



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

# Leesburg High School

1401 YELLOW JACKET WAY, Leesburg, FL 34748

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Randolph Michael**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/4/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (40%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

# Leesburg High School

1401 YELLOW JACKET WAY, Leesburg, FL 34748

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>85%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>59%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
<b>Grade</b>	C	C	C	C

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Leesburg High School is working together to find success in all students.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Through our collective belief, skill, and will, each Leesburg High School student will graduate with the skills necessary for success in either college/university, a career, or the military.

### 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
Randolph, Michael	Principal	<p>Mr. Randolph Principal: Conducts weekly administration meetings to align instructional and operational priorities to school improvement goals; communicates school improvement goals to stakeholders and school advisory council; works in conjunction with district and school staff to provide a safe, learning environment for all students; outlines programs and initiatives to support school improvement goals; meets frequently with Graduation Facilitator to monitor graduation rate and implement plans for at-risk seniors; conduct frequent meetings with instructional coaches in accordance with school improvement goals; conducts frequent learning walks and observations to provide feedback to instructional personnel as well as compile data from these walks to identify instructional trends and determine professional development needs for the staff; conducts supervision and guidance in accordance with the school's AICE Cambridge Program.</p>
Demps, Tammy	Assistant Principal	<p>Utilize classroom learning walk data and school improvement goals to develop and coordinate professional development needs for the staff; construct and coordinate master schedule; collaborates with Guidance staff members in tracking students' graduation requirements. provide instructional leadership to the English and Reading Departments by conducting classroom learning walk and sharing in best practices in common planning; collaborates with instructional coaches to identify trends impacting student achievement with data analysis and developing plans to offer additional interventions for teacher instruction and student learning, coordinate site-based professional development and teacher planning opportunities; coordinate collection of MTSS data; and facilitates problem-solving team.</p>
Griffin-Gay, Monique	Assistant Principal	<p>Utilizes classroom data to identify trends and develop professional development needs as well as instructional leadership to Social Studies department by conducting learning walks and identifying needs for increased EOC achievement among US History students; provides leadership to CTE departments to determine instructional and professional development needs for and Industry Certification; develops mentorship opportunities for identified students of color and lower quartile students in collaboration with Graduation Facilitator and AVID coordinator; assists principal with coordinating and implementing the AICE Cambridge program school-wide; implement testing school schedule and coordination in conjunction with the school's Testing Coordinator.</p>



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Allen, Christie	Instructional Coach	Provides professional development school-wide to support authentic literacy efforts that align with the school improvement goals; facilitates ELA common planning with alignment to standards and site-based instructional initiatives; conduct weekly classroom learning walks to provide timely feedback and support to teachers attends district Literacy Coach meetings; collaborates with administration conducting professional development and coaching; and provides student pull-out support for students identified as the lower quartile in ELA. She also serves as the school coordinator for the AICE Cambridge program.
Milchman, Stuart	Assistant Principal	Analyzes classroom learning walk data to provide insight on instructional trends and develop professional development needs; provides instructional leadership to the Math Department by conducting classroom learning walk and sharing in best practices in common planning conduct frequent meetings with instructional coaches in accordance with school improvement goals; serves as the technology coordinator to assist teachers with incorporating technology within their lesson for student learning and engagement; implements Advanced Placement testing school schedule and coordination in conjunction with the school's Testing Coordinator; serves as the school contact for instructional materials and resources from district; and coordinates health initiatives and protocols in accordance with district guidelines.
Kallina, Kenneth	Assistant Principal	Mr. Kallina provides instructional leadership to Biology department by conducting learning walk and identifying needs for increased EOC achievement among Biology students. He coordinates Title I budget to align with instructional priorities; conducts SAC meetings with the SAC President. He also Serves as the administrative head over the ESE Department providing educational leadership to ESE teachers by conducting learning walks. She also maintains the support facilitation schedule and ensures students' needs are met in partnership with the ESE School Specialist. He coordinates safety initiatives in partnership with the Instructional Dean in addition to providing professional development and guidance for teachers on utilizing restorative practices.
Campbell, Sean	Instructional Coach	Provides professional development school-wide to support instructional initiatives that align with the school improvement goals; provides EWS systems data and maintains Math Performance Matters data to assist problem-solving team; develops and implements push-in/pull-out strategies to increase achievement in Algebra and Geometry; facilitate Math common planning and extended planning opportunities via PLC's; provide resources and tools to support Math achievement; conduct weekly classroom learning walks to provide timely feedback and support to teachers; coordinates

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	-------	---------------------------------

student pullout  
for students identified as the Math lower quartile during designated  
intervention time.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 8/4/2020, Randolph Michael

**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.*

0

**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.*

11

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

66

**Demographic Data**

<p><b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Active</p>
<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p>	<p>High School 9-12</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p>	<p>K-12 General Education</p>
<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p>	<p>100%</p>
<p><b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)</p>	<p>Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students</p>

<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (40%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	411	374	425	250	1460
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	87	88	51	304
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	42	17	12	127
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	81	74	7	220
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	80	72	8	218
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	154	0	0	313
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	117	65	8	264

**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	348	281	185	1129

**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	64	8	72
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	18	15	43

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 8/18/2020

**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	429	440	381	271	1521
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	57	65	36	217
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	64	35	17	204
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153	87	130	30	400
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	264	306	149	842

**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	209	234	205	139	787

**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	12	22	18	6	58
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	25	29	11	74

**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	429	440	381	271	1521
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	57	65	36	217
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	64	35	17	204
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153	87	130	30	400
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	264	306	149	842

**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	209	234	205	139	787

**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	12	22	18	6	58
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	25	29	11	74

**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	34%	50%	56%	35%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	32%	46%	51%	40%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	22%	33%	42%	38%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	36%	44%	51%	29%	44%	49%
Math Learning Gains	39%	45%	48%	36%	41%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	36%	45%	34%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	59%	68%	68%	52%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	54%	69%	73%	55%	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	35%	47%	-12%	55%	-20%
	2018	35%	46%	-11%	53%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2019	30%	48%	-18%	53%	-23%
	2018	36%	49%	-13%	53%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

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	58%	66%	-8%	67%	-9%
2018	50%	61%	-11%	65%	-15%
Compare		8%			

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	52%	67%	-15%	70%	-18%
2018	59%	69%	-10%	68%	-9%
Compare		-7%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	34%	52%	-18%	61%	-27%
2018	60%	62%	-2%	62%	-2%
Compare		-26%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	36%	49%	-13%	57%	-21%
2018	32%	50%	-18%	56%	-24%
Compare		4%			

**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	14	25	23	15	26	19	26	29		62	25
ELL	3	28	28	18	47		28	21		58	14
ASN	38	50		71	42		64				
BLK	23	29	17	19	28	19	42	32		70	36
HSP	30	31	30	29	41	42	57	42		65	42
MUL	46	41		55	43		57	40		80	58
WHT	40	32	19	47	44	24	70	72		74	54
FRL	26	27	21	30	37	28	50	44		65	34
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	10	31	31	32	39	40	22	35		56	16
ELL	15	33	27	22	44	20	27	29		36	
ASN	58	40			30						
BLK	21	30	26	32	33	34	28	50		68	23
HSP	35	34	35	43	36	29	46	48		67	42
MUL	41	59		60	45		67	76		69	
WHT	47	49	50	52	44	39	73	74		68	61
FRL	31	36	34	42	39	34	47	57		64	38
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	4	28	30	4	25	31	10	21		54	9
ELL	6	31	29	3	27	43	22			50	
ASN	60			55						100	55
BLK	21	38	46	15	28	30	36	40		72	21
HSP	26	36	43	23	32	34	42	51		68	35
MUL	37	35		35	37	42	55	33		71	67
WHT	46	44	31	38	42	39	65	69		78	48
FRL	29	38	37	24	33	34	46	48		70	36

**ESSA Data**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	28
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	53
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41



Hispanic Students	
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	53
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	48
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	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.**

The ELA lowest 25 percentile showed the lowest performance with 22%. 10th-grade proficiency performance declined by six percent from the previous year to 30 percent. After the first quarter of the 18-19 school year, the decision was made to transition to the PATHs curriculum to be more aligned to the rigor of the standards. Even though we saw improvement in performance in district assessments, the time it took to transition and adjust to pacing is a contributing factor. This year, the teachers are working with the curriculum from the beginning of the year. Also, the district's blueprints are revised to the curriculum which will be a help when teachers plan in addition to receiving district support. Math lowest 25 percentile showed an 8% drop compared to 2019. The leadership team continues to access the math progression and implement a sequence to best help students.

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

10th grade ELA lowest quartile learning gains had a significant decline compared to the previous year. Also, 10th-grade proficiency showed a 6 % decline. Both ELA 9 and 10 transitioned to using a new curriculum (PATHS) during the second nine-week period. However, the curriculum was entirely new to ELA 10 which had to receive more training compared to ELA 9 who used PATHS in a modified format the prior year. Algebra proficiency had a 26% decline compared to the previous year. A slight drop was anticipated due to a section of the students taking the EOC were Algebra 1B students. The leadership team did not expect as large as a decline experienced due to the fact that students were looped with the same teacher for two consecutive years in addition to taking Intensive Math for extra support.

**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 data component with the greatest gap, when compared to the state's average, was Algebra I performance that showed a 27% performance gap. 80% of Algebra IB students scored a level one on the EOC. The next data component with the greatest gap was 10th-grade ELA with a 23% performance gap. A change in curriculum once the year began along with a mid-year replacement for our teaching line serving students needing support facilitation might have impacted overall 10th-grade performance.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the Science Achievement component. Biology performance showed a 7% increase compared to the previous year's performance. The Biology team participated in Professional Development in partnership with the University of Florida to expand strategies and practice in increasing rigor within the various labs. The team also focused on analyzing student data based upon ELA FSA levels during weekly common planning and monthly PLCs.

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

The two areas of concern for the upcoming year are decreasing the number of students absent 90 percent during the school year, decreasing the number of students with one or more failing grades, and increasing the number of students earning proficiency in ELA and Math on the Florida State Assessment.

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

1. Increasing ELA proficiency of the lowest quartile and achievement proficiency
2. Increasing ELA and Math learning gains of the lowest quartile
3. Increasing Math learning gains
4. school-wide focus on the Instructional Framework-specifically Modeling
5. Increasing the graduation rate

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** With high expectations, Leesburg High School will deliver standards-based instruction via the district's Instructional Framework daily in all content areas with an emphasis on Modeling strategies to support all students increasing proficiency in ELA and Math. If we place an emphasis on focused, consistent instruction, then a better alignment to the standards will be evident as well as an increase in student performance in ELA and Math, especially an increase in student performance from the reviewed data in both ELA and Math, with the focus on Modeling from the district's framework.

**Measurable Outcome:** At least a five percent increase will occur in ELA and Math proficiency, learning gains, and lower quartile gains. Increased evidence instructional framework implementation will occur in at least ninety percent of classrooms school-wide as evidenced by Learning Walk data, administration review of lesson plans, and Performance Matter formative assessment reports.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Michael Randolph (randolphm@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The district's instructional framework for intentional teaching will be used to increase ELA and Math data components by 5%. The framework is built upon a research-based instructional practice that aligns with the six Marzano elements. A heavy focus of this framework also focuses on formative assessments which will enable the leadership team to make instructional adjustments during common plannings, intervention time, and revise professional development offerings throughout the school year. ELA and Math teams have created a plan to work specifically with the lower quartile based upon the data pulled from formative assessments. To monitor this strategy LSA quarter assessment data, lesson plans, Performance Matter data, and learning walk data will be analyzed by the administrative team weekly during leadership meetings.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If we implement, monitor, and support the district instructional framework, then there will be an increase in ELA and Math proficiency. Using this framework, it will serve as a guide for teachers to utilize in their common plannings to ensure that there is an emphasis on model thinking and guided practice to assist in helping student process their thinking in ELA with interacting with complex text and in Math with coherence and rigor.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Create a common planning weekly schedule. Common planning weekly will focus on standards-based lessons incorporating think, read, write, and speak opportunities. The administration will conduct at least 10 learning walk visits in on-campus and Lake Live classrooms a week to progress monitor. Conduct ongoing PLC;s for teachers to review formative assessment data and access student transfer. Conduct site-based professional development offered to LHS teachers during the first Wednesday monthly. Participate in conferences and training as needed to improve instructional practice. Build capacity of teacher leaders and Instructional Coaches in the Instructional Framework for new teacher support. Promote student independent reading opportunities through active involvement in the Superintendent's Reading Challenge. Continued student use of classroom libraries in core content classrooms. Continue Chromebook purchases to support student learning. Purchase IXL math, Cambridge textbooks, USA Test Prep, Math Nation, and instructional supplies to support teachers' standards-based lessons and providing remediation/enrichment opportunities.

**Person Responsible** Michael Randolph (randolphm@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** By utilizing EWS data, Leesburg High School will target all students to increase engagement to maintain a safe and supportive culture for students. If we utilize EWS data, there will be an increase in student engagement, increase school attendance, focused behavior, and a higher graduation rate.

**Measurable Outcome:** A decrease in student and teacher absenteeism by at least 15% compared to 2018 data as evidenced by Performance Matters and Skyward reports; A reduction in the number of students with a D or F in at least one course as evidenced by Performance Matters and Skyward reports; An increase in students learning via the implementation of the district's Instructional Framework in 90% of the classrooms based upon Learning Walk data and student performance on formative assessments; and an increase in state assessment data in ELA and Math in proficiency, learning gains, and lower quartile gains by at least five-percent in each area.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Michael Randolph (randolphm@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Focusing on standard operational procedures to establish high expectations and promote safety. Restorative practices will also be a focus to foster positive relationships between students and teachers. School-wide culture will be used to decrease absenteeism by 15% and a decrease in the number of D's and F's by 15%. To monitor this strategy absenteeism reports from Skyward and Performance Matters baseball cards will be analyzed weekly by administration during leadership meetings.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If we implement, monitor, and support the school-wide operational and restorative practices then there will be fewer tardies and absences which will increase student engagement and focused behavior.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Administration, Instructional Dean, and teachers continue to use Restorative Practice protocol where appropriate and necessary. Restorative practice training will be ongoing and encouraged for all classrooms. Continue use of positive behavior supports, Bee Bucks incentive system, and student recognition incentives to increase good decision-making, support of SOP's, attendance, and student motivation. Instructional Dean and behavior support teacher will maintain a tracking sheet for teachers needing assistance for student referral to the MTSS problem-solving team for behavioral tier two supports via check-in system. The faculty will establish collective goals and commitments. Beliefs that aligns with the school's vision. The administration will establish an equity committee to ensure all school-wide systems promote opportunities for success for all students. Supplemental Academic Instructional funds will be directed to purchase texts and resources for school-wide book study and training on equity practices. Conduct grade-level meetings each semester to outline school-wide expectations.

**Person Responsible** Michael Randolph (randolphm@lake.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** By utilizing a school-wide Intervention Time, Leesburg High School will provide all students the opportunity to receive academic support for success. Intervention time two days a week will increase the academic performance of lower quartile, decrease students who earn D's and F's, reduce retention, and increase students on track for graduation.

**Measurable Outcome:** The number of students earning at least one D or F will decrease by at least 20% by the end of the school year. At least a five percent increase will occur in ELA and Math lower quartile learning gains. The number of students on track for graduation in all cohorts will increase by 10%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Michael Randolph (randolphm@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Providing time during intervention for remediation for the lowest 25 percentile in ELA and Math will be used to increase the ELA and Math lowest 25 percentile learning gains by five percent from 2019's lowest 25 percentile FSA performance. To monitor this strategy Performance Matter MTSS data, FlexTime reports, LSA data, and Skyward grade book reports will be analyzed weekly by the administrative team and at least quarterly by the MTSS problem-solving team. Strategies that will be utilized to support students needing tier two and/or three interventions will include Achieve 3000 support and use of Kahn Academy during Intensive Reading, Math, and Intervention time. MTSS Behavioral tier two supports will include check-in schedules and participation in restorative circles and further evaluation from MTSS problem-solving team.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** If we implement, monitor, and support intervention time, then there will be an increase in the lowest 25 percentile learning gains in ELA and Math and an increase in the number of students on track for graduation.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Continued implementation of the plan for the structure of Intervention time involving all faculty members. Provide funds and access for SAT/ACT testing for seniors. Implement an intervention time plan for Instructional Coaches and teachers to provide targeted support to lower quartile students in ELA, Algebra I, and Geometry. Plan blackout periods for FlexTime for concentrated remediation for FSA/EOC content areas. Utilize Chromebooks within academic and intervention classes. Provide remediation time to support lower quartile students with additional opportunities for practice and deepening thought processes. Continue monitoring of the graduating cohort to ensure all students are on track for graduation. Three audit windows will be conducted by guidance staff and graduation facilitator. Continue mentorships with Delta Gems and Two Steps in Common program with continued progress monitoring for students identified as in ESSA high-risk group. Continue summer staffing of secretary and two clerks to assist with graduating cohort documentation.

**Person Responsible** Michael Randolph (randolphm@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.

**This year the leadership team will create an equity meeting for the purpose of evaluating systems and bias that create barriers to students, especially ESSA high-risk groups, from having access to all career-technical opportunities, extracurricular activities, and rigorous programs such as the AICE Cambridge and Advanced Placement programs in place at Leesburg High School. Committee meetings will be held on a frequent basis as well as open meetings with all stakeholders to receive input and suggestions for driving the school's vision with equity and access in mind. The training and school-wide book study will support the action steps of the three focus goals as well as help the leadership team on the aforementioned priorities from the needs assessment analysis. The early work of the equity committee has already lead to an expansion of the AICE Cambridge program to ninth-grade students previously slated to take English I Honors and all twelfth-grade students with enrolling these students in the AICE General Paper.**

## 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.

Leesburg High builds positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by participating in business partnerships, hosting family nights, and providing frequent opportunities for parent communication and meetings with parents as outlined in the school's PFEP document. In addition to efforts described in the PFEP document, the school will promote student and faculty accomplishments with an increased effort to celebrate and recognize these accomplishments such as perfect attendance, honor roll celebrations, and the Academic Excellence Showcase at year's end. This is an opportunity for the community to participate in recognizing students and faculty that in turn promotes the school's vision and mission. The school makes every effort to communicate with parents in their home language with translated documents and available staff that serve as translators when needed to communicate information via phone conversation or in meetings and conferences as well as ongoing opportunities for active parental involvement.

### **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: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>