

The School District of Lee County

Lehigh Senior 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	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Lehigh Senior High School

901 GUNNERY RD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

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

Demographics

Principal: Darya Grote

Start Date for this Principal: 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%)
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	24

Lehigh Senior High School

901 GUNNERY RD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

<http://lsh.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	92%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	87%

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 Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mission: To improve teaching and increase student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: To be a World Class High School.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Corey, Jackie	Principal	
Chiorello, Cyndi	Assistant Principal	
Farrell, Liam	Assistant Principal	
Krevinko, Timothy	Assistant Principal	
Szafran, Amy	Assistant Principal	
Young, Veronica	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, Darya Grote

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

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,414

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	0	558	589	729	538	2414
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	116	129	106	443
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	64	61	45	220
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	50	84	24	168
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	72	110	92	290
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168	167	182	134	651
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193	212	324	132	861
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	163	201	265	156	785

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	1	1	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	8	6	36	

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	549	709	535	531	2324
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	59	68	53	227
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	94	99	61	293
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	52	17	8	78
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	44	37	53	137
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	169	129	119	564
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	168	76	179	554

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	175	113	139	541

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	9	9	42

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	549	709	535	531	2324
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	59	68	53	227
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	94	99	61	293
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	52	17	8	78
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	44	37	53	137
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	169	129	119	564
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	168	76	179	554

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	175	113	139	541

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	9	9	42

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				48%	55%	56%	51%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	49%	51%	51%	50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	37%	42%	37%	42%	44%
Math Achievement				39%	50%	51%	42%	54%	51%
Math Learning Gains				38%	45%	48%	33%	43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	43%	45%	28%	43%	45%
Science Achievement				48%	62%	68%	91%	70%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				61%	67%	73%	60%	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	46%	51%	-5%	55%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	47%	48%	-1%	53%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

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	47%	56%	-9%	67%	-20%
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	60%	64%	-4%	70%	-10%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	39%	59%	-20%	61%	-22%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	37%	50%	-13%	57%	-20%

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	114/28.1	125/30.3	126/28.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	7/12.3	7/11.9	6/10
	English Language Learners	2/5.1	2/4.8	3/7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	90/28.1	99/26.5	88/25.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	8/15.7	9/14.5	5/9.6
	English Language Learners	7/18.9	6/13.6	3/7.7
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	124/73.4	148/85.5	159/90.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	1/20	3/75	2/50
	English Language Learners	1/100	1/100	0/0
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	62/23	75/26	81/26.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	4/6.8	3/5.2	4/6.9
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/2	3/5.7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40/15.3	28/10	29/11.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	5/9.4	2/3.4	1/1.9
	English Language Learners	10/21.3	8/16	7/14.3
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50/23.4	110/47.7	116/48.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	8/17.8	18/36	22/46.8
	English Language Learners	7/16.3	16/34	25/45.5
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0	0/0	0/0
	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	2/50	2/22.2	4/40
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/100	0/0	1/25
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	229/51.3	294/58.9	275/62.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	9/25	13/29.5	16/42.1
	English Language Learners	11/31.4	13/35.1	12/35.3

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	0/0	2/66.7	1/33.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/50	1/50
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1/50	1/100	2/66.7
	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	16	30	27	7	17	18	21	32		96	19
ELL	17	38	39	12	25	30	24	33		90	30
ASN	75	58								100	80
BLK	38	39	32	15	22	22	41	46		98	53
HSP	45	48	41	26	23	20	52	61		96	53

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	57	37		36	33		73	80		100	69
WHT	56	50	46	34	30	20	63	74		93	64
FRL	38	40	36	19	22	21	44	52		96	51
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	29	22	15	34	31	22	27		87	15
ELL	7	30	31	17	42	44	23	24		69	21
ASN	68	37		75			64				
BLK	41	43	31	36	38	46	41	57		93	37
HSP	49	48	33	37	37	37	46	58		90	48
MUL	70	55		40	21		57	69			
WHT	60	50	40	49	40	50	66	79		92	70
FRL	42	42	32	33	36	41	40	51		91	46
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	30	28	15	20	21	64	25		56	14
ELL	13	43	41	20	31	29		13		64	41
ASN	84	75									
BLK	45	48	38	38	31	36	87	47		88	38
HSP	49	51	38	41	36	28	92	63		86	52
MUL	63	61		47	54						
WHT	66	50	36	49	23	19	91	77		83	62
FRL	48	49	37	40	33	29	89	56		85	44

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	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	505
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	35
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	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
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	61
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	53
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	42
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?

Students that are in our bottom 25%, ESE or ELL are not making adequate progress.

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

Students enrolled in our Geometry classes demonstrate the largest needed for improvement.

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

Past years, Geometry has been a less motivating course/assessment for students as they have just needed to "take the test". Now that the assessment can be substituted for the Algebra 1 EOC, there needs to be a bigger sense of urgency. Our data is in the bottom of the district average.

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

According to 2019 data, the bottom 25% of math students making gains was the most improved however according to progress monitoring data Biology performance was the strongest area.

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

Our math teachers are very geared at developing content that will fill in the gaps in learning. They focus on the lower level students however, this is at detriment to our higher performing students.

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

- Kagan structures
- AVID strategies
- Strong PLC's
- Common planning
- Common lessons

- Common assessment
- Data tracking by teachers and students
- Flipped classrooms
- Reading strategies through Brockton Model of Active Reading Open Response
- Increased conceptual learning
- Provide additional support for teachers
- Learning stations in low level classrooms

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.

- Weekly optional training for teachers
- Summer professional development opportunities
- Teacher leaders providing Hands on training.

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

- PCTs/Teacher leaders
- Increased leadership opportunities allowing teachers to help grow their own.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**Area of Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

Attendance in class is one of the highest indicators of performance and ability.

Measurable Outcome: For the 2021-2022, 85% of students (1,976 of 2,524 students) will maintain an attendance rate higher than 90% as measured by daily attendance records by May 2022.

Monitoring: Student attendance will be tracked on a quarterly to monthly basis, depending on the individual students. Students with poor attendance will be contacted by counselors, Administration and then social worker as needed.

**Person responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Veronica Young (veronicayo@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

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

**Rationale
for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

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

Action Steps to Implement

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

**Person
Responsible**

Veronica Young (veronicayo@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	While our school have very strong PLCs in place, it has been determined that the planning for the level of rigor necessary for student achievement is below expectation.
Measurable Outcome:	PLCs will be held weekly and during those PLCs, teams will examine exemplars in order to backwards plan to allow instruction to meet the rigor of the standards.
Monitoring:	Admin over departments will attend PLCs weekly/bi-weekly depending on needs of the team. During this time, the admin will ensure that discussion is leading to student achievement and mastery of standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Szafran (amysz@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLCs are an ongoing process in which educators work together and learn from each other by using Data to drive discussion and improve instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Since our PLCs are strong and our teachers care about our kids, they spend more time working on filling in the gaps in learning, than instructing to the rigor of the standards. This is evident by the gradebook and EOC/FSA deficit.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1) Ensure that PLCs are meeting weekly
- 2) PLCs attended by admin over department
- 3) Using exemplars to backward plan and design instruction.
- 4) Review data from exemplars weekly, to guide instruction including remediation.

Person Responsible Amy Szafran (amysz@leeschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities and English Language Learner students will be areas of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY22.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of students with disabilities making a learning gain in FSA ELA will increase to 40% as measured by the FSA ELA assessment administered May 2022.
Monitoring:	Student performance will be tracked via progress monitoring tools and classroom assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cyndi Chiorello (cyndiac@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring data in all areas will be used to drive instructional decisions during PLCs to increase supports SWD and ELL students at Lehigh Senior High School. Social Emotional learning opportunities will be utilized to increase social emotional wellness among our student body.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data driven decision making has been proven to be an effective strategy for increasing student achievement. PLCs teams can make stronger connections with students to increase attendance and decrease discipline, which will improve student achievement. It is also important to focus on social and emotional wellness for our student body to increase their ability to focus on learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data driven PLCs to drive instruction
2. Analysis of discipline and attendance data during PLCs to increase supports
3. Provide social and emotional wellness learning opportunities to increase ability to focus on learning

Person Responsible Cyndi Chiorello (cyndiac@leeschools.net)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Teacher recruitment and retention is vital to a successful school. Ensuring that all teachers are adequately trained and following district and school guidelines is a huge measurement of success.

Measurable Outcome: At the end of the 2021-2022 school year, teacher retention will increase to 95% as measured by the end of year teacher survey.

Monitoring: This area will be monitored by observing teacher performance in the classroom and giving support via admin or PCTs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jackie Corey (jackielc@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: A supportive management environment will be implemented to ensure that teachers know admin is here to support and assist in any way possible. This will include teacher leader support as well as mentorship programs when necessary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research from the National Association of Secondary School Principals shows that the single most important aspect of a school's culture is the leadership and management style of the principal.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

According to SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, Lehigh Senior High has a low incident rating. We are currently ranked at #159. We are high in the area of property incidents and that will be where our focus lies for the 2021-2022 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.

Lshs works to build a positive school culture for students and staff by ensuring that all know that there is support last built in to systems. Student behavior is awarded for doing the right things and ensuring that they are successful both in and out of the classroom.

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

Administrative team-supporting students and teachers, plan activities to increase student achievement
Guidance team- supporting students via individual meetings and planning events to promote positivity on campus

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Teacher Recruitment and Retention	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00