

Lake County Schools

Tavares High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

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: 8/14/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2019-20 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%)
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 was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	62%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stein, Jacob	Principal	Lead Learner Oversee Professional Learning Communities Articulation between all curriculum areas Scheduling Addressing Equity and Equality between all subgroups Start Date 7/19/2020
Hall, Carl	Assistant Principal	Oversee the ELA and Reading Departments
Glass, Richard (Bryan)	Assistant Principal	Oversee the Social Studies Department
Farnsworth, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Oversee the ESE and Science Departments. Also work with graduation facilitator to assist with students.
Campbell, Randy	Assistant Principal	Oversee the Math and ESE Departments.
Lester, Carolyn	Instructional Coach	Work with all teachers to incorporate reading strategies into instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/14/2020, Jacob Stein

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

29

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

31

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

75

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	0	351	305	310	310	1276
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	60	75	64	238
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	25	15	10	80
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	30	40	4	115
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	30	39	5	115
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	67	71	79	294
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	46	30	105	227

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	204	241	221	163	829

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	10	21

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/27/2020

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		
Number of students enrolled	0	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	0	54	62	70	73	259
One or more suspensions	0	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	0	76	68	46	190
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	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	0	3	1	12	4	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	12	6	32

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		
Number of students enrolled	0	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	0	54	62	70	73	259
One or more suspensions	0	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	0	76	68	46	190
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	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	0	3	1	12	4	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	12	6	32

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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
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

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
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
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%	0
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%	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	54
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	44
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	49
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	42
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	56
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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 -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?

- 1) A major area of concern for Tavares High School is attendance below 90%.
- 2) Also, we need to address the equity between subgroups, with a special focus on Black and Hispanic males and economically disadvantaged students.

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

1. Achievement Gap - focus on minority males and economically disadvantaged students
2. Lowest quartile gains in ELA.
3. Lowest quartile gains in Math.
4. ELL performance
5. ELA Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 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. 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.

Measurable Outcome: By focusing on this area, we expect to see increases in state FSA and EOC data from 28 percent to 53 percent in ELA and from 39 percent to 50 percent in math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jacob Stein (steinj@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 Steps to Implement

1. Identify and notify the teachers of lowest quartile students with emphasis on the SWD and ELL.

When: 8/17/20- 9/12/21

Frequency: monthly

Evidence: ESE Logs, ELL Logs, and data chat schedule

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

2. Deliberate scheduling of learning opportunities time

When: 9/3/20- 4/30/21

Frequency: weekly

Evidence: Flex Time scheduler reports

Person Responsible Richard (Bryan) Glass (glassb@lake.k12.fl.us)

3. Create, administer, and evaluate formative assessments in tested areas

When: 9/13/20-4/24/21

Frequency: twice per nine weeks

Evidence: formative assessments and data from the assessments

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

5. Use ESE funds and personnel to support SWD

When 9/1/20- 5/29/21

Frequency: Daily

Evidence: Support Logs, Meeting Logs, and Intervention Documentation

Person Responsible Randy Campbell (campbellr@lake.k12.fl.us)

6. Use of ELL support staff and resources

When 9/1/20- 5/29/21

Frequency: Daily

Evidence: Meeting Logs, Teacher Assistant Documentation, WIDA Scores

Person Responsible Richard (Bryan) Glass (glassb@lake.k12.fl.us)

7. Writing Teams will be developed to create and monitor common assessments and data related to them as well as create remediation and enrichment activities for individual standards.

When: June 2021

Frequency: Monthly

Evidence Common assessments, data notebooks, enrichment and remediation activities

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2019 -2020 early warning systems data, males of color receive a higher number of discipline referrals than other subgroups , at 1.5 times more likely to have two or more discipline referrals, while achieving below the other racial subgroup cohorts in both reading and math proficiency. We believe that discipline has a direct effect on student success inside the classroom.

Measurable Outcome: Through the 20-21 early warning systems data, males of color will decrease the likelihood of receiving two or more referrals by 10 percent from 25 percent to 15 percent.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carl Hall (hallc2@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Formation of the equity guiding coalition, to review academic and discipline data, discuss educational and extra-curricular opportunities, and advise administration through recommendations addressing need of all students will decrease the number of males of color receiving two or more referrals by 10 percent . To monitor progress towards this goal, monthly early warning system data will be used by the guiding coalition.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we implement, monitor and support the guiding coalition the there will be a decrease of two or more discipline referrals by males of color by 10 percent for the 20-21 school year.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Create and develop the guiding coalition by selecting a diverse committee from all stake-holders, which includes faculty, staff, parents, students and community members that will meet monthly to review data and discuss recommendations for school culture improvement.

When: 8/17/20-6/9/21

Frequency: Monthly

Evidence: Monthly meeting agendas, EWS discipline and academic data

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

2) Implement additional Advance Placement and Pre-Advance Placement programs while increasing enrollment in existing programs.

When 8/17/20-6/2/21

Frequency; Bi-annual

Evidence: master schedule, student rosters, performance tasks

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

3) Create and implement mentoring program focusing on lowest quartile juniors and seniors to prepare for academic success and post secondary transition.

When 9/2020 -6/2021

Frequency: Weekly

Evidence: mentoring logs, Test Scores, and grades

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

4) Tutoring will be provided to students needing assistance, in meeting the full intent of the standard, based on LSA test data and teacher graded assignments.

When: 10/20-4/21

Frequency: Weekly

Evidence: Tutoring Logs, LSA Data and student feedback

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2018-2019 Florida State Assessments data and Lake County Schools Lake Standards Assessment data form 2019-2020 of the needs assessment, Collaboration from the Lake County Instructional Framework is one of our most critical areas of focus. The area of focus is most critical because of the FSA Lowest Quartile in both ELA and Math. Collaboration is a key to the comprehension and application of standards.

Measurable Outcome: By focusing on this area, we expect to see increases in lowest quartile proficiency from 41% to 53% in ELA and from 28% to 40% in math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carolyn Lester (lesterc@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Working with teachers in weekly PLC meetings focused on designing lessons incorporating student collaboration as a key component will increase ELA proficiency of lowest quartile from 41% to 53% in ELA and from 28% to 40% in Math. To monitor this strategy classroom walk-throughs, LSA data and common assessments will be analyzed weekly by the PLC teams, administration, and academic coaches.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we implement, monitor and support weekly PLC meetings focused on designing lessons incorporating student collaboration as a key component then there will be an increase from 41% to 53% in ELA and from 28% to 40% in Math.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Create and schedule weekly PLC meetings with departments.

When: 9/8/20-5/28/21
 Frequency: Weekly
 Evidence: Weekly sign-in sheets and PLC Calendar

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

2) Create monthly professional development opportunities at the PLC meetings to focus on how teachers can incorporate student collaboration in lesson planning.

When: 9/8/20-5/28/21
 Frequency: Monthly
 Evidence: PD sign in sheets and monthly PD agenda

Person Responsible Jennifer Farnsworth (farnsworthj1@lake.k12.fl.us)

3) Classroom walk-throughs focused on the instructional framework and gathering trends and evidence of student collaboration.

When: 10/15/20-5/28/21
 Frequency: Monthly
 Evidence: Data collected in Walk-through forms and administrator feedback forms.

Person Responsible Randy Campbell (campbellr@lake.k12.fl.us)

4) Grade Recovery opportunities will be provided using the Edgenuity and school created assessments before and after school.
 When 10/20-4/21
 Frequency: Weekly
 Evidence: Student Grade Reports, Edgenuity logs and teacher logs

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The Tavares High School administration will progress monitor student performance by conducting classroom walk-throughs, implementing common assessments, reviewing and discussing LSA Data, and continuing the development of Professional Learning Communities. By incorporating and monitoring these practices Tavares High School will continue working towards achieving higher academic and performance categories while closing the equity and achievement gaps.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

N/A

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	\$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00