



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

## 2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

---

---

Leesburg High School  
1401 YELLOW JACKET WAY  
Leesburg, FL 34748  
352-787-5047  
<http://lake.k12.fl.us/lhs>

---

## School Demographics

---

**School Type**

High School

**Title I**

Yes

**Free and Reduced Lunch Rate**

64%

**Alternative/ESE Center**

No

**Charter School**

No

**Minority Rate**

44%

---

## School Grades History

---

**2013-14**

C

**2012-13**

C

**2011-12**

C

**2010-11**

C

---

## SIP Authority and Template

---

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

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, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Differentiated Accountability</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Part I: Current School Status</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Part II: Expected Improvements</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Goals Summary</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Goals Detail</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Action Plan for Improvement</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Part III: Coordination and Integration</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>41</b>

---

## 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. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. 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: Current School Status

---

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

### Part II: Expected Improvements

---

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

### Part III: Coordination and Integration

---

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

### Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

---

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

### Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

---

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

## Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

### DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

### DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
  - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
  - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
  - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
  - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
  - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

### DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

### 2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

  

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

## Current School Status

### School Information

#### School-Level Information

##### School

Leesburg High School

##### Principal

Bill Miller

##### School Advisory Council chair

Daniel Morris

#### Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
Bill Miller	Principal
Lora Braucher	Assistant principal
Anthony Russell	Assistant principal
Kinetrai Kelley-Truitt	Assistant principal
Roger Rice	Assistant principal
Kyle Bracewell	Literacy coach
Tessa Clark	Science coach
Amanda Trivers	Math coach
Allison Auld	Bookkeeper
Porshialee Byfield	ESE specialist
Beverly Coe	Media specialist
Nancy Hunter	Teacher, Title 1
Catherine Lockett	Guidance counselor
Maura Nathanson	Family/School liaison
Sandy Rowe	school secretary
Kathy Sawyer	Athletic director
George Sneed	Athletic director
Brandy Wade	RTI teacher assistant
Thomas Bartley	Test coordinator

#### District-Level Information

##### District

Lake

##### Superintendent

Dr. Susan Moxley

**Date of school board approval of SIP**

12/16/2013

**School Advisory Council (SAC)**

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Membership of the SAC**

Daniel Morris-----Chair

Shannon Sawyer-----Vice Chair

Maura Nathanson-----Secretary, treasurer

The SAC participants reflect the demographics of our school and community and school.

**Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP**

The Leesburg High School School Advisory Council has met on September 5th to begin the process of providing assistance to both the SIP and the Title 1 plan. The SAC will meet monthly, or as needed, to assist in planning and implementation of the SIP.

**Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year**

The primary purpose and main objective of the SAC is to assist in the development of the SIP and then provide oversight in the implementation of the plan.

**Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project**

As of now, we have no indication of SAC funds for the 2013-14 school year. In the past funds have been used to support academic achievement and communication. (Examples: postage, sheet music for chorus, National Honor Society recognition, culinary arts supplies, website, digital newspaper, and non-fiction reading textbooks.)

**Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC**

In Compliance

**If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements**

N/A

**Highly Qualified Staff**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Administrators**

**# of administrators**

5

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is < 10)

**Administrator Information:**

<b>Bill Miller</b>		
Principal	Years as Administrator: 22	Years at Current School: 4
<b>Credentials</b>	Masters of Science in Educational Leadership Nova University, Fort Lauderdale, Fl. January 1990 Bachelor of Science in Health and Physical Education West Chester State University, West Chester, Pa. May 1975 State of Florida Reading Endorsement	
<b>Performance Record</b>	2013 pending 2012 C 2011 C 2010 C 2009 D Leesburg High School recovered from low academic performance. LHS has been released from state oversight and no longer is in the bottom 5% of student performance in the state of Florida.	



<b>Lora Braucher</b>		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 9	Years at Current School: 2

<b>Credentials</b>	<p>Masters Degree in Ed. Leadership from NLU.                  Bachelor's Degree in Political Science from UCF. Certification in Social Studies 6-12, Educational Leadership and School Principal</p>
<b>Performance Record</b>	<p>Leesburg HS grade is pending. Responsible for 28 point increase in math gains for the 1213 school year. Over FCAT data improved by 9 points.                  South Lake High School, 2011-2012                  Assistant Principal of South Lake High School 2010-2011: Grade: Reading mastery: 43%, Math mastery: 73%, Science mastery: 36% Writing mastery: 68%, Reading AYP: 40%, Math AYP: 70%, Writing AYP; 92%, Science AYP: 77%, AYP 72%, White, Black, Hispanic, Econ. Disad &amp; SWD did not make AYP in Reading, White, Hispanic and Econ. Disad did not make AYP in math.                  Assistant Principal of East Ridge MS in 2009-2010: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 74%, Math Proficiency: 74%, Science Proficiency: 61%, Writing Proficiency: 93%. AYP: Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in reading. Hispanic and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Math. Assistant Principal of East Ridge MS in 2008-2009: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 72%, Math Proficiency: 66%, Science Proficiency: 47%, Writing Proficiency: 91%. AYP: Black, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in reading. Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Math. Assistant Principal of Gray MS in 2007-2008: Grade: A, Reading Proficiency: 68%, Math Proficiency: 69%, Science Proficiency: 49%, Writing Proficiency: 85%. AYP: 92%, Black and ELL did not make AYP in reading. ELL did not make AYP in math.</p>

<b>Kenetrai Kelley-Truitt</b>		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 3	Years at Current School: 3

<b>Credentials</b>	B.S./M.S./Ed. S. Educational Leadership
<b>Performance Record</b>	<p>12/13-pending                  11/12-C- LHS                  10/11-C-LHS                  09/10- C – LHS</p>

<b>Roger Rice</b>		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 3	Years at Current School: 16
<b>Credentials</b>	BA History UCF 1993 MA History UCF 1998 Ed.S Educational Leadership 2008 Nova Southeastern FL DOE Certification History FL DOE Certification-Educational Leadership FL DOE Certification-School Principal	
<b>Performance Record</b>	2009-10 C 2010-11 C 2011-12 C 2012-13 Pending	

<b>Anthony Russell</b>		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 7	Years at Current School: 1
<b>Credentials</b>	BS Physical Education MS Physical Education MS Health Education Ed.S Education Leadership	
<b>Performance Record</b>	Tavares High School, 07-08, B 08-09, B 09-10, A 10-11, B Leesburg High School 11-12, C 12-13-Pending	

**Instructional Coaches**

**# of instructional coaches**

3

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is < 10)

**Instructional Coach Information:**

<b>Kyle Bracewell</b>		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 0	Years at Current School: 1
<b>Areas</b>	Reading/Literacy	
<b>Credentials</b>	B.S. in Elementary Education, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL M.Ed. in Educational Leadership, National-Louis University, Tampa, FL Elementary Education Certification ESE Certification Middle Grades Integrated Certification Reading Endorsment ESOL Endorsment	
<b>Performance Record</b>	Pending for 13-14	

<b>Amanda Trivers</b>		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 3	Years at Current School: 4
<b>Areas</b>	Mathematics	
<b>Credentials</b>	B.S. in Mathematics, Towson University, Towson, MD M.A. in Educations and Human Development, Higher Education Administration, The George Washington University, Washington, DC FL teaching certification, Mathematics 6-12	
<b>Performance Record</b>	School Grade of C for last 2 years Pending for 12-13	

<b>Tessa Clark</b>		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 0	Years at Current School: 1
<b>Areas</b>	Science	
<b>Credentials</b>	B.S. Elementary Education M.A. Science Education grades 1-6 certification grades 5-9 middle grades integrated curriculum grades 6-12 Biology ESOL endorsement Reading endorsement completed	
<b>Performance Record</b>	Pending for 13-14	

**Classroom Teachers**

**# of classroom teachers**

96

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

65, 68%

**# Highly Qualified Teachers**

104%

**# certified in-field**

100, 104%

**# ESOL endorsed**

30, 31%

**# reading endorsed**

18, 19%

**# with advanced degrees**

32, 33%

**# National Board Certified**

3, 3%

**# first-year teachers**

9, 9%

**# with 1-5 years of experience**

31, 32%

**# with 6-14 years of experience**

33, 34%

**# with 15 or more years of experience**

22, 23%

**Education Paraprofessionals**

**# of paraprofessionals**

9

**# Highly Qualified**

9, 100%

**Other Instructional Personnel**

**# of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above**

6

**# receiving effective rating or higher**

(not entered because basis is < 10)

**Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies**

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible**

Retention

1. New teacher coach training program

2. Monthly new teacher meetings
3. Teacher induction program  
Recruiting
1. Attendance at Florida Teach-in

### **Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

#### **Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities**

1. Teacher Quality Retention program
2. New teacher coach training
3. District provided assistance concerning new teachers
4. Teacher induction program

### **Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (Rtl)**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

#### **Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs**

The Rtl Leadership team meets monthly to discuss Rtl at Leesburg High School. At these meetings we discuss how we are implementing the three tiered process at our school, as well as teacher training, carrying out our three year plan, and our school needs. Each member of the leadership team plays a vital role in these meetings because each person brings their background knowledge and awareness to the decision making table. Our current plan is to focus on Tier one instruction at Leesburg High School and how we are going accomplish this task. The Rtl chair also meets monthly with the District Rtl specialist to plan for LHS and to tie the district and school Rtl plans together.

#### **Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP**

The school-based Rtl Leadership team has a large role in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. The Leadership team is aware of the needs of the school as well as the problem solving process and works together with other school stakeholders to create the school improvement plan. The problem solving process of anticipating barriers, strategies, people responsible, process used to determine effectiveness, and the evaluation are built into the SIP model is the way we carry out initiatives at our school and how we discuss these issues at our team meetings. The Rtl Leadership team meets monthly to discuss Rtl at Leesburg High School. At these meetings we discuss how we are implementing the three tiered process at our school, as well as teacher training, carrying out our three year plan, and our school needs. Each member of the leadership team plays a vital role in these meetings because each person brings their background knowledge and awareness to the decision making table. Our current plan is to focus on Tier one instruction at Leesburg High School and how we are going accomplish this task. The Rtl chair also meets monthly with the District Rtl specialist to plan for LHS and to tie the district and school Rtl plans together.

#### **Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP**

At Leesburg High School we use multiple data sources such as FCAT, AYP, FAIR, and Edusoft Math and Science Benchmarks.

We use FCAT/EOC to locate math, and reading for 9th and 10th (or until passing), AYP for our subgroups, and FAIR for reading of all ninth and tenth grade students, and students who scored a three and below for eleventh and twelfth. Lastly, we use Edusoft benchmark tests for Algebra, Geometry, and Biology students.

Our data management systems used to summarize our data are: FIDO, FCAT Star, and Edusoft. We use AS400 to access and summarize our behavior data. Continued use of the progress monitoring software to track student progress in all courses as well as document any interventions, conversations or interactions with all stakeholders.

**Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement**

At Leesburg High School we use multiple data sources such as FCAT, AYP, FAIR, and Edusoft Math and Science Benchmarks.

We use FCAT/EOC to locate math, and reading for 9th and 10th (or until passing), AYP for our subgroups, and FAIR for reading of all ninth and tenth grade students, and students who scored a three and below for eleventh and twelfth. Lastly, we use Edusoft benchmark tests for Algebra, Geometry, and Biology students.

Our data management systems used to summarize our data are: FIDO, FCAT Star, and Edusoft. We use AS400 to access and summarize our behavior data. Continued use of the progress monitoring software to track student progress in all courses as well as document any interventions, conversations or interactions with all stakeholders.

**Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents**

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

A school-wide creed and expectations have been created by the team and are clearly posted around campus. The faculty will use these expectations to drive all corrective actions taken with students. The administration will support the RtI team with the development and implementation of expectations.

**Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities**

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

**Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:**

**Strategy:** Before or After School Program

**Minutes added to school year:** 11,760

Title 1 District Before/After tutoring  
 -core academics  
 -e20/20  
 -Sylan Algebra 1 EOC assistance  
 -ACT readiness readiness

**Strategy Purpose(s)**

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education

**How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?**

-Share point  
 -ACTpractice scores  
 -LBA baseline.  
 -FAIR  
 -FCAT  
 -EOC  
 -PERT

Data is analyzed as results are available. Weekly leadership meetings are used to disburse and study areas such as LBS, mini-assessments, and all other forms of standardized testing.

**Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?**

-Title 1 administrator  
 -Title 1 site based coordinatiior  
 -bookkeeper  
 -school secretary

**Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)**

**Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
Kyle Bracewell	Literacy Coach
Lora Braucher	Asst. Principal
Hollee Mitchell	Teacher/ Reading Dept. Chair
Beverly Coe	Media Specialist
Jessica Rogerson	Teacher
Stacie Booth	Teacher
Denise Glaude	Teacher
Keith Henshaw	Teacher
Evan Bregal	Teacher
Don Herold	Teacher

Name	Title
George Goff	Teacher
Mary Bailey	Teacher
Tessa Clark	Science Coach

### How the school-based LLT functions

The LLT will meet once a month to plan and evaluate activities and programs that promote literacy on our campus. Meetings will be facilitated by the Literacy Coach and driven by needs of the students/teachers on campus as determined by data and surveys.

### Major initiatives of the LLT

- Develop school-wide writing guidelines
- Encourage participation in the Superintendent's Reading Challenge and Florida Teen Reads
- Engage students across the curriculum in reading and writing about non-fiction texts (books, articles, etc.)
- Provide various reading strategies and professional development/coaching on how to implement these strategies in content area classes.
- Conduct parent/community night activities related to literacy

## Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

### How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

Subject area teachers collaborate through common planning, to ensure their instruction meets the needs of their students. Reading strategies are a focal point of these common plan meetings. Teachers also utilize Scales and Rubrics to continually monitor student progress and adjust instruction. Strategies include, but are not limited to, Thinking Maps, Kagan Cooperative Structures, WICOR Strategies, Cornell Notes, NG-CARPD, and reading endorsement.

## College and Career Readiness

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

### How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future

Leesburg High School offers dynamic career and technology classes in order to promote relevance to today's world.

### How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful

LHS guidance department reviews student schedules to mold student interest with student course offerings. The AVID program has grown considerably over the past three years. Mr. Fox has assisted and guided AVID students to the benefits gained by college admittance.

LHS has also hosted a community wide College and Career Night on October 1, 2013. This event was attended by 250-300 people and was considered a huge success.

### Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

The promotion of ACT prep classes and AP classes serve to increase the post secondary readiness level.



## Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

### Area 1: Reading

#### Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	51%	43%	No	56%
American Indian				
Asian	44%	62%	Yes	50%
Black/African American	38%	19%	No	45%
Hispanic	43%	46%	Yes	49%
White	58%	54%	No	62%
English language learners	22%	25%	Yes	30%
Students with disabilities	32%	24%	No	39%
Economically disadvantaged	43%	35%	No	48%

#### Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	366	43%	50%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	120	15%	17%

#### Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	20	90%	91%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		12%

#### Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	456	57%	60%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	232	58%	60%

**Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		50%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		30%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		40%

**Postsecondary Readiness**

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.	81	36%	40%

**Area 2: Writing**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	128	32%	40%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		0%

**Area 3: Mathematics**

**High School Mathematics**

**Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA**

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	42%	57%	Yes	48%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	33%	39%	Yes	39%
Hispanic	31%	60%	Yes	38%
White	48%	63%	Yes	53%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	48%	31%	No	53%
Economically disadvantaged	38%	52%	Yes	45%

**Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		45%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		10%

**Learning Gains**

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (EOC and FAA)	378	63%	65%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (EOC)	102	68%	71%

**Postsecondary Readiness**

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.	77	61%	65%

**Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	78	21%	23%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		4%

**Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	130	38%	40%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	84	25%	27%

**Area 4: Science**

**High School Science**

**Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		0%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	[data excluded for privacy reasons]		0%

**Biology I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	175	35%	38%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	136	27%	29%

**Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)****All Levels**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	4		5
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	82	5%	10%

**High Schools**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses	491	31%	35%
Completion rate (%) for students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses		96%	97%
Students taking one or more advanced placement exams for STEM-related courses	85	5%	10%
CTE-STEM program concentrators	180		200
Students taking CTE-STEM industry certification exams	83	5%	10%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE-STEM industry certification exams		84%	90%

**Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)**

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses	1036	64%	75%
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more <i>accelerated</i> courses	142	1%	3%
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> courses		43%	45%
Students taking CTE industry certification exams	83	18%	100%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams		84%	85%
CTE program concentrators	446	28%	30%
CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications	8	89%	100%

## Area 8: Early Warning Systems

### High School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	249	15%	14%
Students in ninth grade with one or more absences within the first 20 days	198	48%	25%
Students in ninth grade who fail two or more courses in any subject	17	4%	3%
Students with grade point average less than 2.0	587	37%	30%
Students who fail to progress on-time to tenth grade	45	11%	5%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	267	17%	15%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	227	14%	12%

### Graduation

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students dropping out of school, as defined in s.1003.01(9), F.S.	26	1%	1%
Students graduating in 4 years, using criteria for the federal uniform graduation rate defined in the Code of Federal Regulations at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)	298	378%	79%
Academically at-risk students graduating in 4 years, as defined in Rule 6A-1.09981, F.A.C.	41	79%	52%
Students graduating in 5 years, using criteria defined at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)	334	444%	75%

## Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

### Parental involvement targets for the school

Leesburg High School will involve parents in an organized, ongoing, and timely manner, in the planning, review and improvement of Title I programs including involvement in the decisions regarding how funds for parental involvement will be used. These opportunities will be encouraged through parents joining/ attending our monthly SAC(School Advisory Council) meetings and Annual Title I Meeting. Capacity building activities will be implemented throughout the school year to improve student achievement through the combined support of the school, parents and community.

**Specific Parental Involvement Targets**

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Orientaion	n/a	n/a%	15%
Family Involvement Night	n/a	n/a%	15%
College and Career Night	n/a	n/a%	15%
FCAT Night	n/a	n/a%	15%
eSembler Training	n/a	n/a%	15%
Annual Title I Meeting	n/a	n/a%	15%
AVID parent night	35	23%	45%

**Area 10: Additional Targets**

**Additional targets for the school**

N/A

**Specific Additional Targets**

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
N/A	N/A	N/A%	N/A%

## Goals Summary

- G1.** Leesburg will continue to focus on improved student achievement by continuing to focus on improved instructional delivery. LHS has committed to a high degree of support with our high percentage of new instructors.
  
- G2.** Student conduct and discipline will improve. All student discipline (EWS) related data is gathered weekly. Suspensions will be reduced (12%) which should lead to greater instructional time.

## Goals Detail

**G1.** Leesburg will continue to focus on improved student achievement by continuing to focus on improved instructional delivery. LHS has committed to a high degree of support with our high percentage of new instructors.

### **Targets Supported**

- All Areas
- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- Writing
- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains, Middle School Acceleration, High School, High School AMO's, High School FAA, High School FAA, High School Postsecondary Readiness)
- Algebra 1 EOC
- Geometry EOC
- Social Studies
- U.S. History EOC
- Civics EOC
- Science
- Science - Elementary School
- Science - Middle School
- Science - High School
- Science - Biology 1 EOC
- STEM
- STEM - All Levels
- STEM - High School
- CTE
- Parental Involvement
- EWS
- EWS - Elementary School
- EWS - Middle School
- EWS - High School
- EWS - Graduation
- Additional Targets

### **Resources Available to Support the Goal**

- LHS administration and a team of academic coaches. HIVE leaders will also support new teachers with instructional assistance. The LHS common planning format greatly allows time to provide for lesson planning, data analysis, and instructional adjustments. Also, LHS will adhere to the Lake Writes plan to increase overall writing scores.



- The District led C2 cohort training will assist with instructional support and expectations.
- District led Instructional Reviews assist to monitor the fidelity of instruction.

**Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal**

- Management distractions that hinder the focus on academic and instructional performance.

**Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal**

Request for administrative assistance.

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Bill Miller

**Target Dates or Schedule:**

Spring 2014

**Evidence of Completion:**

additional administrator

**G2.** Student conduct and discipline will improve. All student discipline (EWS) related data is gathered weekly. Suspensions will be reduced (12%) which should lead to greater instructional time.

### **Targets Supported**

- All Areas
- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- Writing
- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains, Middle School Acceleration, High School, High School AMO's, High School FAA, High School FAA, High School Postsecondary Readiness)
- Algebra 1 EOC
- Geometry EOC
- Social Studies
- U.S. History EOC
- Civics EOC
- Science
- Science - Elementary School
- Science - Middle School
- Science - High School
- Science - Biology 1 EOC
- STEM
- STEM - All Levels
- STEM - High School
- CTE
- Parental Involvement
- EWS
- EWS - Elementary School
- EWS - Middle School
- EWS - High School
- EWS - Graduation
- Additional Targets

### **Resources Available to Support the Goal**

- RTI teacher assistant, Family School liaison, school resource officers, LHS instructional staff, LHS administrative staff, Positive Behavior incentives

### **Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal**

- LHS does not have a school security team in place to monitor hallways, bathrooms, parking lots, and common areas.

### Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

School security team

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Anthony Russell

**Target Dates or Schedule:**

Spring, 2014

**Evidence of Completion:**

Schools security feedback

## Action Plan for Improvement

### Problem Solving Key

**G** = Goal

**B** = Barrier

**S** = Strategy

**G1.** Leesburg will continue to focus on improved student achievement by continuing to focus on improved instructional delivery. LHS has committed to a high degree of support with our high percentage of new instructors.

**G1.B2** Management distractions that hinder the focus on academic and instructional performance.

**G1.B2.S1** The roles of administrators need to be addressed. Asking administrators to monitor instruction and oversee student discipline prevents focusing on academics. Deans to monitor discipline and APs to monitor academics would assist. Due to the amount of time that the admin team devotes to discipline and school management issues, academic coaches are essential in the monitoring of instructional fidelity. Their role of supporting new teachers is also essential for on-going teacher development.

#### **Action Step 1**

Increase administrative personnel to previous levels in order to keep the energy focused on academic improvement. LHS will solicit additional assistance from the District to restore administrative personnel levels. In addition monthly meetings with new teachers will be held on the LHS campus. The school based TQR team will also provide assistance.

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

District and LHS admin team school based mentors and buddies

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Fall 2013-Spring 2014

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Letter to District requesting assistance. TQR minutes and meeting schedule

### **Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B2.S1**

Letter to district requesting assistance. TQR minutes

#### **Person or Persons Responsible**

Bill Miller

#### **Target Dates or Schedule**

Fall 2013

#### **Evidence of Completion**

Copy of letter

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S1

Request for administrative assistance

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Bill Miller

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Winter 2013

#### Evidence of Completion

feedback from letter

**G2.** Student conduct and discipline will improve. All student discipline (EWS) related data is gathered weekly. Suspensions will be reduced (12%) which should lead to greater instructional time.

**G2.B2** LHS does not have a school security team in place to monitor hallways, bathrooms, parking lots, and common areas.

**G2.B2.S1** Contact the district office in regards to establishing a school security team.

#### Action Step 1

Contact Safe Schools department

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Anthony Russell

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Fall 2013

#### Evidence of Completion

Documented feedback from Safe Schools

### Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B2.S1

Safe Schools assistance with a school security team

#### Person or Persons Responsible

Anthony Russell

#### Target Dates or Schedule

Winter, 2013

#### Evidence of Completion

Feedback from Safe Schools

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B2.S1

School security team

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Anthony Russell

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Spring, 2014

**Evidence of Completion**

Continued feedback from Safe Schools

**G2.B2.S2** Solicit input and expertise from the the Safe Schools department in regards to upgrading our school security camera system.

**Action Step 1**

School security team

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Anthony Russell

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Fall 2013

**Evidence of Completion**

Letter to safe schools requesting assistance.

### Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B2.S2

School Security team

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Anthony Russell

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Winter 2013

**Evidence of Completion**

Documentation of assistance

**Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B2.S2**

School security team

**Person or Persons Responsible**

Anthony Russell

**Target Dates or Schedule**

Spring 2014

**Evidence of Completion**

School security team in place

## Coordination and Integration

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

### How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Leesburg High School

Title 1 Plan Outline

2013-2014 Programs

I. Members of the Planning Committee

? Bill Miller, Principal

? Lora Braucher, AP

? Kinetrai Kelly-Truitt, AP

? Roger Rice, AP

? Anthony Russell, AP

? Allison Auld, Bookkeeper

? Kyle Bracewell, Literacy Coach

? Tessa Clark, Science Coach

? Maura Nathanson, FSL

? Amanda Mollet Trivers, Math Coach

II. Dates of Planning Meetings

? April 24, 2013

? May 13, 2013

? May 16, 2013 (SAC)

III. Evidence of Planning with Title I Program Specialist

? April 24, 2013

? May 3, 2013

? May 20, 2013

IV. Evidence of Needs Analysis

Our Needs Analysis is monitored throughout the school year. The leadership team has analyzed data collected from the following sources:

? SIP

? DA Action Plan

? FCAT scores

FCAT Pass Rate

9th Grade Reading 43.3%

10th Grade Reading 38%

Reading Retakes 34.4%

? EOC scores

There were 90 students that passed the Algebra End-of-Course exam out of 300 test takers.

EOC 2012 Pass Rate

Algebra 30%

? LBA data

Students enrolled in all EOC courses took the LBA Baseline in August and the LBA Midyear in December. All subject areas except for US History experienced gains from Baseline to Midyear, ranging from 14% to 21% of students scoring at Level 3 or above.

LBA % L3 or Above Baseline % L3 or Above Midyear

Algebra 8 22

Biology 23 39

Geometry 25 46

Reading (9th) 28 38

Reading (10th) 25 43



US History 38 31

? Attendance

Our average daily attendance rates have been below 90% for the past two years.

Average Daily Attendance

2011 88%

2012 89%

? Student Discipline Referrals

According to a three year trend, discipline incidents are declining slightly.

Tardies ISS OSS

2010 302 285

2011 N/A N/A 284

2012 1116 157 273

? At Risk Data (Graduation)

Total # of Students Total At Risk % At Risk

2012 1622 432 26.63

? Mini-assessments

Mini-assessments were completed in our EOC courses (Algebra, Geometry, Reading, and Biology). Data collected is based on Student Mastery at Level 3 (L3) and above.

Algebra: The Algebra mini-assessment data ranged from 5% to 49% of students that scored at or above L3 on various benchmarks.

Benchmark % L3 or Above Benchmark % L3 or Above

MA.912.A.2.3 9 MA.912.A.4.2 28

MA.912.A.2.4 49 MA.912.A.4.3 5

MA.912.A.3.1 14 MA.912.A.4.4 26

MA.912.A.3.3 6 MA.912.A.5.4 10

MA.912.A.3.4 18 MA.912.A.7.1 15

MA.912.A.3.8 22 MA.912.A.7.2 3

Geometry: The Geometry mini-assessment data ranged from 7% to 82% of students that scored at or above L3 on various benchmarks.

Benchmark % L3 or Above Benchmark % L3 or Above

MA.912.G.1.1 38 MA.912.G.3.4 7

MA.912.G.1.3 65 MA.912.G.4.6 62

MA.912.G.2.2 18 MA.912.G.4.7 49

MA.912.G.2.3 21 MA.912.G.5.4 15

MA.912.G.2.4 23 MA.912.G.8.4 11

MA.912.T.2.1 18 MA.912.D.6.2 82

Reading: The Reading mini-assessment data ranged from 9% to 86% of students that scored at or above L3 on various benchmarks.

Benchmark % L3 or Above Benchmark % L3 or Above

LA.910.1.6.7 30 LA.910.2.1.5 48

LA.910.1.6.9 12 LA.910.2.1.7 9

LA.910.1.7.2 49 LA.910.2.2.1 63

LA.910.1.7.3 53 LA.910.6.1.1 60

LA.910.1.7.4 86 LA.910.6.1.2 54

LA.910.1.7.7 57

Biology: The Biology mini-assessment data ranged from 14% to 64% of students that scored at or above L3 on various benchmarks.

Benchmark % L3 or Above Benchmark % L3 or Above

SC.912.N.1.1 31 SC.912.L.15.13 22

SC.912.L.14.1 47 SC.912.L.16.1 58

SC.912.L.14.3 52 SC.912.L.16.10 24

SC.912.L.14.7 41 SC.912.L.16.13 60

SC.912.L.14.26 57 SC.912.L.16.17 53

SC.912.L.14.36 38 SC.912.L.17.5 64  
SC.912.L.14.52 62 SC.912.L.17.9 51  
SC.912.L.15.1 52 SC.912.L.18.1 24  
SC.912.L.15.6 30 SC.912.L.18.9 15  
SC.912.L.15.8 35 SC.912.L.18.12 14

V. Objectives developed as a result of our Needs Analysis

? Attendance Objectives:

? 92% of students will attend school each day

? We will reduce the number of unexcused tardies to less than 986 for the school year 2013-2014

? EOC Objectives:

? 32% of LHS students will score at or above Level 3 on the Algebra EOC

? 40% of LHS students will score at or above Level 3 on the Geometry EOC

? 40% of LHS students will score at or above Level 3 on the Biology EOC

? 40% of LHS students will score at or above Level 3 on the History EOC

? Reading Objectives:

? 44% of LHS students will score at or above Level 3 on the 9th Grade FCAT Reading test

? 44% of LHS students will score at or above Level 3 on the 10th Grade FCAT Reading test

? Writing Objective:

? 74% of LHS students will score at or above Level 3.5 on the 10th Grade FCAT Writing test

? Graduation Objective:

? 87% of LHS seniors will graduate

? Instructional Objectives:

? All core teachers will use Thinking Maps and Text Dependant Questioning with fidelity in their classrooms

? All teachers will use learning goals and learning scales with fidelity

VI. Professional Development Plan and Budget

? To close the achievement gap and increase scores on EOC assessments and FCAT, instructional strategies must be in place to increase the levels of rigor and relevance in our classrooms.

? Continue the use of the Reading, Mathematics, and Science coaches

? Continue the implementation of the common planning period

a. Teams will meet at least two times per week

b. Common planning minutes will be recorded for each meeting

? Continue the use of the Common Board Configuration

? Continue the use of the Test Item Specifications to guide instruction

? Continue the use of mini-assessments within the FCIM

? Incorporate the use of text dependant questions in core classes

a. Training to be provided during pre-planning and through common planning meetings

? Incorporate Learning Goals and Scales into daily instruction

a. Training to be provided during pre-planning and through common planning meetings

? Based on the increased writing level needed for proficiency in the state criteria, Leesburg High School will continue the utilization of a Literacy Coach. Additionally, LHS will continue the implementation of the school-wide writing program.

? To close the achievement gap and increase scores on EOC assessments and FCAT, training must be offered to increase the levels of rigor and relevance in our classrooms through student engagement.

? Continue the implementation of Kagan strategies and cooperative structures

a. Additional training will be required for new teachers

? Continue the implementation of Thinking Maps into daily instruction

? Continue the implementation of building relationships through Capturing Kids Hearts

? Pre-service training for new teachers by Academic coaches, Administration, and Media Specialist

? Continue the implementation of Lesson Study

Professional Development Budget: \$15,727 (see attached spreadsheet)

VII. Parent Involvement and Budget

? Capacity Building Activities for Parent Involvement that will be implemented:

? Orientation Nights for grades 9 – 12

- ? Family Awareness Nights
  - a. Money Management
  - b. Bullying
  - c. Drug Awareness / Signs
  - d. Interview Practices/Job Application
  - e. New Driver Safety
- ? Educational Awareness Events / Workshops
  - a. FCAT
  - b. EOC's
  - c. Graduation requirements
  - d. Literacy awareness
  - e. eSembler training
  - f. Career and College Readiness
- ? Parent Resource Center will be maintained and accessible to students and parents
  - a. Clothes Closet
  - b. Food Pantry
  - c. School Supplies
  - d. Hygiene Products
  - e. Free/reduced lunch applications
  - f. Community outreach resources
- ? Parent Resources Page on LHS Website with calendars, links, etc.
- ? Methods of reaching out to parents:
  - ? Website updated and maintained daily
  - ? Create a database of parent email addresses
  - ? Callouts
  - ? Quarterly newsletter mailed home
  - ? Attendance calls made by FSL
  - ? LHS Marquee
  - ? Display board at car rider line
  - ? Tracking of Parent Involvement documentation through:
    - ? Sign-in sheets at events
    - ? Emails
    - ? Notices
    - ? Meeting agendas and minutes
    - ? Suggestion box
  - ? Coordination with Title I through:
    - ? Attendance of FSL at Title I Professional Development monthly meetings
    - ? FSL and parent representative will serve on Title I DPIPC
    - ? FSL portal
    - ? Conferences

Parent Involvement Plan and Budget: \$14904.00

#### VIII. Periodic Evaluation Plan

Leesburg High School implements an annual plan to help ensure high expectations and success for all students. Common planning meetings will occur twice a week for each common planning team. Leadership meeting will occur weekly. HIVE (department), HIVE Leader (department chair), SAC, RTI/PBS team, and faculty meetings will occur monthly.

- ? August
  - a. New teacher orientation at LHS will be provided by administration, academic coaches, and the Media Specialist
  - b. Teacher pre-planning days
    - i. Training/PD regarding discipline
    - ii. Training/PD regarding learning goals and scales
    - iii. Training/PD regarding text dependant questioning

- iv. Follow-up training regarding thinking maps
- v. Follow-up training regarding the school-wide writing plan
- vi. Training regarding Common Core State Standards
- vii. HIVE and common planning teams meet
- viii. Focus calendars will be established for each common planning team
- c. Freshman and New Student Orientation
- d. Disaggregated FCAT and EOC achievement data, attendance data, discipline data, RTI/PBS data, and established goals will be reviewed and discussed by the entire staff
- e. ESE and RTI behavior plans will be given to teachers
- f. Parents will have an opportunity to review the amended Title I plan and provide feedback at the monthly SAC meeting
- g. Students enrolled in EOC courses will take the LBA Baseline tests
  - ? September/October
  - a. Data disaggregation regarding LBA data will be discussed in EOC common planning meeting
  - b. FAIR testing
  - c. FCAT retakes
  - d. PLAN test (10th grade)
  - e. Additional professional development regarding Common Core implementation provided by district and academic coaches
  - f. Implementation of the after-school tutoring program
  - g. Deconstruction and analysis of benchmarks and Test Item Specifications
  - h. Report Cards will be distributed and data will be analyzed regarding the Lowest Quartile
  - i. Professional Development seminar (TBD) provided on the teacher workday in October
  - j. Mini-assessments will begin
  - k. Peer visits and Lesson Study will begin
  - l. Educational Awareness Event
  - m. Family Awareness Night
  - n. Quarterly Newsletter
    - ? November/December
    - a. Ongoing mini-assessments will be given and data will be collected and discussed in common planning meetings
    - b. Focus calendars will be adjusted as needed
    - c. Peer visits and lesson study will continue
    - d. LBA Midyear assessments will be administered and data will be disaggregated by the academic coaches, teachers, and administration
    - e. EOC retakes
    - f. Family Awareness Night
      - ? January
      - a. Final Exams
      - b. 1st semester grades and attendance data will be disaggregated and shared with the faculty
      - c. Focus calendars will be adjusted as needed for 2nd semester
      - d. Educational Awareness Event
      - e. Quarterly Newsletter
        - ? February/March
        - a. Mini-assessments will continue
        - b. Peer visits and lesson study will continue
        - c. FCAT Writing test (10th grade)
          - ? April/May
          - a. FCAT retakes
          - b. FCAT Reading
          - c. EOC Exams
          - d. AP Exams
          - e. PERT testing

- f. Title I surveys will be distributed to the staff to assess the program implementation and strategies. The results of the surveys will be discussed with the Leadership team to review and revise the Title I plan.
- g. Parents will be given an opportunity to review and give feedback on the Title I plan at the monthly SAC meeting.
- h. 8th grade showcase
  - ? June
  - a. 2013-2014 FCAT and EOC data will be disaggregated and analyzed by the leadership team. Successes and challenges will be reviewed and adjustments will be made for the 2014-2015 school year.

#### IX. Compliance Narrative

The compliance narrative includes how we will address the Title I mandated compliance objectives and the components of the school-wide program

? A comprehensive needs assessment:

? Reading

- a. LBA Baseline and Midyear data progress monitoring
- b. Weekly administration of mini-assessments
- c. Utilization of and adherence to the focus calendar
- d. Utilization of the FCIM
- e. FAIR Assessment progress monitoring
- f. Common planning meetings two times per week

? Math

- a. LBA Baseline and Midyear data progress monitoring
- b. Bi-weekly administration of mini-assessments in Algebra and Geometry
- c. Utilization of and adherence to the focus calendar
- d. Utilization of the FCIM
- e. Utilization of Blueprints and task cards
- f. Common planning meetings two times per week
- g. Implementation of Common Core State Standards in specified classes

? Science

- a. LBA Baseline, Midyear, and End-of-year data progress monitoring
- b. Weekly administration of mini-assessments
- c. Utilization of and adherence to the focus calendar
- d. Utilization of the FCIM
- e. Common planning meetings two times per week

? Writing

- a. FCAT Writing practice prompts
- b. School-wide writing plan

? FIDO Attendance reports

? FIDO Discipline reports

? School-wide reform strategies

The following are all the initiatives that Leesburg High School has undertaken to improve student achievement.

? Common planning meetings

? 5x7 schedule

? Differentiated instruction

? Instructional focus calendars

? School-wide writing plan

? Student mentoring program

? Edusoft training

? Thinking Maps training

? RTI/PBS process

? DBQs

? After-school tutoring program

? Family School Liaison

- ? Literacy coach
- ? Math coach
- ? Science coach
- ? Title I teachers and assistants
- ? Mini-assessments
- ? LBAs
- ? Kagan training
- ? EOC remediation courses
- ? Online courses
- ? CTE programs
- ? Cross-curricular meetings
- ? Lesson study
- ? Peer visits and observations
- ? Instruction by highly qualified teachers
- ? All teachers are highly qualified
- ? High quality, ongoing professional development
- ? Common core training
- ? Thinking maps training
- ? Text dependant questioning training
- ? HOTS training
- ? Kagan/Cooperative Structures training
- ? Edusoft training
- ? Learning goals training
- ? Learning scales training
- ? New teacher initiation
- ? Lesson study
- ? Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers
- ? Ongoing professional development
- ? Team planning
- ? 5x7 schedule with common planning period built in
- ? New teacher mentoring program
- ? Recruiting through college and career placement programs
- ? Strategies to increase parental involvement
- ? New student orientation
- ? Quarterly newsletters
- ? Attendance phone calls
- ? Family awareness nights
- ? Educational awareness events
- ? SAC meetings
- ? Parent resource center
- ? Marquee
- ? Call-outs
- ? School compact
- ? Plans for assistant 8th grade students in transition from middle school
- ? Guidance counselor visits
- ? Freshman orientation
- ? 8th grade showcase
- ? Measures to include teachers in decisions regarding academic assessments
- ? Common planning meetings
- ? Students who experience difficulty mastering benchmarks or proficient/advanced levels of academic achievement on state standards shall be provided the following:
- ? After-school tutoring
- ? Differentiated instruction

? RTI procedure implementation

? Two Title I teachers to provide intensive Language Arts and ACT classes to students in need, as determined by FCAT scores

? A Title I teacher to provide intensive math classes to students in need, as determined by FCAT scores

? A Title I teacher to provide a freshman foundations class for selected students, as determined by FCAT scores, FAIR results, and recommendation from the middle school

? A Title I teacher to reduce the number of students in US History (EOC class)

? A Title I teacher to reduce the number of students in Biology (EOC class)

? A Title I teacher to provide online credit recovery

? A Title I teacher to provide online critical thinking skills

? A Title I guidance counselor to provide progress monitoring and mentoring for students in the lowest quartile

? A Title I Teacher's Assistant or Paraprofessional to provide RTI assistance and intervention

? Use of PENDA in math and science classes

? Coordination and integration of federal, state, and local services programs

? Title I Grant—Assistance for struggling students

? IDEA—Assistance for ESE students

? Title II Grant—Literacy coach

? SAI—Assistance for struggling students

? Title X—Assistance for homeless students

? Title III—English language acquisition

X. Budget Narrative

? Reasonable

? All requests are tied directly to student achievement and resources will be utilized to address areas of need and improve student achievement

? Necessary

? The additional personnel, resources, and professional development requested are necessary for the fulfillment of the School Improvement Plan for 2013-2014

? Allocable

? Leesburg High School qualifies as a school-wide Title I school, based on data from our feeder elementary schools

? Allowable

? All requested items are allowable for purchases for Title I

## Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

*Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.*



## Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals