Lecanto High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lecanto High School

3810 W EDUCATIONAL PATH, Lecanto, FL 34461

https://lhs.citrusschools.org/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Citrus County School Board on 10/10/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Lecanto High School will encourage students and staff to become active lifelong learners and will provide a positive learning environment so that students and staff can develop their full potential in order to meet the needs of, participate in, and improve our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Achieving Success! Every Panther, Every Day.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Koon, Jason	Principal	To provide the leadership and vision necessary to develop and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources to establish and maintain a safe, caring, and enriching environment conducive to learning and student success.
Applegate, Maurisa	Assistant Principal	To assist the Principal with administrative and instructional functions to meet the educational needs of students and carry out the mission and goals of the school and the District. Master Schedule, Curriculum, guidance.
Crowley, Richard	Assistant Principal	To assist the Principal with administrative and instructional functions to meet the educational needs of students and carry out the mission and goals of the school and the District. Facilities, Discipline, and Teacher Induction Program
Goolsby, Dianna	Assistant Principal	To assist the Principal with administrative and instructional functions to meet the educational needs of students and carry out the mission and goals of the school and the District. AP testing, professional development, Mental Health, technology

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Advisory Enhancement Counsel (SAEC)met during the summer to review the available data and provided input for planning the SIP. The SAEC included the leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students, and business.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored through SAEC quarterly meetings and through monthly leadership, department head, professional learning communities and grade level meetings. The SIP will be adjusted quarterly as needed using formative assessment data.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	24%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	72%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B

	2018-19: B	
	2017-18: B	
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	47	46	50	49	45	51	54		
ELA Learning Gains				38			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				21			30		
Math Achievement*	28	28	38	34	26	38	46		
Math Learning Gains				31			29		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				26			30		
Science Achievement*	73	66	64	66	35	40	75		
Social Studies Achievement*	68	64	66	69	38	48	70		
Middle School Acceleration					33	44			
Graduation Rate	92	90	89	93	60	61	93		
College and Career Acceleration	56	51	65	49	65	67	51		
ELP Progress	42	35	45				60		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	92

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	476
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	93

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	4	
ELL	28	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	40	Yes	2	
HSP	58			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	61			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	56			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	46			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	43			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	47			28			73	68		92	56	42
SWD	19			11			41	40		13	6	
ELL	23			20							3	42
AMI												
ASN	83						83	87		80	5	
BLK	29			3			33			40	5	
HSP	42			21			66	58		67	6	
MUL	42			31			78	54		53	6	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	48			30			75	70		54	6	
FRL	41			23			73	58		51	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	49	38	21	34	31	26	66	69		93	49	
SWD	21	31	22	20	21	26	35	43		83	12	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	90	68						94		100	88	
BLK	28	16		4	7			83		87	15	
HSP	43	37	22	37	38	27	57	66		92	41	
MUL	43	33		29	36		43			91	70	
PAC												
WHT	50	37	22	34	31	27	69	68		93	49	
FRL	43	34	16	30	29	24	60	61		91	41	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	54	47	30	46	29	30	75	70		93	51	60
SWD	17	29	25	22	28	18	41	53		82	3	
ELL												60
AMI												
ASN	100	68		67			100	100		100	75	
BLK	30	33	30	30	44		50	30		100	40	
HSP	40	41	35	43	29	19	59	73		100	42	
MUL	46	45	20	38	31		67	50		86	50	
PAC												
WHT	56	47	30	48	28	35	79	69		92	51	
FRL	45	42	31	42	31	33	68	64		89	38	50

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	45%	44%	1%	50%	-5%
09	2023 - Spring	49%	47%	2%	48%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	37%	-15%	50%	-28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	33%	38%	-5%	48%	-15%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	63%	8%	63%	8%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	62%	4%	63%	3%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 overall Math Achievement of both Algebra and Geometry combined was at 32% which dropped 2% from last school year. While Algebra made a 4% increase, Geometry made a 13% decrease. Contributing factors include the transition to the new B.E.S.T. math standards and the continuing decline of student performance as Algebra students to Geometry.

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

ELA 10th students scoring a 3% or higher dropped from 57% to 45% (12% decrease) and Geometry students scoring a 3% or higher dropped from 48% to 35% (13% decrease). Contributing factors include the transition to the new B.E.S.T. standards and the continuing decline of student performance as Algebra students to Geometry.

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 greatest gap compared to the state average is Geometry students scoring a 3% or higher with a 10% difference. Contributing factors include the transition to the new B.E.S.T. math standards and the continuing decline of student performance as Algebra students to Geometry.

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

Students scoring a 3 or higher in 9th grade ELA increased from 43% to 49% (6% increase). This data component was also 1% higher than the state. Contributing factors.....

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Not applicable at the high school levels.

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

I. Improve student achievement in math in both Algebra and Geometry
2. Improve student achievement in ELA at both the 9th and 10th grade levels
3. Achievement of Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ESSA Subgroup of SWD has a Federal Percent of Points Index below 41% for 3 years and below 32% for 1 year. The current FPP is 31%

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ESE achievement level increased by 3%

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress Learning, Achieve 3000 and the PM testing will be utilized for progress monitoring

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maurisa Applegate (applegatem@citrusschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Attention must be placed on facilitated support and instructional strategies to effectively address this population. This shift will be supported by purposeful, data-driven PLC groups that assess data, create lessons, and build assessments collaboratively.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the TURN-AROUND AT HIGHLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HARVARD BUSINESS SCHOOL CASE STUDY, aligning curriculum and assessments through PLCs moved school grades from a "D" to an "A" over the course of 3 years

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Support all Tier 3 and ESE students with a reading strategies in the IEP with a Reading Endorsed teacher for their ELA and Reading courses as well as supporting 11 and 12 grade students who have not completed the reading graduation requirement with an additional reading intervention.
2. Heterogeneous grouping in ELA classes.

Person Responsible: Maurisa Applegate (applegatem@citrusschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Although Lecanto High School has had steady gains in the areas of ELA Achievement, the level still falls below the State average

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA Achievement increase by 5%

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress Learning and the PM testing will be utilized for progress monitoring

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maurisa Applegate (applegatem@citrusschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Attention must be placed on instructional strategies to effectively address the bottom quartile population. This
shift will be supported by purposeful, data-driven PLC groups that assess data, create lessons, and build assessments collaboratively

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the TURN-AROUND AT HIGHLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HARVARD BUSINESS SCHOOL CASE STUDY, aligning curriculum and assessments through PLCs moved school grades from a "D" to an "A" over the course of 3 years.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Create Professional Learning Communities
2. Actively review data and create learning goals
3. Collaboratively creating unified formative assessments specifically tied to State Standards in Learning Communities
4. Utilizing formative, standards-based assessment data to drive instruction for mastery
5. Support all Tier 3 and ESE students with a reading strategies in the IEP with a Reading Endorsed teacher for their ELA and Reading courses as well as supporting 11 and 12 grade students who have not completed the reading graduation requirement with an additional reading intervention.
6. Common classroom expectations:

•Learning Target posted daily
•Student Talk\ Metacognition (engagement)
WRAP/WICOR - School wide literacy initiative (reading and writing)
•Data Chats\ Student communication
7. ELA will have common planning to facilitate collaboration and PLC meetings

Person Responsible: Jason Koon (koonj@citrusschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The overall Math Achievement for all students decreased from 34% to 32% from the previous school year. Students who scored a 3 or higher in Algebra increased from 23% to 27%, however, was 5% below the state average. Students who scored a 3 or higher in Geometry decreased from 34% to 32% which was 10% below the state average.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Math Achievement level of 50% in both Algebra and Geometry

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1) Monthly PLC meetings where formative data is analyzed and monitored, instructional strategies are discussed, and lessons and assessments are created collaboratively. This includes utilizing data from both district created progress monitoring assessments (PM1 - September & PM2 - December) in Algebra and Geometry
2) The online program, IXL, will be used in both Algebra and Geometry courses.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dianna Goolsby (goolsbyd@citrusschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention: Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1) Attention will be placed on facilitated support instructional strategies to effectively address student achievement. This will be supported by purposeful, data-driven PLC groups that assess data, create lesson and build assessments collaboratively.
2) IXL will be implemented in both the Algebra and Geometry courses to provide remediation and extra practice in order to support standards mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1) According to the turn-around at Highland Elementary School Havard Business School Case Study, aligning curriculum and assessments through PLCs moved school grades from a "D" to an "A" over the course of 3 years.
2) IXL is a personalized learning platform that utilizes comprehensive K-12 curriculum, real-time diagnostics, personalized guidance, and actionable analytics to give teacher what they need to differentiate instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention (Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Create Professional Learning Communities.
2. Actively review data and create learning goals
3. Collaboratively creating unified formative assessments specifically tied to State Standards in Learning Communities
4. Utilizing formative, standards-based assessment data to drive instruction for mastery of standards
5. Sharing best practices for student learning (Spiraling techniques, new content enhancement, etc)
6. Common classroom expectations:
•Learning Target;
•Student Talk\ Metacognition
•Literary Focus\ Marking Text\ Writing
WRAP/WICOR - School wide literacy initiative (reading and writing)
•Data Chats\ Student communication
7. Math will have common planning to facilitate collaboration and PLC meeting

Person Responsible: Dianna Goolsby (goolsbyd@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ESSA Subgroup of Black/African-American had a Federal Percent of Points Index below 41% for 1 year and The FPP for this group is currently 34%.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

increase of FPP of 5%

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress Learning, Achieve 3000 and the PM testing will be utilized for progress monitoring

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maurisa Applegate (applegatem@citrusschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Attention must be placed on facilitated support instructional strategies to effectively address the bottom quartile population. This shift will be supported by purposeful, data-driven PLC groups that assess data, create lessons, and build assessments collaboratively.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the TURN-AROUND AT HIGHLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HARVARD BUSINESS SCHOOL CASE STUDY, aligning curriculum and assessments through PLCs moved school grades from a "D" to an "A" over the course of 3 years

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. All students will be place in Honors/IB ELA classes.
2. Students will be given the opportunity to apply for the FAMU College Explorers Program

Person Responsible: Maurisa Applegate (applegatem@citrusschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Teacher retention, Student absenteeism, student behavior
Lecanto high school relies on student voice and student choice to guide practices related to the development of a positive school culture. These practices include Panther Hour, Teachers as advisor program (TAP), Homeroom, Principal Advisory counsel, Superintendent's counsel, student leadership organizations (SGA, NHS, Key Club, FFA, FFEA, etc.), special and rigorous academic programs (International Baccalaureate Program, AVID, Lecanto School of the Arts, Vocational/Agriculture, Advanced
Placement), and various athletic opportunities for all students. Lecanto High School also relies on teacher and staff voice and choice to guide practices related to the development of positive school culture. These practices include Panther Hour, curricular decision making leadership opportunities, and decision making for course offerings

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase interest in the College and Careers Center and Acceleration by 4% in each cohort
Decrease students absent 10 or more days by 10%
Increase teacher retention by 10%
Decrease out of area and tardy referrals by 10%

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Via Skyward Reports: Student absences, referral data, Acceleration reports
Via Employment reports, number teachers hired and retained

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Richard Crowley (crowleyr@citrusschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Evidenced-based strategies that will be implemented in the development of a positive school culture and environment:
1) implementation of the International Baccalaureate (IB) program and curriculum for all
2) application of AVID strategies
3) utilization of PBIS behavioral support strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of the IB program will encourage both personal development and academic achievement. The application of AVID strategies will provide scaffolding support that students need to encourage college and career readiness and success. The PBIS schoolwide systems approach will establish positive student culture and individualized behavior supports that will create a safe and effective learning environment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Increase interest in College and Careers and increase Acceleration by 4% in each cohort via the College and Career Center to include but not limited to picnic tables, signage, and posters.
-Decrease students absent 10 or more days by 10% via campus beautification to include but not limited to picnic tables, signage, and posters.
-Increase implementation of AVID strategies via teacher Professional Development and build capacity for WICOR and Approaches to Teaching and Learning practices through the ideas of AVID and IB
-Heterogeneously grouping in ELA courses school wide.
-Incorporate Mental Wellness First Aid training for staff and students as mandated by the state
-Decrease out of area and tardy referrals by 10% via PBIS strategies

Person Responsible: Richard Crowley (crowleyr@citrusschools.org)

By When:

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The SAEC reviews and provides input for the budget annually.