

Lake County Schools

Tavares High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Tavares High School

603 N NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE, Tavares, FL 32778

<https://ths.lake.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Jacob Stein

Start Date for this Principal: 7/16/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (49%) 2014-15: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Lake 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Tavares High School

603 N NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE, Tavares, FL 32778

<https://ths.lake.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	64%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	B	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake 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 Tavares High School is to prepare students to become confident, self-directed, lifelong learners enabling them to grow personally and academically as they work towards becoming college and career ready citizens who will make positive contributions to society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Tavares High School is that by meeting the needs of all students through the commitments of all stakeholders, our students will become ethical and responsible citizens capable of realizing their fullest potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stein, Jacob	Principal	Be the lead learner Oversee Professional Learning Communities Articulation between all curriculum areas Scheduling
Hall, Carl	Assistant Principal	Oversee the ELA and Reading Departments
Glass, Richard (Bryan)	Assistant Principal	Oversee the Science and Social Studies Departments
Farnsworth, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Oversee the ESE and Performing Arts Departments
Campbell, Randy	Assistant Principal	Oversee the Math and CTE departments
Lester, Carolyn	Instructional Coach	Work with all teachers to incorporate reading strategies into instruction.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	341	406	370	318	1435
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	62	70	73	259
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	41	21	16	109
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	68	46	190
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	114	102	44	354

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	154	188	158	135	635

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	1	12	4	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	12	6	32

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

65

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/16/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	52	62	35	224
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	25	30	13	116
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	71	78	11	260
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	99	76	25	315

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	248	224	230	176	878

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	52	62	35	224	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	25	30	13	116	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	71	78	11	260	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	99	76	25	315	

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	248	224	230	176	878	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	44%	50%	56%	43%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	41%	46%	51%	44%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	33%	42%	42%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	48%	44%	51%	39%	44%	49%
Math Learning Gains	45%	45%	48%	38%	41%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	36%	45%	29%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	67%	68%	68%	74%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	69%	73%	69%	69%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	341 (0)	406 (0)	370 (0)	318 (0)	1435 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	54 (75)	62 (52)	70 (62)	73 (35)	259 (224)
One or more suspensions	31 (48)	41 (25)	21 (30)	16 (13)	109 (116)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (100)	76 (71)	68 (78)	46 (11)	190 (260)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	94 (115)	114 (99)	102 (76)	44 (25)	354 (315)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	42%	47%	-5%	55%	-13%
	2018	43%	46%	-3%	53%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	45%	48%	-3%	53%	-8%
	2018	48%	49%	-1%	53%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

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
2019	65%	66%	-1%	67%	-2%
2018	71%	61%	10%	65%	6%
Compare		-6%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	67%	5%	70%	2%
2018	81%	69%	12%	68%	13%
Compare		-9%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	32%	52%	-20%	61%	-29%
2018	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
Compare		-17%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	55%	49%	6%	57%	-2%
2018	57%	50%	7%	56%	1%
Compare		-2%			

Subgroup Data

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	25	30	16	31	52	46	44	36		86	21
ELL	17	33	31	36							
ASN	69	46		60	40						
BLK	27	39	36	28	42	42	50	40		95	39
HSP	37	39	27	41	38		59	62		87	47
MUL	48	36		36			46				
WHT	49	42	26	54	48	41	73	80		88	60
FRL	33	37	26	43	41	41	57	62		78	47
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	19	29	28	39	59		43	54		53	6
ELL		50									
ASN										90	
BLK	30	49	44	35	45	42	44	72		68	29
HSP	40	52	47	56	46	39	77	72		73	43
MUL	52	56		63	56		92			90	
WHT	49	54	35	61	55	48	77	85		83	54
FRL	40	50	36	51	50	43	69	78		74	49
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	15	43	40	15	41	33	40	36		61	6
BLK	32	38	25	26	25	25	48	53		76	8
HSP	39	44	46	39	40	38	77	64		83	38
MUL	50	35		40	53					70	
WHT	44	45	46	40	40	27	75	75		81	45
FRL	35	37	36	31	35	31	73	58		75	30

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	581
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	54
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

English Language Arts lowest quartile learning gains was the component that showed the lowest performance at 28%. The loss of five ELA teachers during the school year did not allow the students to have the consistency that is necessary for performance.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

English Language Arts lowest quartile learning gains also was the component that had the biggest decline from 2017-2018 school year. The loss of five ELA teachers throughout the school year was a major factor in the decline. Tavares High School recognizes the need for collaboration and consistency to improve student success.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The English Language Arts and Math lowest quartile learning gains both showed the biggest gap when compared to the state average at a -16% .

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Graduation rate was the component that had the most improvement during the 2018-2019 school year. Tavares High School made this a top priority through intentional scheduling, progress meetings with students and parents and individual advising and encouragement that led to the six percent increase.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

A major area of concern for Tavares High School is attendance below 90%

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Lowest Quartile Learning Gains in both Math and ELA
2. Attendance
3. Math Achievement (Algebra 1)
4. ELA Achievement
5. Subgroup improvement in SWD and ELL

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Based on FSA and EOC data from the 2018-2019 school year from the needs assessment, Lowest Quartile in ELA and Math, with emphasis on ELL and SWD subgroups, is one of our most critical areas of focus.
Rationale	Lowest quartile ELA and Math were identified as a critical area of focus because of a combined decrease of 28 points from the 2017-2018 FSA and EOC testing data. This area of focus will improve learning and success by ensuring that our lowest quartile students gain 15, or more, points on the 2019-2020 school year examinations.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on this area, we expect to see increases in state FSA and EOC data from 28 percent to 41 percent in ELA and from 39 percent to 54 percent in math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Carl Hall (hallc2@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Learning opportunity time will be used to increase ELA test scores from 28 to 41 percent and math test scores from 39 to 54 percent. To monitor the strategy, THS will use classroom walk through data, formative assessment data, Fair data, and flextime reports which will be analyzed monthly by the strategic team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we implement, monitor, and support learning opportunity time, along with formative assessment data, there will be an increase in ELA and Math lowest quartile learning gains and overall proficiency. The rationale behind the implementation of this strategic focus comes from the LCS district instructional framework, authentic literacy moves, the intensive reading framework, SBI, and various studies focusing on the benefits of data-driven decision making in the classroom.
Action Step	
Description	1. Identify and notify the teachers of lowest quartile students with emphasis on the SWD and ELL. Who: Principal, Assistant Principals, ESE specialist, and ELL Coordinator When: 8/12-19- 9/12/19 Frequency: monthly Evidence: ESE Logs, ELL Logs, and data chat schedule
	2. Deliberate scheduling of learning opportunities time Who: teachers When: 9/3/19- 4/30/19 Frequency: weekly Evidence: Flex Time scheduler reports
	3. Create, administer, and evaluate formative assessments in tested areas Who: teachers and administration When: 9/13/19-4/24/19 Frequency: twice per nine weeks Evidence: formative assessments and data from the assessments
	4. Learning Opportunities for non-traditional Algebra 1 students will use the ALEKS

program to help with diagnostic, practice, and monitoring of student performance.

Who: teachers

When: 9/15/19- 4/30/15

Frequency: minimum of twice a week

Monitoring: LSA, FSA, and student reports

5. Use ESE funds and personnel to support SWD

Who ESE Specialist, Support Facilitators, and Teachers Assistants

When 9/1/19- 5/29/20

Frequency: Daily

Evidence: Support Logs, Meeting Logs, and Intervention Documentation

6. Use of ELL support staff and resources

Who: Guidance Counselor and ELL Teacher Assistant

When 9/1/19- 5/29/20

Frequency: Daily

Evidence: Meeting Logs, Teacher Assistant Documentation, WIDA Scores

Person

Responsible

Jacob Stein (steinj@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Based on Early Warning Systems data from the needs assessment THS will create a culture that focuses on building student relationships is one of our most critical areas of focus.
Rationale	This area was identified as a critical need because the number of students who are missing 10 or more day is over 20 percent which hinders the students ability to be successful in the classroom and on state assessments.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on this area, we expect to see a decrease, from 23% to 13%, in students with excessive absences.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Randy Campbell (campbellr@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The use of restorative practices and community building activities will be used to decrease our excessive absence rate from 23% to 13%. To monitor this strategy, EWS data will monitored monthly by administrative team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we implement, monitor, and support our restorative practices and community building activities there will be stronger school-student relationships and community support efforts which will ultimately lead to improved student attendance.
Action Step	
Description	<p>1. Review and practice restorative practices with teachers through faculty meetings Who: administration When: 8/14/19 Frequency: monthly Evidence: faculty meeting agenda</p> <p>2. Teachers use restorative practice activities in the classrooms. Who: teachers When: 9/3/19-4/30/19 Frequency: weekly Evidence: CWT data and lesson plans</p> <p>3. Create community building opportunities aimed at school wide participation. Who: principal When: 9/3/19 - 5/29/19 Frequency: quarterly Evidence: pictures of events and feedback surveys</p> <p>4. Attendance reviews held with students in danger of not meeting requirements Who: Assistant Principal and Social Worker When: As needed Frequency: 9/13/19 Evidence: Meeting Logs</p> <p>5. Implement reward system for students with perfect attendance Who: guiding coalition When: 9/3/19 -5/29/19 Frequency: quarterly</p>

Evidence: attendance plan

6 Summer writing teams will be utilized to help develop procedures and incentives to increase student attendance and community building activities.

Who: selected teachers

When: June 2020

Frequency: 4 hours per teacher

Evidence: procedures and created community building activities

7 Tutoring After School Plus

Who Selected teachers

When 1/20-5/20

Frequency - Once a week up to 3 hours

Evidence Tutoring Logs

8. Mental Health Professional implementation

Who Mental Health Liaison

When 8/19-5/20

Evidence: Faculty meeting logs, calendars, training logs

**Person
Responsible**

Jacob Stein (steinj@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Based on overall school data from the state school grading system and the needs assessment data, establishing a purpose is our most critical area of focus from the Lake County Schools Instructional framework.
Rationale	This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because of the decrease in total school points from 58% to 53% on the State of Florida school grading model. By focusing on purpose, student comprehension of the Florida standards will increase leading to mastery of standard(s) content/skills. This will result in increased student achievement on various state assessments vital to overall school grade.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on this area, we expect to see an overall increase from 53% to 62% in the State of Florida grading model.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jacob Stein (steinj@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Focusing on purpose will provide all stakeholders, most importantly students, with the what, why, and how behind Florida state standards. This newfound comprehension will lead to improved levels of assessment achievement increasing overall school points from 53% to 62%. To monitor this strategy, the school strategic team and district will, monthly, analyze both classroom walk-through and common formative assessment data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By focusing on, monitoring, and supporting the development of standard(s) purpose, there will be a greater understanding with the what, why, and how behind SBI. In addition, focusing on purpose will enhance curricular relevance and student engagement with the curricular learning goals and tasks; which is needed to prove mastery of standard(s) content/skills. Ultimately, focusing on standard(s) purpose, in the classroom, will lead to improved performance on state FSA and EOC exams.
Action Step	
Description	1. Introduction and review of Lake County Schools instructional framework during faculty and PLC meetings. Who: administration and coaches When: 8/12/19- May 6/20 Frequency: monthly Evidence: faculty meeting agenda, CWT data, data chat schedule, and formative assessment data.
	2. Focus on purpose as part of LCS Instructional Framework for CWT's each month. Who: administration and coaches When: 8/12/19- 4/30/19 Frequency: daily Evidence: CWT feedback and faculty meeting agendas
	3. Complete feedback cycles focusing on establishing a purpose Who: Administration When: 9/3/19- 4/30/20 Frequency: quarterly

Evidence: feedback cycle notes and calendars

Person Responsible Jacob Stein (steinj@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

N/A

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

N/A

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N?A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Based on FSA and EOC data from the 2018-2019 school year from the needs assessment, Lowest Quartile in ELA and Math, with emphasis on ELL and SWD subgroups, is one of our most critical areas of focus.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Based on Early Warning Systems data from the needs assessment THS willl create a culture that focuses on building student relationships is one of our most critical areas of focus.	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Based on overall school data from the state school grading system and the needs assessment data, establishing a purpose is our most critical area of focus from the Lake County Schools Instructional framework.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00