**Charlotte County Public Schools** 

# **Lemon Bay High School**



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# **Table of Contents**

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	22
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

# **Lemon Bay High School**

2201 PLACIDA RD, Englewood, FL 34224

http://lemonbayhigh.com/

# **Demographics**

**Principal: Robert Murphy** 

Start Date for this Principal: 1/1/2014

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)	64%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info	ormation*
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. Fo	or more information, click here.

#### **School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Charlotte 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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

#### 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	13
Planning for Improvement	22
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

# **Lemon Bay High School**

2201 PLACIDA RD, Englewood, FL 34224

http://lemonbayhigh.com/

#### **School Demographics**

School Type and Gi (per MSID I		2020-21 Title I School	l Disadvan	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
High Scho 9-12	ool	No		37%
Primary Servio (per MSID I	• •	Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General E	ducation	No		17%
School Grades Histo	ory			
Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		А	Α	A

#### **School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Charlotte 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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### 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 Lemon Bay High School is to inspire students, teachers, and parents to form a community of learners to promote excellence through a varied curriculum, to provide the tools necessary to foster positive contributions to our society, and instill a commitment to academic and personal achievement.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Enter to Learn. Go Forth to Serve.

#### 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
Bedford, Bob	Principal	-Setting School Vision and academic priorities with input from stakeholders -Co-Chairing of Lemon Bay Leadership Council (Partnership in Performance Council) - Formal and Informal Classroom Observations - Administration Walkthroughs - Master Schedule - PPC - Staffing - Facilities Planning - Budget - SIP Plan - Student Learning Plan - Student Learning Plan - Student Learning Plan - SAC - Capital Outlay - Staff Handbook - Purchasing - Progress Monitoring/Coaching - Discipline Appeals - Awards Program - Senior Awards - Underclass Awards - Keys - NET teachers - Technology - Athletics - Athletics Director - Rules/Regs/Policies - Asst. AD - Calendar - PLC/s - Facilitating the leadership of departments through department chairs - Establishing and maintaining key community stakeholder relationships - Acting as appellate decision-maker in terms of academics, discipline, and athletics - Evaluating English and Math Department instructional staff members and several others
Murphy, Robert	Assistant Principal	-Overseeing Curriculum and Instruction - Technology - Teacher Hardware - Peripherals - Administration - Data - Transportation

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		- PPC - Student Surveys - Guidance - Registration - Parent Conferences - ESE/ESOL Coordinator - Advanced Placement - Post-Secondary Articulation - Textbooks - APC Meetings - Acting as administrative second-in-command in absence of principal - Overseeing Discipline for all students - Grades 9 - 12 - Behavioral Units -ESE - Acting as liaison between Department of Learning at the district office and the school - Coordinating school Fire Drill policies, protocols, and procedures - Coordinating school Crisis Plan and associated policies, protocols, and procedures - Coordinating the implementation of state- and county-mandated curriculum initiatives - Evaluating Science Department instructional staff members, ESE Department instructional staff members and several others
Henry, Michael	Assistant Principal	-Testing & Facilities - EOC - FSA - SAT Day -Technology - Teacher Hardware - Peripherals - Administration - Facilities - LBPAC Sound/Lighting - Inventory - Technology - Music Instruments - Daily Teacher Attendance - SERT - Discipline - Behavioral Unit - ESE - ISS - Evaluating ROTC, Foreign Language, PE and Fine Arts instructional staff members and several others
Smith, Steve	Assistant Principal	-Overseeing Discipline & Activities - Dean Position & ISS Position

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		- Discipline Grades 9-12 - Activities Calendar - Activities SOM - Activities Co-Curriculars (Band/Drama/ROTC) - Activities Field Trips - School Support - Cafe/Free & Reduced - Transportation/Buses & Vans - SAT Team - Attendance - Appeals/ Drivers License - Support PPC - Reporting - Weekly Grades - Progress Reports - Report Cards - Professional Development - SAC Evaluation - PLCs - Evaluating Social Studies Department instructional staff members Acting as liaison with district office in matter of construction, security, and student safety - Coordinating community organization goals and needs with those of the school - Coordinating the implementation of state- and county-mandated curriculum initiatives - Attending and implementing state and county Career and Tech education initiatives, policies, and protocols - Discipline - IND Units - ESE - Grade 12 - Plagiarism

#### **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 1/1/2014, Robert Murphy

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.

2

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.

9

#### Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

#### Total number of students enrolled at the school

1.227

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

2

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

8

**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
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	306	370	303	258	1237
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	97	76	53	273
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	50	24	20	135
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	23	27	74
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	82	58	47	213
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	34	47	26	140
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	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

#### The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	110	48	49	252

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	1	1	0	0	2

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

#### 2020-21 - As Reported

#### The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	305	238	216	232	991
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	48	26	13	20	107
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	26

#### The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator		Grade Level													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
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:

ladianta	Grade Level										Total			
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6
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		
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAT
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	305	238	216	232	991
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	48	26	13	20	107
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	26

# The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator		Grade Level											Total	
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal
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	
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

# Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

#### **School Data 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 Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				65%	62%	56%	61%	62%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	54%	51%	57%	57%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	45%	42%	40%	47%	44%
Math Achievement				65%	64%	51%	64%	67%	51%
Math Learning Gains				53%	56%	48%	52%	59%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	52%	45%	55%	57%	45%
Science Achievement				77%	72%	68%	80%	74%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				76%	80%	73%	73%	80%	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	68%	53%	15%	55%	13%
Cohort Com	nparison					
10	2021					
	2019	61%	52%	9%	53%	8%
Cohort Com	nparison	-68%				

MATH									
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison			

	SCIENCE									
G	Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison			

		BIOLO	GY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	79%	71%	8%	67%	12%
		CIVIC	S EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
		HISTO	RY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	74%	76%	-2%	70%	4%
<u> </u>		ALGEE	RA EOC	<u>'</u>	
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	59%	64%	-5%	61%	-2%
		GEOME	TRY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	70%	62%	8%	57%	13%

# **Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

Clearsight (ELA & Math (Alg/Geo)) Grades 9-12, USATestprep (Biology) Grades 9-10, Certica Navigate (History) Grade 11

		Grade 9		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		106/43%	125/49%
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged		37/40%	33/36%
	Students With Disabilities		2/6%	6/21%
	English Language Learners		0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27/19%	118/53%	100/53%
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	7/13%	41/51%	31/45%
	Students With Disabilities	2/14%	8/38%	2/13%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/50%	1/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	110/52%	165/67%	
Biology	Economically Disadvantaged	29/41%	48/54%	
	Students With Disabilities	5/28%	7/32%	
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

		Grade 10		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		73/35%	100/44%
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged		25/36%	32/43%
	Students With Disabilities		6/32%	4/21%
	English Language Learners		1/50%	1/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3/5%	23/28%	30/35%
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	1/5%	10/36%	7/28%
	Students With Disabilities	2/18%	3/25%	4/33%
	English Language Learners		2/100%	1/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/13%	13/30%	
Biology	Economically Disadvantaged	2/12%	5/26%	
	Students With Disabilities	4/44%	3/33%	
	English Language Learners		1/50%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/50%	3/50%	6/86%
US History	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	1/33%	2/67%
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	0/0%	1/100%	2/100%

		Grade 11		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			0/0%
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3/8%	5/12%	4/10%
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	1/4%	1/4%	2/8%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/6%	1/7%
	English Language Learners		0/0%	1/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/100%	1/100%	
Biology	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	1/100%	1/100%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	78/45%	104/71%	107/74%
US History	Economically Disadvantaged	23/37%	37/64%	37/64%
	Students With Disabilities	7/30%	14/70%	14/61%
	English Language Learners	1/100%	0/0%	1/100%

		Grade 12		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			2/13%
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			2/22%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		4/80%	4/100%
US History	Economically Disadvantaged		1/100%	1/100%
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners		1/50%	1/100%

# **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	25	26	24	19	22	20	31	46		95	45	
BLK				42								
HSP	53	45	18	47	40	31	66	58		91	85	
MUL								50				
WHT	57	51	36	50	33	29	70	76		98	81	

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
FRL	44	38	26	38	32	31	61	59		96	70
		2019	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	34	48	44	45	53		51	55		86	20
ELL	47	78	64	92	60		73				
HSP	57	57	52	67	55	60	76	77		100	75
MUL	76	69		71	64		73				
WHT	67	55	43	65	52	53	78	76		94	60
FRL	60	54	47	61	56	60	73	70		95	52
		2018	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	39	46	40	46	42		65	62		89	29
HSP	68	66		68	58		81	63		100	36
MUL	54	50		60							
WHT	61	57	40	64	52	58	80	76		93	55
FRL	56	54	38	61	53	63	73	65		93	43

# **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	57			
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO			
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target				
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency				
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	573			
Total Components for the Federal Index	10			
Percent Tested	96%			

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
r actific islander students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	N/A
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%  White Students	N/A 58
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
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?

According to the county data, we had a decrease in learning gains for the lowest 25% from 44% in 2019 to 24% in 2021, which could possibly move us into TS&I status.

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

Learning gains for the L25 in ELA which reported out as 46%.

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

Teacher turnover, using unproven teaching strategies and student absenteeism were contributing factors. Training in additional SIM teaching strategies and a better focus on attendance.

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

Lemon Bay showed the most improvement in overall Math L25 moving from 42% in 2018 to 55% in 2019. We are continually looking at Math SIM strategies to enhance the learning needs of our students. We have focused solely on strategies that help students read and comprehend in all subject areas.

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

The use of SIM Strategies such as Unit Organizers and Frames used by the Math teachers on a daily basis as a main instructional strategy.

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

SIM model / Frames, Xtreme Reading Model

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.

Summer Xtreme Reading Training. Before school SIM Model training in Frames.

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

The goal is to continue to add additional teaching strategies to teachers, thus expanding their tool belt of proven instructional strategies. Continued progress monitoring with a focus on increasing all teacher strategies by using SIM strategies such as Unit Organizers, Frames and Xtreme Reading that are proven to be successful. This training of all staff members will be facilitated by one of our staff members, Mr. Sean Strickland, who is a certified SIM trainer. Training will be provided and reinforced to staff members every year.

# Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:** 

#### **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

Area of

and

Focus
Description

Examining the data from 2021 state tests, the data showed a significant decline in the learning gains of our lowest 25% students from 46% in 2019 to 34% in 2021.

Rationale:

Measurable We have set a school goal of increasing our percentage from 34 to 43, which is 2

**Outcome:** percentage points higher than our 5 year average.

We will use the progress monitoring tool, Clearsight, to actively monitor the students

Monitoring: progression. Reading and ELA teachers will meet with both admin and C&I's to reflect on

data and teaching throughout the year.

Person responsible

**for** Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased

We are currently using Xtreme Reading with our lowest quartile students. We are also in the process of training our teachers in the SIM model (Frames).

Strategy:

Xtreme Reading is a supplemental program derived from the University of Kansas Strategic

**Rationale** Instruction Model. It is designed to teach struggling adolescent readers step-by-step strategies for word identification, vocabulary, self-questioning, visual imagery,

Evidence-

based

paraphrasing, and inference, among others (recommended for students at the 4th grade level or higher, scoring 2 grades or more below grade level). Teachers are trained in highly

**Strategy:** structured methods, and are given structured materials to support these strategies.

According to Evidence for ESSA, it has a strong rating.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

Summer Training of Reading Teachers in Xtreme Reading. Upon teacher completion of the training, we will build a schedule of 15-17 level one students in the master schedule for the teacher to instruct with the xtreme reading curriculum. We will purchase the necessary resources that go with xtreme reading for the teacher. As well we will perform monthly check-ins with the teacher to monitor the affect of the program.

Person Responsible

Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Admin will meet with ELA teachers after the MOY test is complete to look/compare the results and to also discuss next steps for instruction between the MOY and EOY.

Person Responsible

Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Students are enrolled in both an ELA and reading classes with a certified teachers. Reading teachers will monitor progress weekly using the program Study Sync while ELA teachers will monitor progress every two weeks using Savvas.

Person Responsible

Robert Murphy (robert.murphy@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Identification of L25 students. ELA Teachers were provided with a projection of L25 students, as well as training them on the L25 FOCUS list, that are currently in their classes so they could specifically monitor these students as well as build positive relationships and reward effort.

Person Responsible

Robert Murphy (robert.murphy@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#### #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of

Focus
Description

**Description** and

Examining the data from 2021 state tests, the data showed a significant decline in the learning gains of our lowest 25% students from 55% in 2019 to 30% in 2021.

Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

We have set a school goal of increasing our percentage from 30 to 45, which is 2

percentage points higher than our 5 year average.

We will use the progress monitoring tool, Clearsight, to actively monitor the students

**Monitoring:** progression. Algebra and Geometry teachers will meet with both admin and C&I's to reflect

on data and teaching throughout the year.

Person responsible

for

Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased Strategy:

Our math teachers have all been trained and will use the SIM Model, specifically Unit

Organizers and Frames.

Rationale for

The Strategic Instruction Model (SIM), created by the University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning, is a multi-tiered approach to adolescent literacy. SIM emphasizes teaching routines that allow teachers to organize and present curriculum content in straightforward, easy-to-learn ways and provide students with tools to solve problems independently. According to Evidence for ESSA, the SIM Model has a Strong rating.

Evidencebased Strategy:

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

Continued professional development in the SIM model. We will be training our core teachers in the SIM model during the second quarter with the expectation that they start to implement either the SIM unit organizer or the SIM frame. Trainings will happen before school on one or two days a week for a total of five days of training. We will meet with the core teachers during the third quarter to follow up with how implementation is going. Mr. Sean Strickland, who is a certified SIM trainer, will be providing the training. Any resources needed for the teachers will be purchased by the school.

Person Responsible

Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Admin will meet with Algebra and Geometry teachers after the MOY test is complete to look/compare the results and to also discuss next steps for instruction between the MOY and EOY.

Person Responsible

Bob Bedford (bob.bedford@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Identification of L25 students. Algebra and Geometry Teachers were provided with a projection of L25 students, as well as training them on the L25 FOCUS list, that are currently in their classes so they could specifically monitor these students as well as build positive relationships and reward effort.

Person Responsible

Robert Murphy (robert.murphy@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#### **Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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 the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, Lemon Bay ranks in the very high category. When drilling down in the data, our tobacco incidents skew the data to be on the high end. Lemon Bay always looks at the behavior and discipline date against our county schools and other indicators to monitor the school environment. Our discipline team plans to actively talk to students about the harmful affects of tobacco use and vaping when students are caught doing them. Our hope is a reduction of repeat offenders over the school year.

#### 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.

Building a positive school culture and environment is one of our main objectives at Lemon Bay. Positive school culture for teachers includes, but is not limited to, addressing their needs in the classroom and providing additional resources for them, celebrating monthly with food, and celebrating our successes with events such as Palm Island, after school social gatherings and various other events. For students, it is our many clubs and activities on campus that directly involve students. Our use of the PBIS program as well as our Manta Pride program to recognize students. For the parents it is our school advisory committee and our many parent booster programs that help maintain a positive culture. Our relationship with the community is second to none. Each year our students donate thousands of hours to community service and in return, the community donates thousands of dollars to our many programs including our Community Academic Partners (CAPs) where the community raises money so that our struggling students can receive after-school tutoring help Monday through Thursday. Each year we invite 40-50 colleges, universities, tech programs to a career day at LBHS where all students take part in a college/career expo. For social services, we partner with Charlotte Behavioral Health to supplement our school social workers needs pertaining to student mental health.

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

SAC - Approving SIP as well as helping in school events such as homecoming.

Community - Booster clubs such as CAPs that help provide tutoring and additional classroom resources to teachers.

Parents - Getting students to school, taking part in fundraisers, supporting our Athletics, Band, Drama and

# ROTC programs.

Students - PBIS initiative, Spirit Fridays, SGA Homecoming, bonfire, lipsync competition, and dance. Business - Donations to our many clubs, sports teams, band, drama, rotc and booster clubs Staff - Countless hours spent at the school whether tutoring, coaching, directing, attending functions.

# Part V: Budget

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

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