

Lake County Schools

Leesburg High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	21
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	25

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: 8/10/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 (42%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Leesburg High School

1401 YELLOW JACKET WAY, Leesburg, FL 34748

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) High School 9-12	2020-21 Title I School Yes	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) 98%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File) K-12 General Education	Charter School No	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) 59%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Randolph, Michael	Principal	<p>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; conducts 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 staff; conducts supervision and guidance in accordance with the school's AICE Cambridge Program.</p>
Bailey, Mary	Assistant Principal	<p>Utilizes classroom learning walk data and school improvement goals to develop and coordinate professional development for staff; assists principal with coordinating and implementing the AICE Cambridge program school-wide; provides oversight to the school testing coordinator to ensure students are assigned appropriately; provide instructional leadership to the English and Reading departments by conducting learning walks and sharing best practices during common team planning; collaborate with instructional coaches to identify trends that impact student achievement; support coaches and teachers with analyzing data and developing plans to offer students additional interventions and acceleration opportunities; assist with the collection of MTSS data; and facilitate problem solving team meetings.</p>
Griffin-Gay, Monique	Assistant Principal	<p>Utilizes classroom data to identify trends and develop professional development needs as well as instructional leadership to the 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 Industry Certification; develops mentorship opportunities for identified students of color and lower quartile students in collaboration with Graduation Facilitator and AVID coordinator; and constructs and coordinates the master schedule with the Guidance Department.</p>
Allen, Christie	Instructional Coach	<p>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; conducts 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.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Milchman, Stuart	Assistant Principal	<p>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 walks 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 lessons 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.</p>
Kallina, Kenneth	Assistant Principal	<p>Mr. Kallina provides instructional leadership to the Biology Department conducting learning walks and identifying needs for increased EOC achievement among Biology students. He coordinates Title 1 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. He 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.</p>
Campbell, Sean	Instructional Coach	<p>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; provide resources and tools to support Math achievement; conduct weekly classroom learning walks to provide timely feedback and support to teachers; coordinates student pullout for students identified as the Math lower quartile during designated intervention time.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/10/2021, 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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

83

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,540

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	405	416	441	278	1540
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/12/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	0	64	8	72
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	18	15	43

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				34%	50%	56%	37%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				32%	46%	51%	40%	49%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				22%	33%	42%	36%	44%	44%
Math Achievement				36%	44%	51%	45%	50%	51%
Math Learning Gains				39%	45%	48%	39%	47%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				26%	36%	45%	34%	41%	45%
Science Achievement				59%	68%	68%	52%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				54%	69%	73%	62%	72%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	35%	47%	-12%	55%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	30%	48%	-18%	53%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

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
2021					
2019	58%	66%	-8%	67%	-9%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	52%	67%	-15%	70%	-18%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	34%	52%	-18%	61%	-27%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	36%	49%	-13%	57%	-21%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Leesburg High School utilized the Lake Standards Assessment tool to gather data for each of the tested subject areas. This included ELA for both 9th and 10th grade; Biology for 10th grade; US History for 11th grade; Geometry for the grades in which the students were enrolled, primarily 9th, 10th and some 11th. The Lake Standards Assessment is a monitoring tool vetted by the district and utilized district-wide in all schools in order to form decisions around interventions and support.

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	15	24	28	11	30	47	27	32		65	23
ELL	16	32	39	23	31		21	13		94	27
ASN	63	74		73			83			90	
BLK	19	26	21	13	27	39	41	34		86	23
HSP	30	30	32	28	27	29	45	39		80	45

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	33	32		27	19		69	56		63	50
WHT	46	41	36	28	23	31	62	57		83	62
FRL	26	31	27	19	21	28	47	42		80	40
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	30
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	438
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	37
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	44
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	47
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The ELA lowest 25th percentile showed the lowest performance with 22%. 10th grade proficiency performance declined by six percent from the previous year to 30%. Algebra proficiency had a 26% decline compared to the previous year. The math lowest 25th percentile was at 26% compared to the district at 36% and the state at 45%. Math lowest 25th percentile showed an 8% drop compared to 2019. The leadership team continues to assess the math progression and implement a sequence to best help students.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The prior year, the ELA utilized a pilot curriculum with 9th grade implementing first and ELA 10 coming on board the following year. More training was necessary to produce a strong alignment with instruction in the classroom around the framework. A slight drop for Algebra was anticipated due to a section of the students taking the EOC were Algebra 1B students. The leadership team did not expect as large 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.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

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.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The Biology team participated in Professional Development in partnership with the University of Florida to expand strategies and practice in increasing rigor within various labs. The team also

focused on analyzing student data based upon FSA ELA levels during weekly common planning time, focusing on the PLC design questions.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Students will have four days per week this year to select the teacher of choice to accelerate their learning and receive acceleration time. During this time students will have the opportunity to work on extension activities with their teachers to enhance their learning, while other students select to visit their teacher where they may be struggling. This initiative is designed to give students voice and choice to receive real time intervention and acceleration that aligns to their current performance in their core academic classes.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will be trained on using Flex Time, which is a program that provides the students on opportunity to sign up to meet with their teacher of choice for intervention or acceleration. Leaders will be able to monitor which students are signing up for which teacher and how often. Leaders will be able to intervene and assign students based off of data trends to the teacher/mentee of which the data shows a need for in order to remediate a standard and/or skill. Teachers will have the option to select a group of students to assign to themselves in order to work a small group setting with students during intervention time. Teachers will have a professional development relaunch around the District's Instructional Framework, which will focus attention on what teachers can do when students have mastered a standard vs. when they have not. During common planning time, teachers will frame their discussions around the PLC questions framework to ensure that misconceptions of learning can be well planned for before they happen during instruction.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

FlexTime will be used as a platform to support the tracking for Intervention time which will be increased to four days per week. Departments will have access to additional tracking opportunities through funding from SAI; software for Science and Reading, tutors for AVID, concordant testing opportunities for seniors, and on-site credit recovery options.

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 with instructional framework implementation will occur in at least ninety percent of classrooms school-wide as evidenced by Learning Walk data, administrative review of lesson plans, and Performance Matters formative assessment reports.

Monitoring: The Leadership Team will monitor through the use of weekly classroom walkthroughs, which will focus on the lesson plan transfer of strategies from weekly common planning time. Walkthrough data will look specifically at the area of modeling. Formative assessment data will become a part of the discussion through PLC questions during common planning.

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 of which teachers are evaluated. A heavy focus on this framework also focuses on formative assessments which well enable the leadership team to make instructional adjustments during common planning, intervention time, and revise professional development offerings throughout the year. ELA and Math teams have created a plan to work specifically with the lower quartile based upon the data pulled from formative assessments.

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 will serve as a guide for teachers to utilize in their common planning time to ensure that there is emphasis on modeling thinking and guided practice to assist in helping students process a deep understanding of the complex text in ELA and in Math with coherence and rigor.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a common planning weekly schedule. Weekly planning time will focus on standards-based lessons incorporating opportunities to think, read, write, and speak. Administration will conduct at least 10 learning walk visits in classrooms per week to progress monitor. Conduct ongoing team planning time for teachers to incorporate the PLC questions for teachers to review formative assessment data and assess student transfer. Conduct site-based professional development offered to LHS teachers during the first Wednesday each month. 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. Utilize the one-to-one ratio of student Chromebooks to support student learning. Purchase IXL math, Cambridge textbooks, USA Test Prep, Math Nation, and instructional supplies.

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, school attendance, focused behavior, and a higher graduation rate.

Measurable Outcome: A decrease in student and teacher absenteeism by 15% compared to the previous year as evidenced by Performance Matters and Skyward reports; A reduction in the number of students with a D or F in at least once course as evidenced by Performance Matters and Skyward reports; An increase in student 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 proficiency, learning gains, and lower quartile gains by at least five percent in each.

Monitoring: To monitor this strategy absenteeism reports from Skyward and Performance Matters baseball cars will be analyzed weekly by administration during leadership meetings.

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%.

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 with Discipline Team, 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. The Instructional Dean and behavior support teacher will maintain student tracking for those that need referrals to the MTSS problem-solving team for behavioral tier 2 supports via check-in system. All faculty will establish collective goals and commitments, which become beliefs aligned to the school's vision. Administration will establish a guiding coalition to ensure all school-wide systems promote opportunities for success for all students. Supplemental Academic Instruction funds will be directed to purchase a tutor for AVID tutorials, an SAT day attempt for seniors needing concordant scores, and teachers to facilitate Summer School learning opportunities.

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 four days a week will increase the academic performance of lower quartile, reduce retention, decrease the amount of students earning D's and F's, 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 5% 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%.

Monitoring: To monitor this strategy Performance Matters, MTSS data, FlexTime reports, LSA data, and Skyward gradebook reports will be analyzed weekly by the administrative team and at least quarterly by the MTSS problem-solving team.

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 5 percent from 2021's lowest 25 percentile FSA performance. Strategies that will be utilized to support students needing tier two and/or tier 3 interventions will include Achieve 3000 support and use of Kahn Academy during Intensive Reading, Math, and Intervention time. Behavior tier two supports include check-in schedules and participation in restorative circles, with 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, which is increased to four days per week, involving all faculty members. Provide funds and access for SAT/ACT testing for seniors. Targeted support for lower quartile students in ELA, Algebra 1, and Geometry during intervention time. Planned blackout periods for FlexTime with a concentration on FSA/EOC content areas. Chromebooks will be utilized in academic and intervention classes. SAI funds will purchase PENDA software for Science support, along with Vocabulary Power Plus and Albert IO for Intensive Reading 3 and 4 classes. Continue monitoring of the graduation 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.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

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.

Leesburg High Schools 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 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 student 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.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

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
Total:			\$0.00