Lennard High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lennard High School

2002 E SHELL POINT RD, Ruskin, FL 33570

www.sdhc.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Denise Savino

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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)	88%
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 (50%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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

Lennard High School

2002 E SHELL POINT RD, Ruskin, FL 33570

www.sdhc.k12.fl.us

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	58%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

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 Hillsborough 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.

As a united and diverse community, we will prepare students to actively take ownership in their academics while preparing them for success

Provide the school's vision statement.

Guiding graduates to a life of learning.

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
Savino, Denise	Principal	Principal- Active participant in the decisions of the SIP team.
Santacruz, Priscilla	SAC Member	Chair - Chemistry Teacher
Greene, Talana	Assistant Principal	SIP Team Member
Wohlgamuth, Diana	Instructional Coach	Math - Liaison for each grade level and/or content area.
Stanley, Tracy	Instructional Coach	Reading - Liaison for each grade level and/or content area.
Steele, Nikol	Assistant Principal	SIP Team Member
Lawson, Denise	Instructional Coach	SIP Team Member
Lane, Sharon	Teacher, Career/ Technical	SIP Team Member
Callaway, Brooklyn	Assistant Principal	SIP team member

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Denise Savino

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

2

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

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

92

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,276

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

17

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

14

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	612	589	571	504	2276
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	11	8	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	56	53	37	194
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158	145	159	84	546
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	28	105	86	240
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	147	161	87	557

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	24	38	32	59	153

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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/26/2021

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	532	560	493	673	2258
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	203	231	214	268	916
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	21	17	12	74
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	137	126	170	544
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	118	40	102	342

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	18	14	8	8	48

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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	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	532	560	493	673	2258
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	203	231	214	268	916
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	21	17	12	74
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	137	126	170	544
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	118	40	102	342

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	18	14	8	8	48

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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				42%	56%	56%	43%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				44%	54%	51%	47%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				26%	41%	42%	31%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				44%	49%	51%	46%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains				50%	48%	48%	58%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	45%	45%	55%	45%	45%
Science Achievement				59%	69%	68%	60%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				68%	75%	73%	58%	73%	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	42%	55%	-13%	55%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	40%	53%	-13%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

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	59%	66%	-7%	67%	-8%
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	68%	73%	-5%	70%	-2%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	29%	63%	-34%	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%	57%	-6%	57%	-6%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Lennard High School used Viewpoint to progress monitor the discipline breakdown by incident and grade level on our campus.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33.3	37.92	40.77
	Economically Disadvantaged	22.18	25.99	28.53
	Students With Disabilities	42.6	45.22	46.65
	English Language Learners	2.51	3.79	4.19
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49.3	76.77	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	42.60	75.72	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	62.3	85.41	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56.9	54.51	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	50.45	46.80	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	72.2	68.09	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	n/a	35.78	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	35.78	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	40.87	43.45	46.04
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.08	30.98	33.47
	Students With Disabilities	47.59	48.95	50.03
	English Language Learners	4.9	5.05	6.08
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19.5	50.25	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	16.1	50.25	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	16.1	41.97	n/a
	English Language Learners	3.7	52.71	n/a
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13.4	24.79	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	13.4	21.41	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	27.2	45.37	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	7.57	n/a
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34.4	47.84	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	36.85	20.89	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	34.4	20.89	n/a
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	8.3	9.97	11.56
	Economically Disadvantaged	6.38	7.73	8.9
	Students With Disabilities	7.13	8.79	9.16
	English Language Learners	2.65	3.16	3.94
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	23.3	45.7	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	23.3	44.98	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	23.3	17.18	n/a
	English Language Learners	23.3	25.25	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Biology	All Students	17.8	18.05	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	22.4	18.05	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	20.1	13.44	n/a
	English Language Learners	7.8	21.42	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
US History	All Students	39.3	42.18	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.9	41.93	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	23.9	28.78	n/a
	English Language Learners	15	24.99	n/a

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4.87	6.55	7.37
	Economically Disadvantaged	3.86	4.45	5.22
	Students With Disabilities	5	8.15	8.57
	English Language Learners	0.33	0.53	0.74
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23.30	44.98	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	23.3	44.98	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	18.1	39.29	n/a
	English Language Learners	29	39.29	n/a
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27.20	29.99	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	27.2	29.99	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	27.2	40.65	n/a
	English Language Learners	25.1	21.41	n/a
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34.4	54.33	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.4	46.71	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	55.05	53.65	n/a
	English Language Learners	15	32.84	n/a

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	13	22	23	15	33	41	14	32		77	13
ELL	18	32	34	18	27	42	26	19		73	18
ASN	94	87								86	67
BLK	39	46	33	17	19	24	26	37		95	35
HSP	34	38	36	25	27	34	40	41		81	36

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	66	66		52	43		69	50		96	48
WHT	65	54	33	48	31	30	66	70		94	51
FRL	38	43	38	24	25	34	39	38		85	35

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	14	24	19	25	46	45	29	36		78	10
ELL	8	26	26	24	37	27	16	41		63	15
ASN	95	50		92	64		100			100	30
BLK	35	43	28	39	47	47	55	64		95	43
HSP	33	37	25	39	50	41	50	60		79	28
MUL	52	58		58	36		47	83		89	47
WHT	60	55	25	56	55	56	79	82		88	50
FRL	34	38	26	38	48	45	52	61		82	31

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	15	32	27	17	38	50	43	26		59	9
ELL	9	34	34	24	49	67	27	25		58	25
ASN	84	68					90	87			
BLK	39	47	31	39	52	38	54	50		88	33
HSP	31	42	30	40	58	58	51	51		75	29
MUL	50	58		54	50		75	71		89	59
WHT	65	56	35	61	63	55	74	77		87	44
FRL	35	44	30	41	57	52	54	51		77	28

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	33
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	92%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	31
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	84
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	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	39
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	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	54
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	39
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?

Academic Ownership – Students will be responsible for doing the thinking in each of their classes to master the standards for the course.
Acceleration Rate – Increase the number of students earning an Industry Certification in Industrial Education courses and schedule all students who meet the criteria into an Advanced Placement and/ or Dual Enrollment classes.

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

42% of students showed proficiency on the FSA ELA with 44 points in Learning Gains and 26 points in the Low 25% Learning Gains.
44% of students are proficient in Math with 50 points in Learning Gains and 44 points in the Low 25% Learning Gains.
59% of students showed proficiency on the Biology EOC.
68% of students showed proficiency on the US History EOC.
Percentage of students not meeting Lexile Level in grades 9 through 11 in 2020-2021 School year.
9th – 29% Fall Far Below 10th – 31% Fall Far Below 11th – 36% Fall Far Below
9th – 37% Approaching 10th – 34% Approaching 11th – 45% Approaching
41% of our students are College and Career Ready

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

Number of students scheduled and meeting success in an Advanced Placement and/or Dual Enrollment class
Mid-Year Assessment Data in all Algebra 1, Geometry, and US History courses.

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

The achievement points from our ELA students showed the most improvement with scores at 42 in 2019 and ending at 47 in 2021. Also, the ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% increased form 26% to 36% in 2021.

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

Our teachers promoted and provided small group instructions. Our Instructors specialized in their subject areas and Professional Development was provided for our teachers to enhance reading skills for our students. Data driven instructions were promoted. Our students were given Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on the standards they did not master on the 2019 FSA and ELA test scores.

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

Students in all grade levels are intentionally scheduled into classes in which they can earn an acceleration point or an Industry Certification to ensure they are College and Career Ready.
School Counselors, Instructional Leadership Team and Administration will meet twice per month to review every student's status toward becoming College and Career Ready in each of the cohorts.
Our Instructional Leadership Team will identify and work to eliminate barriers to implementing and executing our Instructional Priorities.
Our Instructional Leadership Team will identify school wide trends and determine next steps needed for teachers to successfully implement the strategies which forge our Instructional Priorities.
We have added additional Industrial Education courses to our master schedule to provide more students with the opportunity to earn an Industry Certification.

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.

Our Instructional Leadership Team will drive the work that occurs in our Professional Learning Communities to ensure a common understanding and implementation of our instructional priorities.
Our Instructional Leadership Team will progress monitor student performance and teacher data and design Professional Development, which supports our Instructional Priority in the classroom.

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

We have added additional Acceleration Courses to our master schedule to provide more students with the opportunity to take a Dual Enrollment or Advanced Placement course.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Academic Ownership – Students will be responsible for doing the thinking in each of their classes to master the standards for the course. Acceleration Rate – Increase the number of students earning an Industry Certification in Industrial Education courses and schedule all students who meet the criteria into an Advanced Placement and/or Dual Enrollment classes
Measurable Outcome:	Lennard High School will decrease the number of incidents per 100 students from 2.92 to 1.50 by the end of the 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	Our Climate and Culture Resource Teacher will monitor our students' discipline, the effectiveness of our implementation of Restorative Practices as well as our Positive Behavior Intervention System. Our students with disabilities will be monitored by ESE specialist and case managers, who will meet with the students biweekly to ensure that the academic goals are being met. Our English Language Learners will meet with Mr. Melendez biweekly to be monitored and ensure that their academic goals are being met.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brooklyn Callaway (brooklyn.callaway@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lennard High School will incorporate Restorative Practices and Positive Behavior Intervention System to address our Area of Focus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Restorative Practices and Positive Behavior Intervention Systems are an expectation of our district. 80% of Restorative Practices should be preventative so we should see a decrease in incidents on our campus as a result. Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports is an evidence based three-tiered framework for improving and integrating all data, system and practices affecting our students' behavior on our campus.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will be engaged in various formative assessments. Teachers will engage students in the "high order" thinking techniques. Teachers will probe and teach for "understanding". Reading strategies will be address by providing appropriate level text. Formative assessments will be used to provide evidence of mastery. PLC's will identify student centered reading strategies to use in all content areas. Coaches and AVID Coordinator will provide training for teachers throughout the year on student reading comprehension strategies. Teachers will use the results of standards-based assessments to facilitate meaningful student centered reading strategies. Academic Coaches will conduct coaching cycles to monitor fidelity of assessment and instruction. Technology/programs and technology support will be provided to enhance individualized instruction. Student Affairs will conduct walkthroughs with a focus on student centered reading comprehension strategies. Student Climate and Culture Resource, Assistant Teachers, and Teacher Leaders will support students who do not master these skills in Tier 1 instruction.

Person Responsible	Denise Lawson (denise.lawson@sdhc.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.

Lennard High School is ranked #407 out of #505 for number of school incidents reported when compared to other schools in the state. We will monitor the number of fights, sexual harrassment, threat intimidatons, physical attacks, harassment, and bullying on our campus. We will monitor our school culture and environment by the staff addition of our Climate and Culture Resource Teacher and through out CCEIS process in which we are involved daily on our campus.

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.

Lennard High School's stakeholders builds a positive culture and environment by...
1. Promoting Systems- PBIS, LAMP, Principals' (Mrs. Savino's) weekly spotlights both staff and students, etc...
2. Displaying visual promotions- Lennard Ps, positive graffiti, take or give a smile sheets, etc.
3. Giving verbal promotions- greeting students at the door, daily announcements, positive mottos (You are never alone), etc...
4. Conducting a quarterly reward for students nominated by teachers or No tardies. A 30-minute assembly with games or pizza.
5. Developing a community center for the kids in the neighborhoods. Work in unison with the Boys and Girls clubs.
6. Structuring the student council volunteers group that work in the community.
7. Organizing an "L-Block" which is a school spirit activity for all of the sports/athletes and other activities.

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

PTSA- bring events and clubs to Lennard to build positive relationships with all stakeholders
SAC- Keep stakeholders involved with improving the school culture and environment

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**