Lakeland Senior High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lakeland Senior High School

726 HOLLINGSWORTH RD, Lakeland, FL 33801

http://www.lakelandhighschool.com/

Demographics

Principal: Arthur Martinez

Start Date for this Principal: 1/3/2014

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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 Polk 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

Lakeland Senior High School

726 HOLLINGSWORTH RD, Lakeland, FL 33801

http://www.lakelandhighschool.com/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	85%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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 Lakeland High School is to provide a rigorous and relevant education anchored in excellence and tradition.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lakeland High Schools' community of learners will continue to advance their potential for great achievement by engaging globally.

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
Martinez, Art	Principal	
McKown, Lori	Assistant Principal	
Marbra, Orienthial	Assistant Principal	
Guira, Kyle	Assistant Principal	
LeVine, Kevin	Principal	
Polly, Brandy	Assistant Principal	
Jeske, Shellie	Assistant Principal	
Wilt, Shelly	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 1/3/2014, Arthur Martinez

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.*

0

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

102

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,076

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
4

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	619	517	488	455	2079
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	126	139	119	563
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	95	86	66	426
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	50	51	30	174
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	29	36	36	134
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190	114	130	90	524
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186	109	95	54	444
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	46	51	26	148
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	196	124	129	98	547

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	35	26	26	6	93
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	18	19	13	63

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 8/11/2022

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	

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	

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	552	517	446	407	1922
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	110	111	7	374
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	41	35	28	205
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	89	79	30	319
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	25	74	48	235
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	10	6	3	33

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	244	180	141	148		713

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	7	16	9	20		52

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	54%	41%	51%				60%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						53%	46%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						34%	37%	42%
Math Achievement	33%	35%	38%				52%	43%	51%
Math Learning Gains	40%						55%	45%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						51%	44%	45%
Science Achievement	64%	26%	40%				78%	58%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	39%	48%				78%	61%	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	76%	54%	22%	67%	9%

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	77%	57%	20%	70%	7%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	36%	50%	-14%	61%	-25%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	62%	53%	9%	57%	5%

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	15	30	27	17	34	41	21	37		74	23
ELL	17	43	41	13	38		45	47		95	56
ASN	63	77					69				
BLK	30	44	43	18	32	48	40	45		85	43
HSP	48	54	53	24	38	43	52	68		92	52
MUL	73	63		62			80	93		75	83
WHT	68	57	45	49	43	46	80	83		89	74
FRL	36	46	45	22	40	43	46	57		86	48

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	17	28	21	13	20	30	31	41		86	19
ELL	16	43	41	15	21		35	48		88	46

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
ASN	67	69								100	80
BLK	26	30	22	16	20	28	47	53		91	39
HSP	41	45	30	23	22	14	61	58		91	59
MUL	60	43		29	10		75	86		92	82
WHT	71	55	36	43	24	23	78	81		94	78
FRL	36	36	22	17	19	16	53	58		87	51
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	32	26	37	53		40	51		90	8
ELL	11	37	38	24			50	35		73	33
ASN	76	68					100			100	60
BLK	34	41	31	24	29	24	52	54		91	37
HSP	51	55	40	46	58	57	71	72		88	54
MUL	67	56		75			92	87		100	41
WHT	75	56	28	66	61	60	88	91		96	56
FRL	37	43	38	38	44	42	63	63		90	39

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	604
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	70
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	76
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	63
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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

The 2021-22 data indicates that overall students performed better on the FSA and EOCs than in the prior year. The only school grade component to fall was Science Achievement (-3%).
Every other school grade component improved or remained the same (ELA Achievement = +1%, ELA Learning Gains = +6%, ELA Lowest 25%= +19%, Math Achievement = +3%, Math Learning Gains = +18%, Math Lowest 25%= +25%, Science = -3%, Social Studies = 0%). Most grade levels mirrored the overall trends. As of 8/12, the 2021-22 school year subgroup data has not been updated/populated to review.

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

The lowest performing data component is Lakeland High School's Math Achievement at 33%. This component, even though it was up by 3% from the previous year, still was below the district average (42%). Also, the Science Achievement (64%) was down by 3% from the previous year, but still was higher than the district average (43%). Since the 2019 school year, the Science Achievement has decreased by 14% and the Math Achievement has decreased by 19%. These two areas are in need of improvement. As of 8/12, the 2021-22 school year subgroup data has not been updated/populated to review.

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

Lakeland High School would benefit from creating targeted interventions for students performing low in these areas. The Reading Coach and ESE teachers/ELL teachers would create small group pull out sessions for those students in these subgroups underperforming. In addition, the attendance manager would need to work with social worker, guidance counselors and teachers to target those students with chronic attendance issues at the beginning of the school year. ESE and the ELL teachers could also work on building relationships to encourage struggling students to attend school regularly and perform better in the classroom. Our school could offer before/after school tutoring for students struggling in Math and Science.

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

ELA and Math learning gains showed the greatest improvement. Overall learning gains increased by 24% and the overall lowest 25% improved by 44%. The school leveraged ESE teachers to assist in both Algebra and Geometry. The ESE teachers assigned only focused on supporting students in these content areas. This allowed them to become content experts. The school also tracked the learning gains

of both Algebra and Geometry students using district quarterly assessments as evidence of growth. Both Math and ESE teachers used
available data to create targeted interventions for the lowest 25%. The interventions included small group instruction as well as pull out for those students with significant learning gaps.

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

The school leveraged ESE teachers to assist in both Math and ELA. The ESE teachers assigned only focused on supporting students in these content areas. This allowed them to become content experts. The school also tracked the learning gains of both ELA and Math students using district quarterly assessments as evidence of growth. ELA, Math and ELA teachers used available data to create targeted interventions for the lowest 25%. The interventions included small group instruction as well as pull out for those students with significant learning gaps.

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

The gains that were made with ELA and Math students in should be implemented within the classrooms. ELA teachers should be aligned with students based on past FSA ELA performance and teaching experience with these student subgroups. In addition, the ESE teachers should also become content experts and improve their professional practices to aid students struggling with Reading and Writing performance. ELL students will also need be stretched. As of 8/12, the 2021-22 school year subgroup data has not been updated/populated to review.

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.

Teachers, support personnel and administration will be provided professional development in ESOL and ESE strategies during teacher work days and faculty meetings to target these subgroups. In addition, the faculty and staff at Lakeland High School will receive further training in how to identify students in the lowest 25% and how to track learning gains made over the course of the year for all students subgroups.

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

The school leadership team will collectively meet and monitor student performance over the course of the school year. Adjustments and additional interventions will be made based on available data and feedback from the faculty. This may lead to additional professional development opportunities or the identification of other barriers to overcome.

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The Federal Percentage Points of Index indicates that ESE students require additional support since this subgroup underperformed as a whole in the 2018-29 school year. The lowest areas of performance occurred in Mathematics Achievement, ELA Achievement, ELA Learning Gaines for the Lowest 25th Percentile, and ELA Learning Gains. All of the categories fell below 40%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Each performance category defined above (ELA achievement, ELA Learning Gains, ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%, and Mathematics Achievement) will increase by at least 5%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The administrator and ESE Department Head will work collaboratively to monitor students progress. They will use Performance Matters to assess growth and opportunities for targeted intervention using the data provided by progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shellie Jeske (shellie.jeske@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	ESE teachers will focus on student learning objectives in both ELA and Math instruction to ensure that their assigned students demonstrate greater proficiency. ESE teachers will take ownership of student assessment performance and monitoring of student data that are needed to create positive learning growth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for	ESE teachers juggle a myriad of responsibilities and students with varying needs. The emphasis on meeting documentation requirements for IEP compliance has directed ESE teachers' attention away from student performance state assessments and learning growth. In addition, they are required to possess knowledge across a wide array of subjects which limits their abilities to become experts in any one particular subject area. Addressing these barriers will help LHS ESE teachers in reaching the evidence-based strategy identified above.

selecting this strategy.

ESE teachers will be provided training so that they can properly identify the specific support required for their assigned caseload of students. Unify will be utilized to determine which students did not make learning gains and which subject areas students failed to make learning gains. Unify will also be used to identify which test content areas (for example, statistics on the Algebra 1 EOC or circles on the Geometry EOC) each student struggled the most.

Person Responsible   Shellie Jeske (shellie.jeske@polk-fl.net)

Data chats will be conducted on a quarterly basis between the administrators responsible for English and Math and the ESE teachers. Data will be gathered from the ESE teacher and the regular education teachers' anecdotal notes/running records, grade book, formative and summative assessments, as well as district quarterly progress monitoring.

Person Responsible   Shelly Wilt (shelly.wilt@polk-fl.net)

ESE teachers will be given adequate time to co-plan with English and Math teachers on a weekly basis. Also ESE teachers will be scheduled to support either English or math (not both) in order to build proficiency in a content area to better assist students.

Person Responsible   Lori McKown (lori.mckown@polk-fl.net)

#2. 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.	The Algebra EOC was identified as a significant opportunity for improvement across all student subgroups. A focus on unpacking standards and adhering to course content, combined with an intentional approach to assessments and monitoring student data are needed to create positive growth in this area.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percentage of students reaching an achievement level of 3 or higher on the Algebra EOC will increase by 14%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The testing coordinator and math department chair will use performance matter to track student progress on district tests and quarterly assessments. The data will be brought to the school leadership team at least twice per quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Orienthial Marbra (orienthial.marbra@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	All Algebra 1-A and Algebra 1 teachers will collaboratively design instruction aligning with course standards and instructional outcomes. Although Algebra 1-A is not a tested course, preparation in this course prepares struggling students for success in Algebra 1. Collaborative planning also includes progress monitoring and data analysis by the teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The data indicate that instructional outcomes do not match the standards tested on the Algebra 1 EOC. This evidence suggests a misalignment between instruction and course standards. Anecdotal evidence consisting of past classroom observations corroborates this assumption.

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.

No description entered

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The Federal Percentage of Points Index indicates that ELL learners require additional support. Only 11% of ELL students demonstrated ELA proficiency on the 9th and 10th grade FSA. 24% of all ELL students reached math proficiency on the Algebra and Geometry End-of-Course assessments. Providing additional supports for this subgroup will increase performance in both Math and English. In the process, learning gains should also improve.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	ELL student achievement in ELA will improve by at least 10% as measured by the 9th and 10th Grade ELA FSA. In addition, math proficiency will improve by 6% in both Algebra and Geometry as measured by the respective end-of-course assessments.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The testing coordinator and ESOL teacher will work collaboratively to monitor ELL students progress. They will use Performance Matters to assess growth and opportunities for targeted intervention using the data provided by progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lori McKown (lori.mckown@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The LHS faculty and staff will provide continuous professional development in ESOL strategies and instructional delivery after students have been appropriately scheduled and supported.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Second language acquisition occurs in all classrooms and does not take place in isolation. Language, reading, and writing skills carry across content areas. Skills learned in social studies, science, and elective classes affect student performance in English and Math classes. A holistic approach provides students with more practice and opportunities for academic language acquisition.

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.

ELL students will be appropriately scheduled in to English and Reading courses based on testing data and time in the ESOL program.

Person Responsible Lori McKown (lori.mckown@polk-fl.net)

Social Studies teachers will be provided ELL instructional strategies during planning.

Person Responsible   Brittany Sampson (brittany.sampson@polk-fl.net)

Science teachers will be provided ELL instructional strategies and training during planning.

Person Responsible   Cheryl Pierce (cheryl.pierce@polk-fl.net)

Math teachers will be provided ELL instructional strategies and training during common planning.

Person Responsible   Lisa Woods (lisa.woods@polk-fl.net)

ELL students classified as Tier C will be cohorted in Reading and English classes so that the ESOL para will be able to push into classrooms for assistance.

Person Responsible   Shellie Jeske (shellie.jeske@polk-fl.net)

Tier A and B ELL students will be placed in English through ESOL classes with an ESOL teacher for more intensive instruction.

Person Responsible   Lori McKown (lori.mckown@polk-fl.net)

Administration will conduct classroom observations to ensure that ELL instructional strategies developed by the faculty and enacted with fidelity. Additional opportunities for instructional/faculty development also be assessed during these classroom observations.

Person Responsible   Art Martinez (arthur.martinez@polk-fl.net)

ELL students will be appropriately scheduled in to English and Reading courses based on testing data and time in the ESOL program.

Person Responsible   Lori McKown (lori.mckown@polk-fl.net)

Social Studies teachers will be provided ELL instructional strategies during planning.

Person Responsible   Brittany Sampson (brittany.sampson@polk-fl.net)

Science teachers will be provided ELL instructional strategies and training during planning.

Person Responsible   Cheryl Pierce (cheryl.pierce@polk-fl.net)

Math teachers will be provided ELL instructional strategies and training during common planning.

Person Responsible   Lisa Woods (lisa.woods@polk-fl.net)

ELL students classified as Tier C will be cohorted in Reading and English classes so that the ESOL para will be able to push into classrooms for assistance.

Person Responsible   Shellie Jeske (shellie.jeske@polk-fl.net)

Tier A and B ELL students will be placed in English through ESOL classes with an ESOL teacher for more intensive instruction.

Person Responsible   Lori McKown (lori.mckown@polk-fl.net)

Administration will conduct classroom observations to ensure that ELL instructional strategies developed by the faculty and enacted with fidelity. Additional opportunities for instructional/faculty development also be assessed during these classroom observations.

Person Responsible   Art Martinez (arthur.martinez@polk-fl.net)

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.

Lakeland High School strives to work toward a culture of creating an inclusive, positive environment for all students. Staff members believe that all students should be respected, valued, and included as a member of the the school community. There is a focus on building positive relationships between students and staff members on campus. We believe this builds an environment of support, trust, and promotes a safe environment. Students are encouraged to seek mental health support if they demonstrate a need for emotional support. By building positive relationships between students and staff, we also hope that this builds a trusting relationship and encourages communication from students that if they 'see something, say something' if they are concerned about anything regarding the safety of another student or a possible unsafe situation on campus. In addition, the administrative team believes in regular communication with teachers. We strive for all teachers to feel valued and appreciated for all that they do to help promote a positive learning climate for all students, which will ultimately support student achievement.

We also want all parents and students to feel as though there is regular communication and dialogue with our school families. During the month of March each year (before COVID-19), we typically hold a meeting for all incoming 9th-grade students called "Freshmen Forum". Lakeland High School plans to go back to this practice during the 2022-23 school year. This meeting allows parents and students an opportunity to receive information about Lakeland High School. They are also given the opportunity to meet with teachers and guidance counselors, as well as the chance to tour the campus. At Orientation in August, parents and students meet the teachers to explore the various organizations at our school. Our School Advisory Council (SAC) is open for any parent to attend. Notices of these meetings appear on the school web site, are posted on the marquee, and are announced through social media.

Other options of communications are:
1. Freshmen Parent night for incoming 9th graders
2. School web site
3. Parent portal- provides parents and students real time grades and attendance information in addition to school announcements
4. Quarterly school newsletter
5. Electronic surveys for parents/students
6. Facebook and Twitter feeds for parents and students
7. Individual teacher Remind accounts

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

Art Martinez, Principal- Principal has the task of setting the mission and vision for the school year. As the top administrator of the school site, it is the principal's task to create and nurture a staff community that is goal-focused, positive, and supportive. The principal must establish a culture of trust between the

administrative team and the instructional staff.

Administrative team members- The administrative team must embrace the mission and vision of the principal and therefore, promote the mission and vision and engage staff with that in mind. The administrative team is an extension of the principal and must also endeavor to create a positive, supportive, and trust-worthy relationship with instructional staff. These members work directly with teachers and must maintain a balance of understanding staff levels of experience and needs, as well as maintaining their authority as the leadership team at the school.

Reading Coach – The Reading Coach at LHS extends beyond the reading department. This coach interacts not only with the reading department, but with all new teachers as well as teachers new to the school. It is the responsibility of the reaching coach to provide support for teachers. This support includes conversations that are private, mentoring, and being that person who continually encourages, assists with working through concerns, teaching tasks, and challenges -both academic-related as well as job-related stressors. This assistance is not limited to new teachers and teachers new to the school, but rather, extends to all instructional staff on an as-needed basis.

Department Heads-Department heads are liaisons between administration and department members. Department heads are an integral facet of promoting a positive culture and environment at the school as they "lead" their team members through the process of instruction, instructional changes that come from the District, and the team unity of the department. They, too, act as a sounding board within their team, a conduit for questions and concerns to be addressed through them to administration as well as directives coming from administration to the teams. Department heads are the ones who set the mission, vision, and expectations for the department. It is incumbent upon them to unify the department or team to work together as a unit for the best possible student achievement outcomes.

Parents/Guardians – Parents and guardians are essential, perhaps the most essential of the stakeholders. They provide the stability, consistency, structure, nurturing, and guidance on appropriate ways to behave and interact with peers, teachers, coaches, and the community at large. They are responsible for promoting and investing in the well-being and success of their children. Parents and guardians serve as advocates for their children as they matriculate through the school system, from beginning to end. They are the ultimate support for their children as they meet all needs: Social-emotional, dietary, disciplinary, celebratory, financial, as well as the installation of the moral code and belief systems.