Lakewood Ranch High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lakewood Ranch High School

5500 LAKEWOOD RANCH BLVD, Bradenton, FL 34211

https://www.manateeschools.net/lakewoodranch

Demographics

Principal: Dustin Dahlquist

Start Date for this Principal: 1/2/2019

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	24%
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: A (62%) 2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (70%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Manatee 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

Lakewood Ranch High School

5500 LAKEWOOD RANCH BLVD, Bradenton, FL 34211

https://www.manateeschools.net/lakewoodranch

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 PK, 9-12	No	24%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

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 Manatee 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 Lakewood Ranch High School, with the support of staff, parents, and the community, is to strive to inspire each student to recognize and achieve his or her maximum potential through academic excellence, personal integrity, and responsible citizenship.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Lakewood Ranch High School is to provide students a rigorous educational experience that equips them for college or career readiness in a global job market.

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
Dahlquist, Dustin	Principal	Instructional Leadership
Galindo, Jeannie	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leadership, Professional Development
Staker, Michael	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leadership, Testing
Bellantonio, Thomas	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leadership, Discipline
Fleury, Ann	Teacher, K-12	Math Department
Thomas, Bryan	Teacher, K-12	Science Department
Haeussler, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department
Grant, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department
Finnegan, Valerie	Teacher, K-12	World Languages and Fine Arts Department

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 1/2/2019, Dustin Dahlquist

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

115

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,420

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

15

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

13

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578	590	626	618	2412
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	47	52	60	201
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	54	48	45	159
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	57	90	86	245
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	87	112	68	339
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	61	44	23	185
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	65	74	65	227

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	1	0	0	4	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/17/2022

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	582	628	620	593	2423
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	168	168	148	624
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	8	13	45
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	68	92	79	69	308
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	47	25	25	169
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	8	3	0	27

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	34	48	34	31	147

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	3	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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	582	628	620	593	2423
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	168	168	148	624
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	8	13	45
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	68	92	79	69	308
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	47	25	25	169
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	8	3	0	27

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	34	48	34	31	147

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	3	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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	66%	48%	51%				69%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						59%	47%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						45%	37%	42%
Math Achievement	51%	35%	38%				66%	51%	51%
Math Learning Gains	42%						55%	47%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						49%	45%	45%
Science Achievement	79%	45%	40%				83%	67%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	77%	43%	48%				81%	69%	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	82%	69%	13%	67%	15%
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	80%	71%	9%	70%	10%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	52%	65%	-13%	61%	-9%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	74%	61%	13%	57%	17%

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	25	36	35	20	34	38	34	47		87	41
ELL	31	46	42	24	35	27	40	41		79	16
ASN	78	56		57	42		88	82		100	79
BLK	50	53	38	21	16	11	54	50		88	31
HSP	48	47	40	37	39	34	56	63		92	58
MUL	70	64		55	46		78	68		92	75
WHT	70	61	43	57	46	44	85	82		95	78
FRL	49	50	41	32	34	28	62	57		87	47

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	27	41	33	25	31	35	51	58		85	28
ELL	24	43	44	19	25	22	72	56		88	50
ASN	74	56		50	33		100	82		100	74
BLK	26	37	35	16	22	17	52	35		95	37
HSP	49	43	39	37	28	28	76	69		92	61
MUL	68	46		32	17		81	82		100	50
WHT	70	52	43	55	25	31	87	83		96	66
FRL	42	41	38	30	23	21	68	58		89	49

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	32	43	39	35	47	47	32	48		87	21
ELL	20	39	36	36	38	43	33	52		93	36
ASN	80	67		92	71		95	87		100	90
BLK	35	42	45	38	44	45	47	58		92	36
HSP	56	52	44	53	45	44	68	76		91	55
MUL	77	46		77	53		87	81		100	67
WHT	74	62	47	70	58	48	86	83		95	68
FRL	46	47	39	51	50	52	63	62		84	42

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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	682
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	41
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	73
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	41
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	69
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	66
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	50
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?

Trend data suggests slow recovery to pre-Covid levels of achievement across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas. While results in 2021-2022 were better than those recorded in 2020-2021, they still fall short of achievement levels in the 2018-2019 school year before Covid.

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

The greatest need for improvement is in the achievement levels for Geometry and Algebra. In the 18/19 school year, for example, 52% of students taking Algebra I achieved proficiency. In 20/21, that number dipped to 29% proficiency. While the 21/22 students showed dramatic improvement in proficiency, from 29% to 43%, that percentage still lags behind the pre-Covid proficiency percentage of 52.
The data reflects similarly for Geometry. Proficiency is still trending downward. Pre-Covid proficiency was 74%. In 20/21 that proficiency dropped to 59% and further in 21/22 to 53%.
Additionally, against the Federal Index, students with disabilities narrowly failed to accrue 41% of the points possible. (40%)

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:
Learning loss resulting from eLearning and Hybrid scheduling.
Academic misplacement resulting from modality scheduling restraints exacerbated by the MOU.
Teacher and student COVID related absences.

New actions to address this need for improvement include academic placement dependent on articulated prerequisites, instruction grounded in the new B.E.S.T. standards, use of data from common assessments to make instructional decisions, and increased dependence on core resources to support instruction.

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

Overall earning gains in both ELA and Math showed the most improvement. Learning gains in ELA rose from 50% to 58%. With 3% considered statistically significant, these gains are worth mention. Even more impressive were the overall learning gains in Math, from 25% to 43%. While those gains do not rise to pre-Covid numbers, they suggest students are gaining ground.

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

Factors contributing to this improvement include primarily a return to in school learning. Research suggests that the single most significant factor contributing to student achievement is the presence of a highly effective teacher. To that end, mentoring programs were established where new teachers could find support, counsel and input into academic and behavioral problem solving. Additionally, common calendars and common assessments contributed to this improvement, particularly in Language Arts.

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

To accelerate learning, diagnostics will need to be administered early in the school year to determine what students know, understand and can do in a given subject area. Based on the information provided by these assessments, teachers will consider the learning goals for the course, the standards to be assessed and use backward design to accelerate learning. If there are gaps in essential understandings required to perform at grade level, teachers will utilize the learning progressions available to target the points of confusion for remediation.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities provided at the school to support teachers and leaders will include the SPARKS training and resulting behavior plans based on the CHAMPS philosophy to support positive and productive learning environments, Classroom Management 101, ongoing B.E.S.T. standards training, professional learning communities to support problem solving, required participation in the New Teacher Cadre for teachers new to the profession and new to the school.

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

Additional services to ensure sustainability include problem solving through IST and MTSS, Speech, Language and Vision services as required, inclusion support for students with disabilities and for speakers of other languages.

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 B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The state of Florida has adopted a new set of standards for ELA and Math. Progress monitoring assessments administered during the 2022-2023 school year will inform baseline data against which further achievement will be compared. It's critical that we prepare students for the new assessments by: 1. ensuring fidelity of implementation 2. exclusive use of the identified core resources 3. use of learning progressions to identify and bridge learning gaps
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	For the 22/23 school year, our goals are: 3% increase in proficiency in ELA from 66% to 69%. 3% increase in Mathematics proficiency from 51% to 54%. 5% increase in proficiency in both Mathematics and ELA for SWD from 35% to 40% and 25% to 30%, respectively.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of Focus will be monitored by both department heads (informally) and administrators (formally). Department heads will gather anecdotal data Data produced from classroom assessments and progress monitoring will be assessed quarterly in department meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jeannie Galindo (galindoj@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will work in subject same teams to navigate the District's curriculum in ELA and Math using: *Published curriculum maps *Common assessments *Core resources as provided Utilizing these resources is especially important during a baseline year as they were developed to provide a roadmap to student success. They are built around grade-level proficiencies with learning progressions provided to diagnose and remediate gaps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria	It only makes sense to begin with the end in mind. These resources were developed using backward design and the universal design for learning framework. The most direct route to an unknown destination is a straight line. While the standards are new for students and teachers, they have been developed by educators with clear expectations of what students should know, understand and be able to do. The path forward has been carefully planned and following it with fidelity is the only way to learn if adjustments are necessary.

**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.

ELA, Reading, Algebra and Geometry teachers will participate in professional development designed to ground instructional practice in the new B.E.S.T. standards.

Person Responsible   Jeannie Galindo (galindoj@manateeschools.net)

Evaluative walkthroughs and non-evaluative classroom visits will be conducted by administrators to monitor for fidelity of implementation and use of core resources to support instruction.

Person Responsible   Michael Staker (stakerm@manateeschools.net)

Data from assessments will be analyzed quarterly and problem solving conducted when response to intervention is less than adequate to meet the goal.

Person Responsible   Dustin Dahlquist (dahlquid@manateeschools.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Classroom Management	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Research suggests that second only to the effectiveness of the teacher, a positive and productive learning environment has a significant impact on student achievement. Classroom disruptions interfere with instructional momentum and can prevent students from achieving their maximum potential. Students need to be in class every day and discipline referrals resulting in both in and out of school suspensions keep students from class. Consequently, each classroom at Lakewood Ranch High School has developed a specific behavior management plan based upon the CHAMPS framework.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	There will be a 10% decrease in classroom behavior referrals during the 2022-2023 SY as a result of school wide implementation of behavior plans built around the CHAMPS framework.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Behavior management plans will be reviewed by the CHAMPS coaches. Referrals will be tracked quarterly to measure progress toward a 10% reduction. CHAMPS coaches will conduct weekly CHAMPS non-evaluative walk-throughs and document observables on the CHAMPS checklist.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Thomas Bellantonio (bellantoniot@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	All teachers want their students to be orderly, responsive, engaged, and motivated. According to the most current research on teacher effectiveness, putting a successful behavior management system in place is a sure way of achieving these goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the	Improve classroom behavior (on-task, work completion, cooperation) Establish clear classroom behavior expectations with logical and fair responses to misbehavior Motivate students to put forth their best efforts (perseverance, pride in work) Reduce misbehavior (disruptions, disrespect, non-compliance) Increase academic engagement, resulting in improved test scores Spend less time disciplining students and more time teaching them Teach students to behave respectfully and to value diversity, thereby reducing cultural differences that may manifest as misbehavior

resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Feel empowered and happy to be in the classroom Develop a common language about behaviors among all staff

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-Wide CHAMPS training for instructional staff.

Person Responsible	Thomas Bellantonio (bellantoniot@manateeschools.net)

Behavior Management plan development

Person Responsible	Thomas Bellantonio (bellantoniot@manateeschools.net)

Weekly CHAMPS non-evaluative walkthroughs using CHAMPS checklist

Person Responsible	Dustin Dahlquist (dahlquid@manateeschools.net)

CHAMPS Best Practices Reminders

Person Responsible	Thomas Bellantonio (bellantoniot@manateeschools.net)

#3. 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.	Against the Federal Index, students with disabilities at Lakewood Ranch HS narrowly failed to accrue 41% of the points possible. (40%) While the graduation rate for students with disabilities leads the District at 87%,we believe the opportunities afforded our students with disabilities can be strengthened to improve overall achievement levels.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Students with disabilities will accrue points in excess of 41% against the Federal Index for the 22-23 School Year.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Monitoring will occur as data is analyzed from both classroom and district progress monitoring assessments. Problem solving will occur at the classroom level and at the school level and interventions implemented, tracked and analyzed for positive response to intervention.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Fazio (fazioj@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students with disabilities will be provided with in-class, one-on-one inclusion support from certified ESE professionals who work collaboratively with subject specific general education teachers to differentiate instruction and ensure accommodations are provided as prescribed in each student's IEP. Additionally, students with disabilities will be afforded the opportunity to participate in a Learning Strategies class that applies best practice in learning to individual student coursework.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Students with disabilities, provided appropriate accommodations, are able to perform at grade level along side their non-disabled peers. The challenge in schools can be the fidelity with which those accommodations are provided. Assigned case managers and inclusion teachers monitoring fidelity of implementation and advocating for students in the classroom promotes learning for all.

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.

Hand schedule students with disabilities to create clusters for inclusion support.

Person Responsible	Jeannie Galindo (galindoj@manateeschools.net)

Group students by grade level in Learning Strategies when possible to provide additional support.

Person Responsible	Julie Fazio (fazioj@manateeschools.net)

Assign students with disabilities to specific inclusion teachers along with required weekly minimums of support.

Person Responsible   Julie Fazio (fazioj@manateeschools.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.

Lakewood Ranch High School applies a multi-pronged approach to building a positive school culture and environment. A concerted effort is made school wide to communicate expectations early and often. For example, the first week of school, class meetings by grade level are held to make sure that students understand not only behavioral expectations, but also the tradition of academic excellence associated with our school and their role in preserving that tradition.
Additionally, all teachers create and implement a behavior management plan grounded in the CHAMPS framework. These plans provide the structure necessary to create and maintain environments conducive to learning.
Also contributing to positive school culture are extra-curricular opportunities. A variety of clubs and organizations are available to students with varied interests. The Stampede, HOPE Ambassadors, Student Government and National Honor Society are great examples of student organizations that contribute greatly to a positive school culture at LRHS.

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

Leadership Team - provide direction and purpose
Students - cultivate and promote positive school culture
Teachers and Sponsors - cultivate student leadership
Community - provide insight and support