze three years of data to ensure placement into Algebra 1A or Algebra 1.
5. Lowest performing students placed into a study hall with a certified math teacher.
6. Utilize WICOR strategies on a daily basis to increase student engagement and rigor.

Person Responsible Vann Peeples (peeplev@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA 9th grade FSA showed a decline from 41% to 29%. Students were 21% below the state average.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA 9th grade proficiency will increase from 29% to 41% for 2021-2022. NOTE: Incoming freshmen scored 27% in 2020-2021.
Monitoring:	IPG walk-throughs, PLC common assessments, Stocktake process
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Corley (corleyj@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of AVID strategies such as WICOR to increase student engagement and rigor in the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID, Advancement Via Individual Determination, is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization established in 1980. During the 2017-18 school year, AVID impacted more than 2 million students, providing academic and social support to ensure students' success in high school, college, and careers. AVID is recognized as an effective evidence-based strategy in the nation, Florida, and Highlands County.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use PLC common assessment data to drive instruction for creating lesson plans and remediation.
2. Use PLC common assessment data to drive instruction for creating lesson plans and remediation for Students With Disabilities.
3. Follow the MTSS process to monitor student interventions.
4. Lowest performing students placed into a MTSS study hall with a certified reading teacher.
5. Utilize WICOR strategies on a daily basis to increase student engagement and rigor.

Person Responsible Jennifer Corley (corleyj@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Biology EOC showed a decline from 61% to 47%. Students were 14% below the state average.
Measurable Outcome:	Biology EOC proficiency will increase from 47% to 61% (state avg.) for 2021-2022.
Monitoring:	IPG walk-throughs, PLC common assessments, Stocktake process
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Corley (corleyj@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of AVID strategies such as WICOR to increase student engagement and rigor in the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID, Advancement Via Individual Determination, is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization established in 1980. During the 2017-18 school year, AVID impacted more than 2 million students, providing academic and social support to ensure students' success in high school, college, and careers. AVID is recognized as an effective evidence-based strategy in the nation, Florida, and Highlands County.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use PLC common assessment data to drive instruction for creating lesson plans and remediation.
2. Use 5E Model to plan and deliver instruction daily.
3. Utilize WICOR strategies on a daily basis to increase student engagement and rigor.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Corley (corleyj@highlands.k12.fl.us)

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.

Our current discipline data indicates that we have a school incident ranking that is considered very high compared to schools across the state. After examining the data, we have made the determination that the biggest concern is that as a school district we have a SESIR coding issue. We made the comparisons with other schools within our district and the coding issue is happening districtwide. We have made our district safety coordinator aware of this issue and the district is in the process of addressing this issue. Our district safety coordinator will look into the issue and will be providing further guidance to schools. As a result of the coding issue, we believe our data and school incident ranking does not provide the accurate data to address specific areas of concern at this time. While the statewide reporting data may be inaccurate, as a school, we will continue to monitor our local discipline data and make decisions on behavior based on this data.

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.

To build a positive school culture and environment we celebrate personal achievement, provide consistent discipline, model expected behavior, engage students in shaping the school environment, create rituals and traditions, encourage innovation across the campus, provide quality professional development, maintain a clean and inviting campus, and strive to keep tabs on the school culture and adjust accordingly.

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

All staff celebrate personal achievement of students and staff. Deans and administration provide consistent discipline. All staff model expected behavior. Faculty and administration engage students in shaping the environment. All staff help to create and maintain rituals and traditions. Technology personnel help to encourage innovation across the campus. Staff and administration work to provide quality professional development. Custodial staff work to maintain a clean and inviting campus. Administration and staff strive to keep tabs on the school culture and adjust accordingly.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00