South Lake High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

South Lake High School

15600 SILVER EAGLE RD, Groveland, FL 34736

https://slh.lake.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Steven Benson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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)	83%
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 Native American Students* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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

South Lake High School

15600 SILVER EAGLE RD, Groveland, FL 34736

https://slh.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	56%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	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 South Lake High School is to prepare independent, responsible, life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

South Lake High School is committed to an educational process that fosters independence and responsibility in our students. By offering diverse, challenging academic programs in small learning communities and rich co-curricular activities, South Lake High School strives to provide all students with the skills and knowledge to achieve their potential as life-long learners.

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
Jesaitis, Donna	Assistant Principal	South Lake High School 2020-21 Administrative Assignments Steven Benson, Principal Assessment Groups: Assistant Principals (5) Bookkeepers (2) Graduation Resource Facilitator Literacy Coach School Secretary Allocations Budget: Discretionary & Internal Curriculum -All Contracts - School Expulsion Hearings Leadership Team Leave Forms – All Staff Morning Announcements Professional Development Public Relations Room Assignments School Advisory Council (SAC) School Messenger-Call Out SIP-Overall School Resource Deputy Contact Teacher/Employee Recognition Week at a Glance Donna Jesaitis- Assistant Principal (Main Campus) Discipline: 9th/10th/11th Grade (M-Ri) Assessment Groups: AVID, Social Studies (15), Guidance (5), Mental Health Liaison, VL Facilitator, Data Entry Operators (2), Guidance Secretaries (2) Responsibilities: Academic Events - Recognition, College Visits AP & College Board AP Testing AVID Bell Schedules/Adjustments Eagle Pride Night Master Schedule Program Guide – Course Offerings, Honors Criteria Prom

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities

SAI Budget
SAC Contact
Virtual Learning Lab (FLVS, LVS)
Yearbook Proofing

Linda Nichols-
Assistant Principal
(Main Campus)
Discipline: 12th Grade
Assessment Groups: ESE (16.6), ESE School Specialists (1.5), Foreign
Lang. (4), PASS, ELL/ESE Teacher Assistants (9), Clerical Assistants (4)
Responsibilities:
ELL Contact
Early Release Schedules
Facility Usage
Fundraisers
Graduation
Juvenile Justice
New Teacher Orientation
Restorative Practices
School Plus/Administrative Detention/PASS/PBS
Senior Activities
Substitute Contact
Teacher Quality Retention
Vendor Visits
Yearbook Proofing

Michael Spencer-
Assistant Principal
(Main Campus)
Discipline: 9th/10th/11th Grade (Rj-Z)
Assessment Groups: Athletic Trainer, Fine Arts (5), Mathematics (14), ILS,
Media Specialist, Custodians (18)
Responsibilities:
Flex Time Period – Intervention/Acceleration
Athletics – ADs, Boosters, Facilities, Financials
Band/Chorus Booster Liaison – Financials/Meetings
Copiers
Credit Recovery Program (E2020)
Freshman Orientation
Math Remediation
Pep Rallies
Scholarship Signings - Athletics
School Website/Social Media
Technology
Textbooks

Rene James-
Assistant Principal

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		(Flight Academy) Discipline: 9th/10th/11th Grade (A-D) Assessment Groups: PE (5), ROTC (2), Science (11), Testing Coordinator, School Nurse, Food Service (15) Responsibilities: Business Partners – Chamber, Ed. Foundation, etc. Cafeteria Operations Clubs/Student Organizations Field Trips Freshman Orientation Health Coordinator Health Science Collegiate Academy Lead Homecoming STEM Teen Parent Coordinator Testing (Overall – EOC/FSA/FSAA/SAT) Transportation Volunteers All Administrators' Responsibilities Classroom Learning Walks/Feedback Data Analysis – Performance Matters Emergency Lesson Plans (Dwyer) Expulsion Packets FTE Counts Grade Level Attendance Monitoring/Intervention Grade Level Early Warning Signs Data Graduation Rate Monitoring/At-Risk Seniors MTSS/RTI – Grade Level Parent Conferences – Grade Level Hiring – Assessment Groups Lunch Duty PLC's Safety Protocols School Improvement Plan Student Activities Supervision of Campus Testing Facilitation Kevin Thompson– Assistant Principal (Flight Academy) Discipline: 9th/10th/11th Grade (E-L) Assessment Groups:, CTE (11), ELA (14), Reading (4), Responsibilities Attendance Monitoring & Intervention CTE Industry Certification Testing Fines List Freshman Orientation Lockers

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Middle School Liaison Parking: Student & Staff Radios Safe Schools Coordinator Security Cameras Teacher Supervision Duty Transportation (Support) Voting – TOY, RTOY, SREOY, VOY Wellness Leader Lora Calton-Zinn (Literacy Coach) New Teacher Support Intensive Reading & ACT Prep Support MTSS Reading/Writing Strategies School-wide Mandy Shafer (Graduation Resource Facilitator) Graduation Support for at-risk students Acceleration Monitoring for all students
Nichols, Linda	Assistant Principal	
Spencer, Michael	Assistant Principal	
James, Irene	Assistant Principal	
Calton, Lora	Instructional Coach	
Shafer, Mandy	Instructional Coach	
Benson, Steve	Principal	
Thompson, Kevin	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Steven Benson

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.*

1

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

105

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)	83%
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 Native American Students* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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	479	441	456	388	1764
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	75	86	213
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	36	21	89
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	94	89	234
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	94	81	226
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	209	43	252
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	136	44	9	213

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	315	354	329	998

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	43	2	45
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	9	3	24

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/4/2020

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	498	522	586	417	2023
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	84	92	127	369
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	51	25	32	155
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320	391	343	98	1152
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	232	241	192	162	827

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196	232	231	228	887

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	17	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	12	14	47

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498	522	586	417	2023
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	84	92	127	369
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	51	25	32	155
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320	391	343	98	1152
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	232	241	192	162	827

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196	232	231	228	887

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
							Grade Level							
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	17	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	12	14	47

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	48%	50%	56%	42%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	46%	51%	39%	45%	49%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	33%	42%	33%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	43%	44%	51%	33%	44%	49%
Math Learning Gains	54%	45%	48%	28%	41%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	36%	45%	19%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	65%	68%	68%	55%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	69%	73%	65%	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	44%	47%	-3%	55%	-11%
	2018	46%	46%	0%	53%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	50%	48%	2%	53%	-3%
	2018	45%	49%	-4%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

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	63%	66%	-3%	67%	-4%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	58%	61%	-3%	65%	-7%
Compare		5%			

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	63%	67%	-4%	70%	-7%
2018	64%	69%	-5%	68%	-4%
Compare		-1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	31%	52%	-21%	61%	-30%
2018	37%	62%	-25%	62%	-25%
Compare		-6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	49%	-2%	57%	-10%
2018	52%	50%	2%	56%	-4%
Compare		-5%			

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	19	26	19	17	51	44	37	24		80	18
ELL	13	39	42	18	35	33	25	60		70	
AMI	36										
ASN	51	24		35	43		67	69		100	58
BLK	40	41	36	32	48	43	50	53		85	36
HSP	39	41	30	36	47	41	58	59		84	49
MUL	65	68		50	53		87	71		86	50
WHT	55	52	40	54	62	38	73	69		87	49
FRL	36	39	35	33	41	42	56	55		80	35

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	17	31	27	27	33		21	39		70	24
ELL	10	30	33	18	36			27			
AMI	15	33		40							
ASN	62	64		60	57		65	64		70	
BLK	38	43	31	35	37	25	47	56		71	35
HSP	39	38	38	44	48	37	52	59		73	56
MUL	61	47		55	60		67			65	64
WHT	53	42	30	55	51	31	68	73		78	65
FRL	38	38	34	41	44	29	50	58		66	50
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	10	18	17	13	21	18	21	32		69	22
ELL	11	11	20	16	19						
AMI	50	33		40	14						
ASN	60	43		48	27		54	59		85	64
BLK	21	36	33	14	21	20	46	50		72	39
HSP	37	33	24	24	23	22	43	57		70	51
MUL	57	50		31	16		50	85			
WHT	49	43	43	42	35	19	64	75		76	44
FRL	32	32	27	25	24	19	43	53		62	36

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	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	584
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
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	36
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	56
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	46
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	66
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	58
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	46
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.

ESSA Components under 41% - Students with Disabilities (34%), English Language Learners (39%), Native American Students (36%).

Algebra 1 (31%). Student performance on the Algebra 1 EOC dropped across the board at nearly all Lake high schools in 2018-19. Significant skill gaps remain for students already behind when they enter Algebra 1. Intervention and monitoring is needed with students in the lowest 25% subgroup, as well as earlier analysis and intervention for all math students in areas that they are deficient in.

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

Algebra 1 (-6). All Lake high schools dropped significantly in Algebra 1 in 2018-19. We collaborated between schools to determine next steps and how to improve the daily instruction and learning opportunities for students in Algebra 1.

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.

FSA ELA 9th grade (-11%). We believe that increased and more consistent reading, writing, thinking, and talking opportunities are needed. We implemented the PATHS curriculum in 9th grade in 2019-20 in an effort to make those opportunities more consistent while ensuring that the necessary skills/ standards are targeted.

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

Math Learning Gains of the lowest 25% (+8%). Maintained a Google Doc among all Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers to monitor and track the progress of the lowest 25%. Data chats were held with administrators/teachers on a quarterly basis to discuss, along with weekly PLCs.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Students with one or more suspensions, students scoring level 1 on a state assessment

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

1. ESSA-Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Native American Students - All Areas
2. Algebra 1 EOC
3. 9th & 10th grade ELA
4. Geometry
5. US History

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase positive and responsible behaviors within our student population. Continue PBS, increase the use of Restorative Practice techniques, implement PASS and its curriculum, all for the purpose of encouraging students to S.O.A.R. to new heights and thus decrease the amount negative student behaviors, decrease the number of student disciplinary actions, and promote leadership qualities in all students.
Measurable Outcome:	1. With the continuance of PBS, we hope to increase the positive aspect of our school culture by increasing overall student involvement in extracurricular activities, a decrease in student referrals, and an overall increase of our school grade from a "C" to a "B." 2. With a school-wide implementation of Restorative Practices, particularly circles, we hope to increase student community and increase grades and reduce failures across the grade levels, to include raising our graduation rate. 3. With the implementation of PASS, we are looking to decrease the number of out-of-school suspensions as well as increase positive behaviors amongst students who receive referrals worthy of suspension.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Linda Nichols (nicholsl1@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. PBS 2. PASS and its curriculum 3. Restorative Practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By encouraging and rewarding students to increase their levels of self and school pride by being on time to class, being accountable for themselves, and being accountable to others; they will be less likely to engage in negative behaviors, and it will foster a positive culture and climate at our school.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Form a PBS Team, attend summer training, and meet monthly as a team
2. Continue training and support for the PASS teacher, who will be responsible for running the program with school administration and district support.
3. Train more teachers in Restorative Practices techniques, to include modeling it within faculty meetings and allowing teachers, during planning time, to observe other classes using the circles in a positive manner.

Person Responsible   Linda Nichols (nicholsl1@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase achievement in ELA & Reading departments school-wide The English/Language Arts department and Reading department will raise the passing rate on the FSA ELA Grades 9 and 10 to meet or exceed state results from the 2018-2019 SY, whichever is higher. We will meet or exceed the ESSA requirement of greater than 41% proficiency in the target areas of Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Native American students. We will accomplish this goal by utilizing standards-based instructional strategies in our common planning and department meetings, with emphasis on establishing Focused Instruction (purpose, modeling, Think-Alouds, Noticing) in the lessons taught by using Guided Instruction ((Questioning, Prompting, Cueing), Collaborative Learning (Consolidating Thinking with Peers), and Independent Learning (Application of what has been taught) to insure a gradual release of informational responsibility. Areas that need additional reinforcement, reteaching, or individual/group learning opportunities will be addressed through a thirty (30) minute intervention time (Flex Time), four (4) days per week.
Measurable Outcome:	1. Teachers will be coached on the Focused Instruction model. 2. Overall, school-wide ELA Achievement will increase by a minimum of 8% (48% to 56%) to meet or exceed the State score from the 2018-2019 SY of 56%. 3. Overall, school-wide ELA Learning Gains will increase by a minimum of 7% (46% to 53%) to meet or exceed the State score from the 2018-2019 SY of 53%. 4. Overall, school-wide ELA Lowest 25% (Lowest Quartile) will increase by a minimum of 9% (35% to 44%) to meet or exceed the State score from the 2018-2019 SY of 44%. 5. Second-year implementation of PATHS ELA curriculum for all 9th grade ELA classes, with school administration and district support. 6. Continue to utilize the Sylvan ACT Prep course as a means of helping our 11th & 12th grade prepare for the ACT as an alternative for the FSA ELA graduation requirement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Thompson (thompsonc@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Implementation of Focused Learning: A Framework for the Gradual Release of Responsibility (Fisher & Frey) 2. Second-year Implementation of PATHS ELA curriculum in 9th grade ELA classes, to include support from the district office 3. Continued Implementation of ACHIEVE 3000 in Reading classes 4. Continual support via our Literacy Coach, Lora Calton-Zinn 5. Continual implementation of the Sylvan ACT Prep Course for our 11th & 12th graders 6. Focused support (remediation/acceleration) during intervention time (Flex Time) thirty minutes per day, four days per week.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on the success the Focused Instruction model has experienced in the San Diego Unified School District where Doug Fisher teaches, our district has adopted this framework county-wide as a means of increasing student achievement. The PATHS curriculum has also been adopted by the district and is being phased into high schools at the 9th and 10th grade levels as a means of increasing student achievement. ACHIEVE 3000 has been used for several years within the district and is being continued.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Conduct classroom walkthroughs with a focus on purpose, asking students what they are learning, why they are learning it, and how do they know when they have learned it? Monitor/visit intervention time to support teachers in remediation/acceleration of individual/groups of students based on area of need.
2. Coach teachers on the Focused Instruction model, helping students work through the gradual repease

model of the teacher demonstrating what needs to happen, the teacher and students doing this process together, the students doing this process together while the teacher observes and coaches, and then the student being able to do it on their own. This will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs and TEAM evaluations.

3. Second-year Implementation of the PATHS within the 9th grade ELA classes as a means of helping implement Focused Instruction via a newer, proven model. This will be monitored by school administration, the Literacy Coach, and district personnel to insure fidelity in this first year roll out.

4. Continued monitoring of ACHIEVE 3000 achievement, using ACHIEVE 3000 data and correlating it with other data, like LSA's, standard mastery, and overall class grade improvement.

5. Analyze student data from the 2018-19 SY, particularly the Lowest 25%, and begin monitoring those students achievement, using 2019-20 LSA Q1, Q2, and Q3, class grades, and other formative assessments employed by the teacher. Teachers will record this data in shared Google Drive sheet.

Person Responsible   Kevin Thompson (thompsonc@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Raise the passing rate on the Algebra 1 End of Course Exam and Geometry End of Course Exam by 3 percent each. Improve the learning gains of the lowest 25 percent math students by 3 percent. We will meet or exceed the ESSA requirement of greater than 41% proficiency in the target areas of Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Native American students. Despite making gains in 2 out of 3 of these areas, we still have not achieved the scores we are aspiring to. In 2019, our Algebra 1 End of Course Exam pass percentage decreased from 37 percent in 2018 to 31 percent in 2019. In 2019, our Geometry End of Course Exam pass percentage decreased from 52 percent in 2018 to 48 percent in 2019. In 2019, 39 percent of our lowest 25 percent math students made learning gains, which was an increase of 8 percent from 2018. However, 61 percent of our lowest 25 percent students still did not make learning gains. Due to COVID-19, 2020 state assessments were not conducted.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase our pass percentage by 3 percent from 2019 to 2020 in the following areas: Algebra 1 End of Course Exam, Geometry End of Course Exam, and Learning Gains of the lowest 25 percent math students. We intend to increase our Algebra 1 End of Course Exam pass percentage from 31 percent to 34 percent. We intend to increase our Geometry End of Course Exam pass percentage from 48 percent to 51 percent. We intend to increase the percentage of our lowest 25 percent math students who make learning gains from 39 percent to 42 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Spencer (spencerm@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitoring and tracking the academic progress of our Lowest 25 percent math students on our shared Google Sheet will help increase the Learning Gains of our Lowest 25 percent math students from 39 percent in 2019 to 42 percent in 2020. To monitor this strategy, our Administrative Team, Algebra 1 teachers, Geometry teachers, and Strategic Team will track and analyze the academic progress of these students and develop plans to remediate them on content they struggle with. We will track their classroom data and Lake Standards Assessment Data to determine which standards they need the most help with. We will use iXL and Flex Time as strategies to remediate these students. Focused support (remediation/acceleration) during intervention time (Flex Time) thirty minutes per day, four days per week.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In 2019, 39 percent of our lowest 25 percent math students made learning gains, which was an increase of 8 percent from 2018. However, 61 percent of our lowest 25 percent students still did not make learning gains. We want to use these evidence based strategies to continue to have success with our Lowest 25 percent math students while helping even more of them to make learning gains this year.
Action Steps to Implement	

1. Provide lowest 25 percent math students list to teachers. Make this an ongoing conversation in their PLC meetings.
2. Frequent Learning Walks and feedback.
3. Analyze and discuss quarterly LSA's as well as teacher-made assessments.
4. Conduct a mock EOC and compare to last year's EOC results.
5. Use the Flex Time Intervention/Acceleration period to provide remediation for our lowest 25 percent students.
6. Use iXL to identify low performing standards amongst our math students and use these programs to

provide remediation on these select standards.

7. Work with all ESSA subgroups to ensure they test at 41% or higher. (Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Native American students)

Person Responsible	Michael Spencer (spencerm@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Purpose-Focuses on student learning rather than a task, activity or assignment and must be interesting and relevant. A learner who understands the purpose of a new skill (Purpose/Relevancy) and gets an opportunity to see it executed by an expert (Modeling) is going to grasp the details more thoroughly. Students should not have to guess about the purpose. They should be able to answer: "What are you learning today? Why are you learning this? How will you know that you have learned it?" The learner must also understand the relevancy of the content or skill being learned, specifically: how the information can be used outside the walls of the classroom, involving students directly, and by noting the value of the lesson in becoming an educated member of the community. (The Teacher Clarity Playbook pg. 54-55)
Measurable Outcome:	100% of teachers state the purpose daily in conjunction with what is written on their Common Board Configuration (CBC), explain the "why" to the students, and ensure that students understand how they will know when they have learned/mastered the purpose of the lesson.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Steve Benson (bensons@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ask students three questions related to purpose when conducting learning walks. Provide feedback to the individual teacher about the student responses. Share trends with the faculty on a consistent basis, as gleaned from the learning walk tool responses.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Understanding the purpose (what, why, how) is fundamental to the learning process and is a key component of the district's instructional framework. Examples, non-examples, and rationiales are taken from Doug Fisher and Nancy Frey's book "Better Learning through Structured Teaching".

Action Steps to Implement

1. Introduce the district instructional framework one-pager (Mr. Benson - Preplanning and at every faculty meeting)
2. Train teacher's on the purpose component as stated in the district instructional framework. (Mr. Benson - monthly faculty meetings, specifically August-October)
3. Conduct learning walks with purpose being the look-for in conjunction with the three questions asked of students. (Administrative team - weekly)
4. Provide feedback to teachers (Administrative team - weekly)
5. Share school-wide trend data and make adjustments as necessary (Mr. Benson - quarterly)

Person Responsible	Steve Benson (bensons@lake.k12.fl.us)

#5. Other specifically relating to Graduation Rate	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase on time graduation rate and student acceleration. To comply with the School District's expectations that each high school exceed a 90% graduation rate and increase student acceleration.
Measurable Outcome:	South Lake High School plans to exceed a 90% graduation rate and to continue to increase school acceleration to over 53%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Linda Nichols (nicholsl1@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	At-risk students will be identified, monitored, and offered early interventions in order to meet graduation requirements and graduate on time, with their cohort. The graduating cohort will be given multiple opportunities to receive an acceleration point upon graduation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By looking at test scores, credits, and GPA, students' academic progress will be tracked. By identifying students who are at-risk of not graduating on time, all stakeholders can proactively prepare academic services and offer remediation opportunities for those students to meet graduation requirements. Taking an evidence-based approach to instruct and support students from the time they enter 9th grade, and throughout the next four years, will increase the likelihood of on time graduation. Also, from the time a student enters 9th grade, the student will be scheduled into a CTE program, AP course, and/or dual enrolled. Intentional scheduling will offer students multiple opportunities to achieve an acceleration point and to make them more prepared for college and career.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement a graduation action plan consisting of a progress monitoring system
2. Identify at-risk students; provide early interventions and mentors
3. Conference with students, parents, and teachers
4. Schedule at-risk students in Reading for College Success class
5. Provide frequent opportunities for alternate testing to meet concordant scores through ACT, SAT, and PERT 6. Provide multiple credit recovery opportunities
7. Schedule students in CTE, AP, and/or Dual Enrollment course
8. Acceleration data will be tracked and monitored

Person Responsible	Linda Nichols (nicholsl1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Addressed in the Areas of Focus

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.

Formed a Guiding Coalition, representative of our student population, to monitor equity and improve academic, extra-curricular, and social opportunities for all students. Created a school data picture, in alignment with the recommendation by Dr. Anthony Muhammad, to guide the monthly work of the coalition. Engaging our SAC in the same equity focus.

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: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports					$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA					$3,565.20
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	5100	150-Aides	0701 - South Lake High School	School Improvement Funds		$2,000.00	
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0701 - South Lake High School	School Improvement Funds		$1,524.00	
	5100	220-Social Security	0701 - South Lake High School	School Improvement Funds		$29.00	
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	0701 - South Lake High School	School Improvement Funds		$12.20	
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math					$17,137.20
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0701 - South Lake High School	School Improvement Funds		$8,267.70	

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0701 - South Lake High School	School Improvement Funds		$7,500.00
	5100	210-Retirement	0701 - South Lake High School			$750.00
	5100	220-Social Security	0701 - South Lake High School			$573.75
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	0701 - South Lake High School	School Improvement Funds		$45.75
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**				**$0.00**
5	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Other: Graduation Rate**				**$1,182.60**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6120	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0701 - South Lake High School	School Improvement Funds		$1,000.00
	6120	210-Retirement	0701 - South Lake High School	School Improvement Funds		$100.00
	6120	220-Social Security	0701 - South Lake High School	School Improvement Funds		$76.50
	6120	240-Workers Compensation	0701 - South Lake High School	School Improvement Funds		$6.10
					Total:	**$21,885.00**