

Seminole County Public Schools

Lake Brantley 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	8
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Brantley High School

991 SAND LAKE RD, Altamonte Springs, FL 32714

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0491>

Demographics

Principal: Brian Blasewitz

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2019

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)	49%
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 (58%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (58%)
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	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Brantley High School

991 SAND LAKE RD, Altamonte Springs, FL 32714

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0491>

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	47%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

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.

The mission of Lake Brantley High School is to ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to be successful in adult life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Lake Brantley is to empower its students to achieve individual success through Respect, Responsibility and a Readiness to Learn.

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
Blasewitz, Brian	Principal	Oversees all functions of running and leading a comprehensive high school
Windt, Colleen	Assistant Principal	ELA, Reading, ESOL, Science, PD, SIP, Advanced Opportunities, and Transition program.
Cowgill, Daniel	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, CTE, Fine Arts, AP, and Student Services
Sanchez, Jose	Assistant Principal	Math, World Language, Computer Science, and facilities
McIntyre, Jeralee	Assistant Principal	Social Studies, PE, and ROTC
Shafer, Brian	Other	Discipline, custodians, and facilities
Fields, Donald	Assistant Principal	ESE, Performing Arts, Accreditation, MTSS, and graduation
Reyes, Patricia	Other	Discipline, student parking, and student activities
Moore, Amy	Dean	Discipline and testing

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/24/2019, Brian Blasewitz

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.*

4

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

126

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,622

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

21

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

10

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				59%	63%	56%	61%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	56%	51%	55%	55%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	43%	42%	44%	44%	44%
Math Achievement				49%	55%	51%	47%	56%	51%
Math Learning Gains				44%	49%	48%	36%	46%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	42%	45%	29%	38%	45%
Science Achievement				68%	73%	68%	68%	75%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				74%	78%	73%	72%	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	59%	61%	-2%	55%	4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	59%	61%	-2%	53%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

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	67%	71%	-4%	67%	0%
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	73%	75%	-2%	70%	3%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	37%	61%	-24%	61%	-24%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	53%	64%	-11%	57%	-4%

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	377/70%	404/75%	490/84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	164/62%	171/65%	229/78%
	Students With Disabilities	27/44%	17/27%	35/56%
	English Language Learners	14/52%	13/46%	16/43%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	272/60%	252/57%	245/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	126/53%	115/50%	112/43%
	Students With Disabilities	24/41%	17/27%	17/24%
	English Language Learners	10/42%	8/38%	11/35%
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				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	294/65%	375/83%	371/77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	103/53%	139/72%	143/67%
	Students With Disabilities	7/23%	18/53%	16/50%
	English Language Learners	6/21%	13/43%	8/25%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	89/44%	91/45%	82/37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43/41%	36/35%	38/32%
	Students With Disabilities	6/27%	6/26%	6/24%
	English Language Learners	7/44%	5/28%	9/41%
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 11				
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	215/72%	247/83%	224/73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	83/61%	96/72%	82/57%
	Students With Disabilities	12/35%	19/53%	13/33%
	English Language Learners	12/48%	20/77%	13/52%

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
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	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
	All Students	0	0	0
Biology	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
US History	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	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	18	37	36	9	34	38	14	30		86	23
ELL	22	52	48	15	38	41	34	29		100	62
ASN	81	65		57	50		93	87		88	91
BLK	37	40	30	17	17	18	43	56		94	45
HSP	44	47	44	30	30	35	50	59		97	63

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	62	68		48	33		71	79		100	64
WHT	66	54	38	50	30	33	77	79		96	71
FRL	45	44	35	26	27	28	52	59		93	55
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	22	36	28	17	31	26	37	33		90	23
ELL	28	49	47	30	50	44	44	35		86	39
ASN	79	68		72	69		81	87		100	82
BLK	44	42	32	27	32	29	54	66		94	32
HSP	48	48	39	38	46	41	52	64		94	47
MUL	75	67		48	38		71	73		100	63
WHT	67	56	42	60	45	49	79	80		95	62
FRL	47	47	40	35	43	44	53	60		92	42
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	26	41	32	32	24	19	36	48		86	15
ELL	36	57	54	31	38	32	42	24		68	62
ASN	81	70		67	50		93	86		88	73
BLK	38	52	50	29	26	25	53	59		83	40
HSP	55	54	46	38	33	26	58	63		88	48
MUL	53	36		52	42		82	78		95	37
WHT	68	57	43	56	38	33	75	79		92	56
FRL	48	48	44	36	29	26	59	63		85	40

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	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	620
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	81%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	47
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	77
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	52
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	66
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	49
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 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:	Brian Blasewitz (brian_blasewitz@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 Brian Blasewitz (brian_blasewitz@scps.k12.fl.us)

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.

Overall our incident ranking is considered low #149. We have 2.1 incidents per 100 students when compared to all high schools statewide. We will continue to monitor behavior utilizing three security guards, and 9 administrators. We provide supervision in between classes, before school, and after school. We will also communicate with our community through school messenger and social media to keep our students and campus safe.

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.

Lake Brantley utilizes several different resources to build a positive school culture and environment. We have four programs that support this on the student level and these are: Student Government Association, Peer Counselors, P.I.T. Crew, and Latinos in Action. All of these programs are both courses and programs that provide those students in the class the opportunity to become student leaders to help support, build, and grow a positive school culture and environment. Such programs have been responsible for Challenge Day, TBK, mentoring, tutoring, social-emotional support, and working with our special needs students. In addition, students in need have a huge network of support through their guidance counselors, New Horizons, Peer Counselors, and SEL support. Lake Brantley is also utilizing the PBS program to help build and foster a positive school culture.

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

Lake Brantley High School has a strong community base of stakeholders that all assist in promoting a positive culture and environment in the school. Our stakeholders include our PTSA and SAC committees, athletic and band booster clubs. Our Student Government, Peer Counseling, Black Student Union, and Latinos in Action organizations also help promote a positive culture with our students and staff. We have partnered with Seminole State College for our dual enrollment course and with the City of Altamonte for our water treatment course. We also work closely with Addition Financial through our Academy of Finance Academy.