

Collier County Public Schools

Lorenzo Walker Technical 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Lorenzo Walker Technical High School

3702 ESTEY AVE, Naples, FL 34104

<https://www.collierschools.com/lwtc>

Demographics

Principal: Valerie Hernandez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2021

| | |
|--|--|
| 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) | Career and Technical 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: A (84%) 2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (81%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * 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 Collier 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Lorenzo Walker Technical High School

3702 ESTEY AVE, Naples, FL 34104

<https://www.collierschools.com/lwtc>

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 | Yes | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| Career and Technical Education | No | 86% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A | | A | A |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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 Lorenzo Walker Technical High School is to create the ultimate career and college preparatory education program for all students to acquire skills for life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will graduate from high school fully prepared to be successful in the workplace and to pursue post- secondary education.

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Hernandez, Valerie | Principal | Instructional Leader and Collaborator- classroom observations, professional development training's, monitors all school data daily, over site of all PLC's. Engage Stakeholders- marquee weekly updates with important information, Facebook posts, Twitter and school website, robocalls, emails and texts home. Tours of facility for interested community members and parents.SAC member and participates in monthly meetings |
| Garbo, Lauri | Assistant Principal | Instructional Leader and Collaborator- classroom observations, professional development training's, monitors all school data, participation in all PLC's. Engage Stakeholders- parent meetings and communication via robocall, social media (Facebook and Twitter) and e-mail blasts. Attendance and participation in Monthly SAC meetings and community leadership groups. |
| Elliott, Lianne | Instructional Coach | School Leadership- Leads the English department and PLC's. Peer observer for the FTEM observation model. Collaborates with teachers on standard-based lesson planning. Attends monthly district Reading Coach meetings to learn new strategies and updated training. Engaging Stakeholders- Works with individual students on success strategies, models lessons for teachers, communicates with the parents through multiple modes (emails, phone calls, conferences) and provides training to all staff regarding reading strategies. |
| Werner, Cynthia | Instructional Coach | School Leadership- Leads the math department and PLC's. Peer observer for the FTEM observation model. Collaborates with teachers on standard-based lesson planning. Attends monthly district Math Coach meetings to learn new strategies and updated training. Engaging Stakeholders- Works with individual students on success strategies, models lessons for teachers, communicates with the parents through multiple modes (emails, phone calls, conferences) and provides training to all staff regarding math strategies. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/9/2021, Valerie Hernandez

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.*

3

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

598

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

3

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

3

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 | 150 | 150 | 149 | 149 | 598 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 15 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 9 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 11 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 19 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 14 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 16 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | |

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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 141 | 591 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 31 |
| 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 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 18 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 14 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 |

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 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 141 | 591 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 31 |
| 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 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 18 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 14 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 |

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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 92% | 54% | 51% | | | | 86% | 59% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 85% | | | | | | 72% | 52% | 51% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 82% | | | | | | 71% | 41% | 42% |
| Math Achievement | 85% | 35% | 38% | | | | 76% | 58% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | 58% | | | | | | 34% | 44% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 54% | | | | | | 41% | 46% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | 95% | 51% | 40% | | | | 97% | 72% | 68% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 93% | 47% | 48% | | | | 95% | 76% | 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 | 97% | 68% | 29% | 67% | 30% |
| 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 | 95% | 72% | 23% | 70% | 25% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 87% | 67% | 20% | 61% | 26% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 75% | 59% | 16% | 57% | 18% |

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 | 70 | 70 | 73 | 62 | 58 | | 60 | 77 | | 100 | 100 |
| ELL | 82 | 82 | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 91 | 84 | 77 | 92 | 60 | | 100 | 98 | | 100 | 100 |
| HSP | 90 | 84 | 81 | 82 | 56 | 47 | 92 | 88 | | 99 | 99 |
| WHT | 98 | 90 | | 88 | 69 | | 95 | 100 | | 96 | 100 |
| FRL | 91 | 83 | 79 | 88 | 65 | 61 | 94 | 91 | | 99 | 99 |
| 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 | 67 | 83 | 79 | 75 | 53 | | 77 | 53 | | 100 | 100 |
| ELL | 87 | 87 | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 88 | 76 | 55 | 93 | 44 | | 96 | 91 | | 100 | 100 |
| HSP | 87 | 75 | 79 | 89 | 63 | 72 | 96 | 85 | | 100 | 99 |
| WHT | 93 | 77 | | 96 | 72 | 67 | 100 | 91 | | 100 | 100 |
| FRL | 86 | 77 | 74 | 88 | 55 | 61 | 96 | 86 | | 100 | 99 |
| 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 | 46 | 54 | 59 | 53 | 35 | | 92 | 80 | | 100 | 80 |
| ELL | 93 | 67 | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 84 | 73 | 77 | 79 | 13 | | 96 | 96 | | 100 | 91 |
| HSP | 85 | 70 | 66 | 77 | 37 | 53 | 96 | 94 | | 100 | 95 |
| WHT | 89 | 76 | 85 | 70 | 41 | | 100 | 95 | | 100 | 93 |
| FRL | 85 | 72 | 71 | 78 | 37 | 48 | 97 | 94 | | 100 | 95 |

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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 84 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 842 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 74 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 81 |
| 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 | |
| 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 | 89 |
| 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 | 82 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |

| 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 | 92 |
| 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 | 85 |
| 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?

LWTHS scores increased in English Language Arts and U.S. History, with a decrease in Math and Science.

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

Math scores represent the greatest area for improvement. Math achievement scores dropped by 6%, gain scores dropped by 4%, and lowest 25% gain scores dropped by 8% from 20-21 to 22-23.

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

Contributing factors include a change in the composition of the cohort and a change in leadership in the math department as well as the school principal. Actions needed to improve math scores include one-on-one planning with the math coach and the teachers, and increased monitoring and intervention with struggling students.

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

English Language Arts (ELA) showed the most improvement. ELA achievement scores increased by 4%, gain scores increased by 9%, and lowest 25% gain scores increased by 6% from 20-21 to 22-23.

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

Contributing factors include a change in the composition of the cohort and the continued expertise of the ELA coach. We did not do anything different that would explain the increase in scores.

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

*One-on-one coach/teacher planning to ensure that lessons are standards-based, with a sequence of instruction that includes a logical progression of content, concepts, and skills.

* Data chats extended to math classes so that teachers have the opportunity to analyze individual student data in an effort to identify and target students' weaknesses with strategic scaffolding and differentiation strategies.

* Increased support for ESE students with effective scheduling of courses, ESE inclusion teachers, and instructional coaches.

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.

Data Chats - Teachers will learn how to locate and analyze student data, and how to transform the data to make it accessible to students via an informal discussion.

Differentiation - Teachers will learn how to adapt instruction in response to the distinct assessed skills and needs of students who have Individual Learning Plans (IEPs) by modifying content, process, and/or product.

Tech Talks - Teachers will have the opportunity to update their technology skills by attending Tech Talks that focus on district programs, state-adopted textbook technology platforms, and innovative classroom applications (Apps).

Marzano - Teachers will learn more about implementing the standards-based instruction elements in Marzano's framework to support instruction and monitoring for learning.

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

Creation of a long-term professional development plan for the school that supports school-wide goals. Establish specific priorities for the master schedule that includes the most effective use of academic coaches and inclusion teachers.

Use of regular data review and analysis by teachers, counselors, and administration to ensure that interventions, instructional strategies, and resources are aligned to maximize student achievement.

Renewed focus on student recognition programs to reinforce attainment of goals and showcase a variety of academic and extra-curricular achievements.

Additional training regarding the F.A.S.T. assessments and B.E.S.T. standards to ensure that lesson plans and instruction are aligned with the new progress monitoring measures.

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 scores dropped by 6% from 20-21 to 21-22.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase math achievement scores from 85% to 91%.

Monitoring:

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

Progress toward this goal will be measured three times throughout the year. After each assessment, the data will be analyzed and adjustments will be made.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Valerie Hernandez (hernav1@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Common planning for grade-level math teachers and the math coach to review curriculum maps, resources, and the most appropriate instructional strategies.

Data driven discussions with students to ensure that students have an understanding and ownership of their progress with specific concepts in math.

Use of visual representations and schema to help struggling students understand the underlying structure of a mathematical problem.

Common planning will increase accountability with teachers and increase the math coach's awareness of classroom instruction across the department.

Data chats will increase student awareness of areas for improvement.

Visual and schema representations will provide students with a greater understanding of the structure and relevant information involving a variety of math problems.

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

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.

Schedule and execute common planning with math coach and each of the teachers.

Person Responsible

Cynthia Werner (wernec@collierschools.com)

Schedule and execute data chat with each math student.

Person Responsible

Cynthia Werner (wernec@collierschools.com)

Use of visual and schema representations as part of instruction

Person Responsible

Cynthia Werner (wernec@collierschools.com)

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

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

US History achievement scores lag behind our Biology EOC scores by 2%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase U.S. History achievement scores from 93% - 95%.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be collected throughout the year/semester to measure the student's progress in the course. The final desired outcome will be measured by the U.S. History EOC.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Valerie Hernandez (hernav1@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teachers will engage students in frequent reviews of content using flashcards.

Use of literacy strategies (word walls, SQ3R, RAFT) to support the reading of complex texts.

Adherence to the curriculum guide, subject area benchmarks, and resources.

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

The US History EOC requires the recall of many facts. The repetitive nature of flashcards will help students with fact memorization.

Reading comprehension strategies will support student understanding of primary/secondary documents and other complex texts.

The district's curriculum guide is a comprehensive map that will help to ensure that all benchmarks/standards relative to the EOC are being addressed.

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.

School will print and laminate US. History flashcards.

Person Responsible

Valerie Hernandez (hernav1@collierschools.com)

US History teachers will use the flashcards with students throughout the course.

Person Responsible

Valerie Hernandez (hernav1@collierschools.com)

Use of effective reading comprehension strategies

Person Responsible

Lauri Garbo (garbol@collierschools.com)

Lesson plans and pacing align to the curriculum guide and corresponding benchmarks/standards

Person Responsible

Lauri Garbo (garbol@collierschools.com)

#3. 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.

Even though our school has a 92% proficiency rate in ELA, we anticipate that will difficult to maintain over the next few years. The 9th and 10th graders have twice as many Level 1 and 2 readers as the current 11th and 12th grade students.

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

Our goal is to maintain our ELA achievement rate of 92%.

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

Progress toward this goal will be measured three times throughout the year. After each assessment the data will be analyzed an adjustments will be made.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauri Garbo (garbol@collierschools.com)

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

Common planning and one-on-one with literacy coach
 Data driven discussions with students
 Collaborative structures/reciprocal teaching

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

Common planning will increase accountability with teachers and increase the math coach's awareness of classroom instruction across the department.
 Data chats will increase student awareness of areas for improvement.
 Collaborative structures/reciprocal teaching promotes interaction with and mastery of content content.

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.

Schedule and execute common planning with literacy coach and each of the teachers.

Person Responsible

Lianne Elliott (elliottli@collierschools.com)

Schedule and execute data chat with each 9th and 10th grade student.

Person Responsible

Lianne Elliott (elliottli@collierschools.com)

Students will participate in collaborative structures and reciprocal teaching.

Person Responsible

Lianne Elliott (elliottli@collierschools.com)

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.

Hernandez , Valerie , herna1@collierschools.com

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

Hernandez , Valerie , herna1@collierschools.com

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.

Within our school, we have a positive behavioral support system and plan. Students earn Mustang Bucks for meeting or exceeding school wide expectations (Learn Actively, Welcome Responsibility, Treat Others with Consideration, Have a Positive Attitude, Stay Strong and Persevere). These can be used to purchase items from our school store (spirit wear, school supplies, etc.), to enter quarterly prize drawings, and to purchase tickets to events throughout the year. At LWTSHS, we promote a culture of positivity and inclusiveness, by ensuring all stakeholders have a voice. We celebrate Culture and Diversity week each semester, where our theme is "Many Cultures, One Community, Mustang Pride." We plan great activities, such as cultural food menus and a Choice Board that students are already working on and creating cultural submissions for in Canvas (poetry, dance, diversity logo competition, etc.).

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

Parents and Families:

The Parent and Families Engagement Plan (PFEP) will be presented during our SAC meetings, which will be held on the third Tuesday of each month. Parents will be given the opportunity to review the plan and give feedback and other input as documented in agenda and in meeting minutes from designated SAC meetings. SAC will be consulted on the appropriate use of parent involvement funds and other Title 1 information will be shared at the Annual Title 1 Meeting/Meet the Teacher Night and throughout the year. Information will be shared in a PowerPoint/technology format with newsletters/flyers also distributed. The policy will be made available to parents using multiple methods including but not limited to distribution via backpack (folder on the first day of school), parent meetings/trainings, the school's website, and shared via social media (link to website).

Also, parents gave input during our May SAC meeting to determine how effective the current plan has been and to give input for the 2022-2023 plan. The input was analyzed and used to prepare the parent involvement plan for the 2022-2023 school year.