

The School Board of Highlands County

Lake Placid High School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Placid High School

202 GREEN DRAGON DR, Lake Placid, FL 33852

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~lph/>

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Tunning M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (44%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* 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 Highlands 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Placid High School

202 GREEN DRAGON DR, Lake Placid, FL 33852

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~lph/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) High School PK, 9-12	2021-22 Title I School Yes	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) 100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File) K-12 General Education	Charter School No	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) 63%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Highlands 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.

Recognizing that education is a major component in preparing students to become productive members in a diverse society, the staff at Lake Placid High School, in cooperation with our stakeholders, is committed to providing an educational setting focused on "Empowering the Leaders of Tomorrow."

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Empowering the Leaders of Tomorrow"

Lake Placid High School's vision statement is supported by its core beliefs.

We Believe that

- All students can learn
- All people have value and can add value
- Embracing diversity strengthens communities
- Family is the first and most powerful influence on a persons life
- Individuals are responsible for their choices and actions
- Honesty and integrity are vital
- Lifelong learning is essential for individuals and communities to flourish

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tunning, Kevin	Principal	
Matthews, Misty	Assistant Principal	
Irwin, David	Other	
Grizzell, Katherine	Teacher, K-12	
Ramirez, Jose	Teacher, K-12	
Peeples, Vann	Teacher, K-12	
Corley, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Shattler, Starla	Teacher, K-12	
Irwin, Marcy	Teacher, K-12	
McClellan, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Wilson, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
Curry, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Kevin Tunning M

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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

58

Total number of students enrolled at the school

855

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

17

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	293	208	171	183	855
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152	94	80	92	418
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	52	38	20	166
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	46	29	38	201
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	43	48	47	206
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	51	59	51	271
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	33	44	30	201
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	51	59	51	271

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	127	81	83	67	358

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	43	7	3	0	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	15	9	8	65

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/26/2022

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	284	186	187	170	827
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	72	59	64	261
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	32	24	17	112
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	38	29	19	163
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	49	38	24	167
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	47	41	27	193
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	41	34	18	168
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	125	69	82	41	317

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	33	15	4	0	52
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5	5	1	29

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	284	186	187	170	827
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	72	59	64	261
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	32	24	17	112
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	38	29	19	163
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	49	38	24	167
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	47	41	27	193
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	41	34	18	168
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	125	69	82	41	317

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	33	15	4	0	52
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5	5	1	29

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	34%	43%	51%				43%	44%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	46%						46%	46%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%						38%	35%	42%
Math Achievement	33%	32%	38%				43%	45%	51%
Math Learning Gains	35%						49%	44%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						52%	44%	45%
Science Achievement	41%	41%	40%				63%	56%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	57%	46%	48%				73%	65%	73%

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

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
2022					
2019	61%	54%	7%	67%	-6%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	75%	63%	12%	70%	5%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	29%	52%	-23%	61%	-32%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	60%	55%	5%	57%	3%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	10	30	24	16	36		33	36		83	15
ELL	7	29	28				6			92	9
BLK	18	31	25	19	17		24	50		91	5
HSP	33	45	34	30	34	50	33	56		92	39
MUL	57	67									
WHT	38	52	30	41	39	38	51	56		87	30
FRL	27	40	33	31	35	36	34	49		88	29
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	20	21	20	21	22	20	17			83	20
ELL	20	36		36							
BLK	14	37	29	16	30	36	21			83	10
HSP	34	47	41	36	41	41	52	55		90	55
MUL										60	
WHT	43	47	36	42	38	28	51	64		89	54
FRL	29	44	37	30	35	28	40	55		85	46
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	23	31	14	29			33	40		67	6
ELL											
BLK	22	37	27	16			36	46		67	29
HSP	40	40	37	46	53		62	68		85	47
WHT	49	51	43	46	55	47	68	84		76	49
FRL	35	43	35	41	47	62	55	65		79	41

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	504
Total Components for the Federal Index	11

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	46
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Attendance stands out as an extremely negative trend, which appears to impact negatively across multiple areas.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

1. Attendance Rate
2. ELA achievement
3. Algebra 1 achievement
4. Biology achievement

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

Attendance stands out as an extremely negative trend, which appears to impact negatively across multiple areas. We are extending multiple resources to improve our attendance rate.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

1. Math learning gains for white students
2. Math learning gains for the lowest quartile
3. Science proficiency for SWD.
4. ELA achievement for black students

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

1. PLC process
2. Common planning
3. MTSS
4. Job embedded coaching (ELA/Math)
5. Monitoring of student data for instruction adjustments
6. Allocated Math Coach

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

1. Continued growth of PLC process
2. Increased student rigor/engagement through the use of WICOR
3. Common Formative Assessments
4. Implement grad coach
5. Continuous improvement of MTSS

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.

1. Elements of an Effective Lesson (lesson planning)
2. EDIS training to identify student reading levels
3. Ongoing Literacy Strategies (Text marking, etc.)
4. Common boards and Job-embedded coaching cycles
5. Discipline training - classroom management and making relationships with students

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

1. Continued PLCs
2. Daily use of WICOR
3. Biweekly non-classroom instructional personnel meetings
4. Weekly MTSS meetings

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Math achievement showed a decrease from 37% to 33% for 2021-22. Math lowest quartile increased from 35 to 39.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Math learning gains for the lowest quartile will increase from 39% to 50% for 2022-23.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

IPG walk-throughs, PLC common assessments, MTSS data, and the Stocktake process

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vann Peeples (peeplev@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Use of AVID strategies utilizing WICOR to increase student engagement and rigor in the classroom.
Job-embedded coaching cycles with Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers.

Rationale for**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

AVID, Advancement Via Individual Determination, is a 501 (c) (3) nonprofit organization established in 1980. During the 2017-18 school year, AVID impacted more than 2 million students, providing academic and social support to ensure students' success in high school, college, and careers. AVID is recognized as an effective evidence-based strategy in the nation, Florida, and Highlands County.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Use PLC common assessment data to drive instruction for creating lesson plans and remediation.
2. Follow the MTSS process to monitor student interventions.
3. Lowest performing students placed into a study hall with a certified math teacher.
4. Utilize WICOR strategies on a daily basis to increase student engagement and rigor.

Person Responsible

Vann Peeples (peeplev@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

ELA achievement showed a decline from 37% to 34% in 2021-22.

**Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

ELA 9th and 10th-grade reading achievement will increase from 34% to 41% for 2022-23. Note: Incoming freshmen scored 35% in 2021-22.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

IPG walk-throughs, PLC common assessments, Stocktake process, and F.A.S.T. progress monitoring

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Corley (corleyj@highlands.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Use of AVID strategies utilizing WICOR to increase student engagement and rigor in the classroom.
Job-embedded coaching cycles with the 9th and 10th-grade ELA teachers.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

AVID, Advancement Via Individual Determination, is a 501 (c) (3) nonprofit organization established in 1980. During the 2017-18 school year, AVID impacted more than 2 million students, providing academic and social support to ensure students' success in high school, college, and careers. AVID is recognized as an effective evidence-based strategy in the nation, Florida, and Highlands County.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Use PLC common assessment data to drive instruction for creating lesson plans and remediation.
2. Follow the MTSS process to monitor student interventions.
3. Lowest performing students placed into a study hall with a certified reading teacher.
4. Utilize WICOR strategies on a daily basis to increase student engagement and rigor.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Corley (corleyj@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Biology EOC proficiency showed a decline from 49% to 41% in 2021-22.

**Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

Biology EOC proficiency will increase from 41% to 45% for 2022-23.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

IPG walk-throughs, PLC common assessments, Study Island progress monitoring, and Stocktake process

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy McClellan (mcclella@highlands.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Use of AVID strategies utilizing WICOR to increase student engagement and rigor in the classroom.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

AVID, Advancement Via Individual Determination, is a 501 (c) (3) nonprofit organization established in 1980. During the 2017-18 school year, AVID impacted more than 2 million students, providing academic and social support to ensure students' success in high school, college, and careers. AVID is recognized as an effective evidence-based strategy in the nation, Florida, and Highlands County.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Use PLC common assessment data to drive instruction for creating lesson plans and remediation.
2. Use the 5E Model to plan and deliver instruction daily.
3. Utilize Study Island to increase student engagement and remediation of concepts.
4. Utilize WICOR strategies on a daily basis to increase student engagement and rigor.

Person Responsible

Amy McClellan (mcclella@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Daily student attendance showed an increase from 261 to 418 students attending school less than 90% of the school days.

49% of our current students attended school less than 90% of the school days during 21-22 compared 32% in 20-21. For another data point, it was 19% in 19-20.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Decrease the number of students missing more than 10% of school days from 49% to 35% for 2022-23.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1. Skyward Attendance monthly reports
2. SARC process
3. Monitor tardy data
4. Home visits by administration

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jose Ramirez (ramirezj@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1. Relationship building with students
2. AVID strategies to increase student engagement

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

AttendanceWorks believes the number one strategy to increase student engagement is building positive relationships with students and families. Engaging families and creating a positive school climate are key strategies for improving attendance.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Monitor attendance bi-weekly
2. SARC team meetings bi-weekly
3. Weekly MTSS meetings
4. Parent phone calls or conferences
5. Family engagement nights

Person Responsible

Jose Ramirez (ramirezj@highlands.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

NA

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

To build a positive school culture and environment, we celebrate personal achievement, provide consistent discipline, model expected behavior, engage students in shaping the school environment, create rituals and traditions, encourage innovation across campus, provide quality professional development, maintain a clean and inviting campus, and strive to keep tabs on the school culture and adjust accordingly.

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

All staff celebrates the personal achievement of students and staff. Deans and administration provide consistent discipline. All staff model expected behavior. Faculty and administration engage students in shaping the environment. All staff help to create and maintain rituals and traditions. Technology personnel help to encourage innovation across the campus. Staff and administration work to provide quality professional development. Custodial staff work to maintain a clean and inviting campus. Administration and staff strive to keep tabs on the school culture and adjust accordingly.