Lake Howell High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Howell High School

4200 DIKE RD, Winter Park, FL 32792

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0551

Demographics

Principal: Michael Howard

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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)	56%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Seminole County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Lake Howell High School

4200 DIKE RD, Winter Park, FL 32792

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0551

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	55%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Seminole 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.

Lake Howell's mission is to educate students in a manner that will inspire, innovate, and impact our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The school's vision regarding student success denotes one of future planning, goal setting, and a proactive approach to curriculum planning which clarifies both secondary and postsecondary objectives. Student performance is denoted through the following measurements: graduation rate, college readiness, annual yearly gains, yearly secondary and collegiate testing and assessment, college entry/ acceptance percentages and reduction of remediation.

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
Howard, Michael	Principal	Principal
Ackley, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Math
Keyser, Mia	Assistant Principal	Exceptional Student Education, World Languages, Compact Coordinator, Goal Program, and Media Center
Lampe, Victoria	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, Student Services, Science, and Physical Education
Rose, Jesse	Assistant Principal	Facilities, Social Studies, Career and Technical Education, Athletics, and School Safety
Thompson, Tonya	Assistant Principal	ELA, Reading, ESOL, MTSS, and Fine/Performing Arts
Grace, Linion	Other	Discipline and Custodians
Bassinger, Amy	Other	Attendance, Dropout Prevention, MTSS/PBS
Sutton, Arika	Other	Discipline and Advanced Placement
Judge, Mindy	Other	Testing Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Michael Howard

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.*
1

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.*
17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
107

Total number of students enrolled at the school
2,262

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
14

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Demographic Data

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				56%	63%	56%	57%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	56%	51%	56%	55%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	43%	42%	41%	44%	44%
Math Achievement				44%	55%	51%	55%	56%	51%
Math Learning Gains				33%	49%	48%	44%	46%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30%	42%	45%	28%	38%	45%
Science Achievement				66%	73%	68%	77%	75%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				78%	78%	73%	83%	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	55%	61%	-6%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	55%	61%	-6%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

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	65%	71%	-6%	67%	-2%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	77%	75%	2%	70%	7%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	29%	61%	-32%	61%	-32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	51%	64%	-13%	57%	-6%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Common District Created Benchmark Assessments were utilized to progress monitor:
• ELA – Grade 9 & 10
• Mathematics – Grade 9 & 10 enrolled in Algebra and Geometry
• US History – Grade 11 – Common District Created Benchmark Assessments
In Biology, teacher based formative assessments were used for progress monitoring. Data is unavailable for these assessments.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	267/66%	312/74%	378/79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	146/61%	176/70%	223/74%
	Students With Disabilities	23/46%	23/43%	38/57%
	English Language Learners	14/37%	18/50%	14/34%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	195/52%	207/54%	177/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	107/47%	112/47%	110/40%
	Students With Disabilities	21/36%	20/36%	15/23%
	English Language Learners	16/52%	12/34%	15/42%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	251/64%	309/78%	365/80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	115/57%	148/72%	187/78%
	Students With Disabilities	12/29%	27/56%	28/57%
	English Language Learners	7/28%	13/52%	13/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	89/50%	88/48%	91/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44/42%	49/45%	53/49%
	Students With Disabilities	8/32%	6/23%	11/37%
	English Language Learners	6/33%	10/56%	8/44%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	131/61%	190/87%	190/87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	77/60%	112/85%	112/76%
	Students With Disabilities	13/42%	20/69%	19/54%
	English Language Learners	5/22%	16/64%	16/64%

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	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	24	46	42	25	36	31	42	51		91	32
ELL	19	52	59	18	36	34	32	41		100	71
ASN	58	74		50	44		78	92		100	79
BLK	41	43	33	27	30	18	47	56		92	60
HSP	38	44	50	24	28	31	55	64		96	60

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	51	55		45	37		59	87		100	57
WHT	61	56	56	49	41	30	79	80		98	68
FRL	41	48	47	31	31	30	59	69		95	60

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	24	43	37	16	26	24	37	36		90	30
ELL	22	40	31	24	36	38	36	53		77	37
ASN	74	65		32	29		71	81		100	79
BLK	39	52	47	23	26	24	49	80		88	24
HSP	50	52	35	37	31	30	57	65		89	41
MUL	68	62		57	42		83	77		94	44
WHT	62	51	37	54	35	33	74	84		93	61
FRL	48	52	35	38	30	24	61	72		88	40

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	22	42	34	32	37	18	45	56		74	18
ELL	16	43	43	32	28	11	44	52		89	44
ASN	79	65		88	65		89	85		94	81
BLK	42	53	49	35	34	30	75	71		88	38
HSP	47	48	35	44	37	25	69	81		88	40
MUL	59	46		54	46		65	93			
WHT	65	60	45	64	48	31	82	87		87	54
FRL	49	53	41	46	41	23	70	78		83	42

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	616
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	85%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	72
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	45
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	50
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	62
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	53
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?

The performance of students with disabilities across all grade levels and content areas is a concerning trend.

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

The achievement and learning gains of students with disabilities demonstrates the greatest need 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?

Factors contributing to the low performance of students with disabilities in ELA and Math proficiency and learning gains include disruption in instructional continuity due to the pandemic that further widened gaps in students' foundational skills. Actions to support improvement in these areas will include frequent formative progress monitoring with target support and acceleration in identified areas of need.

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

Grade 9 and 10 ELA and US History reflect the most improvement.

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

Deliberate monitoring of specific student groups contributed to this improvement. Actions included focus on the monitoring of the lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students along with standards-based tutoring.

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

Acceleration strategies will include strategic monitoring of lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students, more frequent common formative assessment to gather progress monitoring data and highly structured professional learning community discussions using this data to collaborate on strategies to accelerate student learning.

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.

Professional development will be focused on the development of highly effective professional learning communities and how school-based leaders can foster the growth and development of teacher collaboration for student success.

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

Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include social emotional learning support for students and families, data driven tutoring and acceleration support, expanded use of SCPS early warning tracking and MTSS based support, and additional progress monitoring opportunities in ELA for students in grades 9-11 and grade 12 reading and in mathematics for students enrolled in Algebra 1, Geometry and Liberal Arts Math 1.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Howard (michael_howard@scps.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lessons aligned to Florida Standards at the appropriate level of complexity with ongoing feedback loops between leadership and teachers, students and teachers and student with students and PLCs focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

Student owned progress monitoring
Low 30% Monitoring
High Level 1 and High Level 2 Monitoring
Low Level 3 Acceleration
Collaborative Data Driven PLCs
See SCPS School Improvement Plan for additional details

Person Responsible	Michael Howard (michael_howard@scps.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

PBIS and MTSS Practices (positive behavior referrals, reduction in disciplinary referrals, student intervention, transition mentors)

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.

The school-based PBS administrator has created structures in place to reward positive behavior. Students can earn our school-based incentives such as falcon bills and positive behaviors for exhibiting behaviors that align with our PRIDE expectations, (Punctual, Responsible, Integrity, Dependable and Strive for Excellence) expectations. All teachers and staff can nominate students of the week at any time. Students selected as Student of the Week are recognized and announced on social media and given a LHHS swag bag gifted by community stakeholders. Students who receive a positive referral are recognized by administrators and are given additional prizes as an award. The administrator who oversees PBS identifies and highlights ideal behaviors on the announcements so that students continue to strive for excellence in their behavior choices.

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

Administrators, Teachers, Students, PBS Coach, PTSA, SAC, Students, Student Clubs and Organizations that include student leadership, Seminole State College, Embry Riddle Aeronautical University, Action Church, Winter Park Rotary Club, Winter Park Elks Lodge, Addition Financial, and Business Partners All of these stakeholders support Lake Howell's vision in promoting a positive culture and environment.