

The School District of Lee County

East Lee County 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	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

East Lee County High School

715 THOMAS SHERWIN AVE S, Lehigh Acres, FL 33974

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

Demographics

Principal: Tony Allen

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

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	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 (43%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: D (38%)
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 Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

East Lee County High School

715 THOMAS SHERWIN AVE S, Lehigh Acres, FL 33974

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	85%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

Our Motto is:

own-engage-represent

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Robery, Melissa	Principal	
Biro, Tim	Assistant Principal	
Prentice, Karen	Assistant Principal	
Green, Ellen	Assistant Principal	
Stevens, Kristin	Assistant Principal	
Coser, Michael	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, Tony Allen

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,883

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

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

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	482	453	498	450	1883
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	107	109	118	418
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	40	30	14	115
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	132	136	72	349
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	71	94	112	291
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154	116	123	120	513
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	200	221	123	711
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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													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	144	204	224	173	745

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	10	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	8	12	32

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

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	421	457	409	358	1645
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	64	54	51	224
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	53	20	17	115
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	51	79	43	175
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	29	69	135
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	115	139	104	502
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	110	71	123	419

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	129	102	124	464

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	8	10	32

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	0	421	457	409	358	1645
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	64	54	51	224
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	53	20	17	115
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	51	79	43	175
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	29	69	135
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	115	139	104	502
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	110	71	123	419

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	129	102	124	464

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	8	10	32

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				36%	55%	56%	31%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				40%	49%	51%	37%	50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31%	37%	42%	31%	42%	44%
Math Achievement				34%	50%	51%	34%	54%	51%
Math Learning Gains				39%	45%	48%	38%	43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	43%	45%	37%	43%	45%
Science Achievement				51%	62%	68%	36%	70%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				53%	67%	73%	51%	66%	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	34%	51%	-17%	55%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	35%	48%	-13%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

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	48%	56%	-8%	67%	-19%
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	51%	64%	-13%	70%	-19%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	34%	59%	-25%	61%	-27%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	33%	50%	-17%	57%	-24%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady, and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/6.7	7/7.1	7/6.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/4.7	3/6.5
	English Language Learners	1/4.8	0/0	1/3.6
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75/28.3	86/27.6	75/23.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	5/14.3	1/50	0/0
	English Language Learners	3/7.3	7/12.5	12/20
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59/62.1	98/86.7	83/75.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/50	2/66.7
	English Language Learners	1/50	2/66.7	4/80
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	74/28.8	96/30.6	89/28.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	5/12.8	3/7	4/8.3
	English Language Learners	2/3.8	5/8.6	5/8.3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54/22.1	77/23	65/21.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	4/10	8/17	3/7.9
	English Language Learners	7/11.9	12/16.0	8/11.4
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34/33.3	34/33.3	38/35.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	2/13.3	5/26.3	3/16.7
	English Language Learners	6/30	6/27.3	5/20
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/100	1/100	2/100
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	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
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	3/23.1	3/21.4	3/23.1
	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	129/37.4	169/47.6	169/50.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	14/17.3	20/23.3	23/29.5
	English Language Learners	2/6.1	3/8.6	6/19.4

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	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
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	2/100	0/0	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3/23.1	2/20	3/33.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

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	8	21	23	4	14	17	8	23		82	37
ELL	14	31	29	10	12	7	12	30		89	57
BLK	25	38	32	17	19	17	32	42		86	51
HSP	33	34	23	17	17	19	31	44		94	65
MUL				25						80	

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	22	17	17	25	17		38	57		82	60
FRL	28	34	24	16	17	18	28	47		92	63
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	7	28	28	19	48	48	9	29		78	10
ELL	14	37	30	29	39	38	32	39		62	13
ASN				55							
BLK	34	42	32	30	41	56	48	49		81	17
HSP	35	40	29	33	35	30	48	52		79	28
MUL	43	46		45				60			
WHT	40	37	29	46	47		64	52		82	30
FRL	33	38	29	31	36	36	50	51		81	26
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	10	34	30	9	44	50	15	30		60	13
ELL	10	28	28	16	42	43	15	12		41	37
BLK	30	36	32	26	40	52	27	48		65	18
HSP	29	35	28	36	37	28	35	49		71	45
MUL	24	36		27							
WHT	38	45	48	41	42	47	52	56		75	41
FRL	29	37	30	34	37	34	34	49		69	36

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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	416
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	86%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	30
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	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	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
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	37
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
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 trends that emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas is that ELCHS is below district average, most noticeably within performance levels of students with disabilities and English language learners. This is also true in the gap between ELCHS and the state average. Achievement levels are the largest area of concern, particularly in ELA and Math, where the gap is the largest between ELCHS, district, and state. While more students are making gains in ELA and Math, the ratio of students is not comparable with achievement levels. There has been an increase in Social Studies and Science achievement, without the same progress in ELA and Math.

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

The data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, that demonstrate the greatest need for improvement are in the achievement levels of students with disabilities and English language learners. The reading levels of these two subgroups negatively impact the students' ability to perform well on assessments in Math, Social Studies, and Science. Until the ELA achievement level of these subgroups increases, the other data components will continue to show a learning gap. In 2019, students with disabilities disproportionately did not meet the achievement level in Science, which is related to the low achievement level in ELA.

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 contributing factors to this need for improvement are the low achievement level of students entering the school. There is also a high mobility rate. The new actions that need to be taken to address this need for improvement include a school-wide strategic focus on reading strategies. A systemic focus on literacy in all content areas promotes increased achievement and gains in ELA, as well as in all subject areas. An extended school day program has been introduced to give support to students in all core subject areas in small groups focused on individual needs. Effective and highly effective teachers extend learning for students four days a week for an additional 3 hours.

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

The data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, that showed the most improvement were in Science achievement. There was a drop in Spring progress monitoring data across the board, but this drop was not as significant in Science achievement. The Biology team has worked carefully to include literacy strategies, include high level vocabulary, and increase the rigor of instruction across the Science department to increase proficiency in Science.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement included strategically using a Peer Collaborative Teacher to teach some of the most struggling students, as well as a department-wide focus on literacy strategies, high-level vocabulary, and increased rigor. New actions that the school has taken in this area include incorporating a Science Coach to ensure all new and/or developing teachers have a highly effective collaborative teacher or coach to help increase achievement through rigorous and engaging instruction.

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

Strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning include a focus on close reading and vocabulary in all content areas. Word parts are used in a systemic approach so students make connections between related words in all subject areas. Strategically teaching concepts as they relate to multiple core subject areas, as well as strategies used across subject areas, will be utilized. ESOL and SIOP strategies will be incorporated into all subject areas to support English language learners.

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.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and students will focus on literacy, English language learners, students with disabilities, and engagement. Staff will be trained on how to appropriately and effectively incorporate strategies that align with accommodations provided to English language learners and students with disabilities that are best practice to help all students. ESOL professional development will be provided for all staff members through professional learning communities, as well as school-wide by district personnel.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond include a focus on literacy in all subject areas, as described above. Additionally, the school has hired instructional coaches to increase the instructional leadership team. The school now employs highly effective Peer Collaborative Teachers and Instructional Coaches in English, Reading, Science, and Math. The school also has a College and Career Specialist to help all students focus on post-secondary goals and planning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When examining our graduation data, our ELL subgroup is lower than all others except for ESE students. This is an area of opportunity for our kids.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to move our graduation rate for our ELL students from 85% to 88% as measured in the 2021-22 year, with additional 3% in the next two years to match the current schoolwide rate of 94%.
Monitoring:	The senior support PLC is tracking each student on a weekly basis, and our ELL coordinator and ELL team is tracking seniors specifically. Weekly grade checks, E2020 progress, state assessments and behavior will be checked.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristin Stevens (kristins@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC work with this as a focus is the main strategy for tracking and implementing instructional supports for this goal.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC work is supported through research by Marzano and multiple others. The faculty is familiar with the PLC process and implementation.

Action Steps to Implement

The Senior Support PLC will meet bi-monthly to discuss progress, identify students at increased risk, and create action plans for the next cycle.

Person Responsible Kristin Stevens (kristins@leeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When examining our graduation data, our ESE subgroup is lower than all others except for ELL students. This is an area of opportunity for our kids.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to move our graduation rate for our ESE students from 85% to 88% as measured in the 2021-22 year, with additional 3% in the next two years to meet the current schoolwide rate of 94%.
Monitoring:	The senior support PLC is tracking each student on a weekly basis, and our ESE administrator and ESE team is tracking seniors specifically. Weekly grade checks, E2020 progress, state assessments and behavior will be checked.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC work with this as a focus is the main strategy for tracking and implementing instructional supports for this goal.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC work is supported through research by Marzano and multiple others. The faculty is familiar with the PLC process and implementation.

Action Steps to Implement

The Senior Support PLC will meet bi-monthly to discuss progress, identify students at increased risk, and create action plans for the next cycle.

Person Responsible Kristin Stevens (kristins@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

In the Safe Schools data, ELCHS ranks very high for violent incidents (specifically fighting and threat/intimidation), very high for property incidents (vandalism) and high for drug/public order (drug use/possession, disruption on campus, and tobacco).

We identified two areas of work that will directly impact this area of school culture.

Hallway supervision: incidents with fighting, vandalism, disruption, and drug use/possession were often linked to students who were late to class, out of area or skipping. We are increasing our hallway supervision, tightening our tardy policies and will make this a weekly data review at our administrative PLC. We will tweak our process quarterly, and more often as needed.

Behavior review: incidents with fighting, vandalism, disruption, and drug use/possession were also linked to students with multiple referrals. We are instituting behavior reviews with each student who hits five referrals. This is held in a similar manner to a formal administrative hearing.

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.

ELCHS administration, strategic team and leaders work to build a positive culture on a systematic basis. Student recognition happens at the class and school level at least monthly for academics and improved behaviors. Teacher and staff recognition and appreciation happens individually and schoolwide monthly in a formal system and informally as a way of work. Student leadership groups including Freshmen Success, ELLEs (Esteemed Ladies Leading East) ModEL Men, and SGA, work daily and monthly to promote school spirit, student leadership and mentorship. Social media is used to build our story on a regular basis.

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

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00