

Lake County Schools

South Lake High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

South Lake High School

15600 SILVER EAGLE RD, Groveland, FL 34736

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/23/2023.

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.

The mission of South Lake High School is to prepare independent, responsible, life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, 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
Benson, Steve	Principal	<p>Assessment Groups: Assistant Principals (5) Bookkeepers (2) AICE Coordinator ELL Resource Teacher Graduation Resource Facilitator Literacy Coach School Secretary</p> <p>Responsibilities: Allocations Athletic/Band/Chorus Boosters Budget: Discretionary & Internal Curriculum -All Contracts - School Expulsion Hearings Leadership Team Leave Forms – All Staff Morning Announcements Professional Development Public Relations Room Assignments SAI Budget School Advisory Council (SAC) School Messenger-Call Out SIP-Overall School Resource Officer Contact Substitute Coordinator Teacher/Employee Recognition Week at a Glance</p>
Jesaitis, Donna	Assistant Principal	<p>Discipline: 9th/10th/11th/12th Grade (J-M) Guidance Counselor Pairing: Mrs. Bains</p> <p>Assessment Groups: Foreign Lang. (3), Social Studies (13), Guidance (5), Mental Health Liaison, VL Facilitator, Data Entry Operators (2), Secretary I (2), Guidance Clerical Assistant</p> <p>Responsibilities: Academic Events - Recognition, College Visits AP & College Board AP Testing Homecoming Master Schedule Program Guide – Course Offerings, Honors Criteria Prom SAC Contact Virtual Learning Lab (FLVS, LVS)</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nichols, Linda	Assistant Principal	<p>Discipline: 9th/10th/11th/12th Grade (Sc-Z) Guidance Counselor Pairing: Ms. Stallings</p> <p>Assessment Groups: ESE (16), ESE School Specialists (1.5), PASS, PE (4), ELL/ESE Teacher Assistants (8), Clerical Assistants (5)</p> <p>Responsibilities: ELL Contact Fundraisers Graduation Juvenile Justice New Teacher Orientation/ Teacher Quality Retention Restorative Practices School Plus/Administrative Detention/PASS/PBS Senior Activities Vendor Visits James, Irene Assistant Principal</p>
James, Irene	Assistant Principal	<p>Discipline: 9th/10th/11th/12th Grade (D-I) Guidance Counselor Pairing: Mrs. Scheetz</p> <p>Assessment Groups: Athletic Trainer, Fine Arts (5), ROTC (3), Science (11), Testing Coordinator, School Nurse</p> <p>Responsibilities: Athletics – ADs, Boosters, Facilities, Financials Business Partners – Chamber, Ed. Foundation, etc. Cafeteria Operations Field Trips Food Service Liasion Health Coordinator Health Science Collegiate Academy Lead Scholarship Signings - Athletics Teen Parent Coordinator Testing (Overall – EOC/FSA/FSAA/SAT) Transportation (Lead) Volunteers</p>
Thompson, Kevin	Assistant Principal	<p>Discipline: 9th/10th/11th/12th Grade (N-Sb) Guidance Counselor Pairing: Mrs. Desir</p> <p>Assessment Groups: CTE (11), Mathematics (13), Custodians (18)</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Responsibilities: CTE Industry Certification Testing Flex Time Period – Intervention/Acceleration Freshman Orientation Middle School Liaison Parking: Student & Staff Radios Safe Schools Coordinator Security Cameras Teacher Supervision Duty Textbooks (Lead) Wellness Leader
Flynn, Caitlin J.	Assistant Principal	Discipline: 9th/10th/11th/12th Grade (A-C) Guidance Counselor Pairing: Ms. Googe Assessment Groups: AVID, ILS, Media Specialist, ELA (14), Reading (5) Responsibilities: Clubs/Student Organizations Copiers Credit Recovery Program (E2020) Facility Usage Fines List Lockers School Website/Social Media Technology Textbooks (Support) Transportation (Support) Voting – TOY, RTOY, SREOY, VOY
Shafer, Mandy	Graduation Coach	Graduation Compliance/Student Audits Parent/Student Meetings & Support Graduation Rate Improvement Acceleration Rate Improvement Testing Support Evening School Monitoring & Student Support
McConnell, Nethia	Instructional Coach	Reading department chairperson Support and coaching for ELA and Reading teachers New Teacher support and mentoring LSA Contact Schoolwide literacy support
Lynnette, Gonzalez	Teacher, K-12	Instruction of 9th grade AICE English General Paper students Cambridge AICE coordinator

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wilson, Lilly	Teacher, K-12	ELL Resource Teacher Small Group Instruction of ELL students Training and support for teachers of ELL students

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.

Each school administrator is responsible for developing an academic or school culture goal, following discussion about our students' academic and behavioral strengths and weaknesses. The school's guiding coalition, which comprises administrators, department chairpersons, and other teachers representative of our student body, is involved in the development of school culture goals and strategies. The school advisory council (SAC) has the opportunity to review the SIP draft, and offer input for additions, revisions, and/or deletions. The SAC includes all required stakeholders.

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 is regularly monitored by the principal and leadership team, and multiple SAC meetings are devoted for SIP monitoring and discussion particularly as progress monitoring data becomes available throughout the year. Where necessary, the plan is adjusted or modified to ensure continuous improvement for all students, including underperforming subgroups.

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	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	83%
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)*

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
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*	39	45	50	40	45	51	40		
ELA Learning Gains				43			36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				28			28		
Math Achievement*	38	40	38	31	33	38	36		
Math Learning Gains				38			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			26		
Science Achievement*	61	62	64	51	38	40	68		
Social Studies Achievement*	53	62	66	62	41	48	63		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	92	90	89	96	59	61	95		
College and Career Acceleration	56	61	65	58	64	67	68		
ELP Progress	47	56	45	46			38		

* 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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	386
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	92

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	536
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	96

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	41			
ELL	43			
AMI	25	Yes	1	1

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%
ASN	65			
BLK	48			
HSP	53			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	50			

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	38	Yes	3	
ELL	34	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	59			
BLK	41			
HSP	46			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	54			
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	39			38			61	53		92	56	47
SWD	21			25			43	38		27	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
ELL	10			16			43	28		65	7	47
AMI	25										1	
ASN	45			42			72	65		69	6	
BLK	35			31			53	37		48	6	
HSP	38			36			55	49		49	7	47
MUL	39			46			65	69		40	6	
PAC												
WHT	42			43			70	62		65	6	
FRL	34			30			52	49		51	7	46

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	40	43	28	31	38	43	51	62		96	58	46
SWD	20	28	17	24	43	46	32	48		92	29	
ELL	10	31	30	9	41	50	18	44		80	19	46
AMI												
ASN	45	52		38	39		69			100	69	
BLK	27	39	27	17	38	42	32	46		96	42	
HSP	37	42	30	27	34	40	50	60		95	50	46
MUL	37	45		29	47		47	67		100	69	
PAC												
WHT	47	45	25	43	42	46	59	67		96	68	
FRL	30	38	23	24	36	47	42	57		94	53	31

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	40	36	28	36	27	26	68	63		95	68	38
SWD	20	23	20	21	26	29	39	41		84	27	
ELL	8	33	39	14	25	21	50	19		94	60	38
AMI												
ASN	58	52		40	31		83	72		100	78	

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
BLK	25	28	21	17	27	34	50	51		94	52	
HSP	31	32	30	29	24	22	62	53		96	71	36
MUL	58	50		41	44		80	80		94	75	
PAC												
WHT	49	38	30	52	29	21	75	73		94	70	
FRL	29	29	23	25	20	25	60	51		94	61	29

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	39%	44%	-5%	50%	-11%
09	2023 - Spring	40%	44%	-4%	48%	-8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	31%	51%	-20%	50%	-19%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	45%	49%	-4%	48%	-3%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	60%	0%	63%	-3%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	60%	-7%	63%	-10%

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 answer to this question depends on the definition of lowest. If the answer is to make an overall comparison of all tested subjects, then the Algebra 1 EOC was the lowest at 31%. However, if you based this answer on comparisons to State and District Averages, then F.A.S.T. PM3 for ELA Grade 9 was the lowest compared to the District Average (40% vs. 44%) and F.A.S.T. PM3 for ELA 10th grade was the lowest compared to the State Average (39% vs. 50%). The breakdown for our tested subjects is as follows in order of proficiency:

Algebra 1 EOC
 31% overall
 4% higher than District Average
 1% lower than State Average

F.A.S.T. PM3 ELA 10
 39% overall
 1% lower than District Average
 11% lower than State Average

F.A.S.T. PM3 ELA 9
 40% overall
 4% lower than District Average
 8% lower than State Average

Geometry EOC
 45% overall
 2% lower than District Average
 Tied with State Average

U.S. History EOC
 53% overall
 2% higher than District Average
 10% lower than State Average

Biology EOC
 60% overall
 3% higher than District Average
 3% lower than State Average

As far as factors within our control, we found that we struggled to align district provided resources (Math Nation) with the essential standards and blueprints for the courses. Teachers made collective decisions to deviate from the provided resources to try and fit the needs of their students and to better support the standards and skills being taught. This led to mixed results in Algebra 1 and other mathematics courses.

This year, we have started the year with more teacher stability. We also have implemented a new arrangement of classes (Alg. 1-A, Alg. 1-B, and Alg. 1). Students who took Alg. 1-A are taking Alg. 1 this year. Those incoming freshman who were Level 1's have been placed in Alg. 1-A block class this year. Those who were Level 2's have been placed in Alg. 1-A (single class) for the year. Levels 3's and above are taking Algebra 1 or Alg. 1 Honors. This model was used by another school in the district with great success.

We are also implementing more emphasis on math vocabulary and basic math facts to strengthen deficiencies students have had for years.

In addition, teachers will be utilizing IXL Math to develop diagnostic pre-tests to determine what students already know and what they need to work on at the beginning of a unit. Then, they will issue a similar test at the end of the unit to assess mastery of the standards involved. ALEKS will also be used to reinforce classroom teaching and drill students on essential standards.

We are working with our district's math program specialist to help administrators gain a clear understanding of how to align district resources with the instruction of the essential standards in conjunction with the course blueprints, particularly when it comes to Math Nation, ALEKS, IXL, etc.

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

Our U.S. History EOC showed the greatest decrease (9%) from 2022. The major contributor to this drop was the overall class who took the test. For some reason, the junior class of 2023 consistently, since third grade, performed well below their predecessors and their successors. In their sophomore year, they scored 17% lower than the class before them on the Biology EOC. They also dropped the ELA 10 FSA scores by 8% and the Geometry EOC by 20%. In their freshman year, they dropped the ELA 9 FSA by 10%, and the Alg. 1 EOC by 17%. In each instance, their successors raised the score of the respective test from anywhere between 2% to 18%.

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.

F.A.S.T. PM3 ELA 10 had the biggest gap between its score and the state average (11%). Besides the fact that it was a new test, we believe the implementation of the PM1, PM2, and PM3 process was not managed well. In the past, students took a similar test through the district (known as the LSAs (Lake Standard Assessments)). Because these tests did not count in any way for the students but instead gave teachers data to use for student achievement analysis, students rarely took the tests seriously. We believe this carried over into the new PM process (F.A.S.T.). Our teachers were also in their second year of implementing a new curriculum, so streamlining and understanding what were essential standards were not as strong as they could have been at both levels (9th and 10th).

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

Geometry showed the greatest increase from 28% to 45%. Despite the upset in the math department (See Question #1 above) in 2022-23, we stumbled across the strength of one teacher in Geometry, although he had taught almost exclusively Alg. 1 in the past. And although he had four Geometry Honors

classes, he had a pass rate of 67%. This coupled with a strong Geometry teacher who returned to our school and taught our AICE students (82% pass rate), these two teachers helped boost our schools, for sure. They also had the added benefit of teaching Geometry the year after the Class of 2024 (the class who consistently scored low mentioned in Question #2 above.

Geometry also made a decision in January of 2023 (along with our Alg, 1 teachers) to implement much of what we are going to implement from the beginning in 2023-24 (see Question #1 above.)

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

Attendance and the number of students with D's and F's. We see these as going hand-in-hand, and ultimately affecting our standardized test scores. We noticed this mid-year last year, so we implemented "tardy sweeps" in an effort to get students to class on time to maximize their time in class. We plan to implement these sweeps from the second week of school on, moving forward. We will also be monitoring students who skip class and those who are chronically truant in an effort to get students to school and into class on time.

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

1. We are implementing a standardized collaborative planning time on Wednesday afternoons, wherein teachers are required to meet together in the media center with their grade levels and subject areas for the purpose of planning dynamic lessons designed to emphasize the essential standards (What do students NEED to know?) each week while supplementing those standards with asking the question, "What is NICE for students to know?" Teachers will also ask "How will we know when students have learned the standards?" as well as focusing on remediation ("What will we do when students do not learn the standards required of them?") and acceleration ("What will we do when they master the standards?"). All lesson planning will be done via this process, using a common planning Google form that will be submitted to administration each week. All subjects/grade levels will create a common lesson plan, based on the district's Instructional Framework.
2. A continuance of streamlining how we utilize and structure S.O.A.R. Time (acceleration and remediation time) twice a week. The major focus will on the lower quartile in the PM ELA and Math EOC categories this year because of the Learning Gains categories coming online for the 2-23-24 SY.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**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.

In reviewing our student achievement data from the 2022-23 school year along with the first PM for FAST we noticed there are some areas of concern that still need to be addressed for all students and with students in the lower quartile for both ELA & Math. We also want to see the learning gains in the areas for ELA and Math this school year and to do this a plan for intervention for teachers to use outside their normal block of time has been implemented. This includes our subgroups, as we break down data within the larger groupings and assess how each subgroup's needs can be better met. With the use of the B.E.S.T. Standards, attention to specific standards and the skills they address will be a focal point in determining who needs intervention and who needs acceleration. Additionally, students who are behind to meet graduation requirements, which will consist of the 11th and 12th grade students will get prescribed intervention to focus on specific skills and strategies in ACT/SAT/FAST/BEST to help prep for reading and mathematics are needed to provide them with targeted support in intervention.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With intentional collaborative planning around intervention, the goal is to see student achievement meet or exceed the state averages in ELA 9 and 10, as well as Algebra 1 and Geometry. Specifically, we are seeking significant learning gains in ELA & Math, particularly in our underperforming subgroups of SWD and ELL, which have fallen below the ESSA requirement for three straight years.

Monitoring:

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

As a school, every Wednesday, teachers will meet in one location to collaboratively plan within their departments and support teachers. Teachers will have to answer two questions that focus on intervention for students who have not met mastery yet and those who already have reached mastery. Administration is part of the collaboration on Wednesdays to help facilitate and monitor to help plan interventions to reach targeted students. Teachers will be able to review weekly the interventions to assess the effectiveness of interventions and make necessary adjustments using data that is collected through formative and summative assessments in intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Caitlin J. Flynn (flynnc@lake.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Students will have choice or prescribed intervention outside their normal schedule time for a math and/or ELA twice a week for 30 minutes each time. Students who are assigned to a teacher for intervention in math and/or ELA will work with the teacher for 4 weeks to work on standards that the students have not mastered yet. During collaborative planning teachers will develop a list of students who have not mastered based on formative and/or summative data.

Additionally, SAI funds will be utilized for after school tutoring every Tuesday and Thursday for Level 1 & 2 students in Algebra 1, Geometry, ELA 9, and ELA 10 throughout the year. SAI funds will also be utilized to provide intervention/remediation/credit recovery/graduation requirement opportunities for students for summer learning, including clerical support to mail invitations to parents, facilitate summer learning sign ups, make and receive parent phone calls, etc.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By focusing on a comprehensive intervention approach, our high school will ensure that each student receives the support they need to succeed academically, including meeting graduation requirements. Through ongoing collaboration, data analysis, and commitment, we will empower our students to reach their highest potential.

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. Collaboratively develop formative and summative assessments that are centered around the essential standards.
2. On Wednesdays, teams will discuss the data collected in class, but also any state assessments to develop a list of students who are not meeting mastery of the current standards being taught in the classroom.
3. Using the list of students, teachers will decide on prescribe intervention and place students within their intervention block during SOAR time for 4 weeks.
4. On the last day of the prescribed intervention, teachers will use a summative or formative assessment to see if mastery has been met.
5. During Wednesday collaboration, teachers use the data from the assessments to see who needs continued support and who can be moved to choice
6. Creating after school tutoring opportunities, with parent notification and announcements to students.
7. Identify students in need of summer remediation/testing opportunities

Person Responsible: Caitlin J. Flynn (flynnc@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When:

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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 leadership team has determined that focusing on having high expectations for student behavior, supported by positive reinforcement, will lead to higher student achievement and a positive school environment for all. To increase positive and responsible behaviors within our student population, we will incorporate Community Circles, which is a Restorative Practice strategy that is to be used every Monday during 1st period. The Monday Motivational prompt will be provided to the teachers to share with their students during Circle Time.

The administration team will focus on the Dress Code Policy to monitor the students' adherence to the Code of Student Conduct that outlines the appropriate attire the students are required to wear while on campus. When students dress for success, they gain self-respect, take pride in themselves and change the perspective the way others view them.

We will follow the new Cell Phone Policy set forth by Legislation. Students will not be allowed to use their cell phones or earbuds during class. They are required to receive uninterrupted instructional time.

The purpose is to increase student success, which will encourage and motivate them to S.O.A.R. to new heights and thus decrease the amount of negative student behaviors, decrease the number of student disciplinary actions, and promote leadership qualities in all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

1. The incorporation of Community Circles will be monitored by administration every Monday to ensure teachers are using the Restorative Practice technique, with the students, to increase a positive aspect of our school culture.
2. With a school-wide implementation of the Cell Phone Policy, if a student is found to be in violation, they will be asked to place their device into the bag. Once they do, the teacher will fold the top and staple it, but leave the bag on the student's desk. The teacher will also write the student's name on the bag (this can be how the teacher keeps track of those who are frequent violators).
3. We are looking to decrease the number of students with Dress Code offenses by monitoring the teacher referrals administration will monitor the referrals written by teachers on students who violate the rule.

Monitoring:

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

The Admin Team will meet weekly to review strategies and analyze the student discipline data. Mrs. Nichols will monitor the incorporation of restorative practices Community Circles technique and continue to model them for faculty and staff during meetings.

1. Weekly meetings with the Administration Team.
2. Continue to support for the teachers, who will be responsible for writing referrals for the dress code and cell phone violators.
3. Monitor and support the teachers with the Restorative Practices techniques, to include modeling it within faculty meetings and allowing teachers, during planning time, to observe other classes using the circles in a positive manner.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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.)

By encouraging and rewarding students to increase their levels of self and school pride by being on time to class, being accountable for themselves, and being accountable to others; they will be less likely to engage in negative behaviors, and it will foster a positive culture and climate at our school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The purpose is to increase student success, which will encourage and motivate them to S.O.A.R. to new heights and thus decrease the amount of negative student behaviors, decrease the number of student disciplinary actions, and promote leadership qualities in all students.

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.

Weekly meetings with the administration team to review and discuss the strategies that are working and the ones that will need to be improved.

Provide trainings to teachers, so they are knowledgeable about Restorative Circles and the benefits of their use.

Model the implementation of CIRCLES in the classrooms and monitor their strategic methods.

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

By When: The end of the 2023-2024 school year

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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 leadership team has determined that focusing on student attendance will assist in creating a positive school culture as well as overall student achievement. We will incorporate periodic tardy sweeps on a weekly basis to ensure students are in attendance on time for class. Initiating a classroom hall pass for each teacher will ensure that our students are accountable for their location on campus when needing to leave the classroom. Through FOCUS, our teachers will be held accountable for daily attendance for each of their classes. For our senior class, we will implement a graduation requirement of being in attendance for 90% of the school year.

We will strive to improve attendance and achievement by enhancing the resources, equipment, and educational experiences for all academic program areas including core (ELA, math, science, social studies) and electives (fine and performing arts, foreign language, phys. ed., NJROTC, CTE, ACT/SAT Prep, Intensive Math, etc.) so that students have real world learning experiences, see value in attending their classes, and gain interest in their academic courses. We also seek to remove barriers that lead to students dropping out of school (Inability to pay for testing opportunities - SAT, ACT, CLT, etc., lack of sufficient credit recovery options) by ensuring that funds are provided to meet the needs of each individual student to ensure that they stay in school and graduate on time (Discretionary funds, internal funds, SAC funds, SAI funds, etc.).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Implementation of periodic tardy sweeps by the administrative team will enhance our student population being to class on time. Student names will be populated on a spreadsheet.

Hall passes are color coded clipboards which includes a data sheet of who, when, and where student is traveling to on campus.

FOCUS is the Countywide program for entering student daily attendance which is monitored by administration and staff. Through FOCUS, administration will be able to monitor senior attendance on a weekly/monthly basis which affects their graduation requirement.

Allocate funds to enhancing the learning experiences of students across all subject areas and programs. Allocate funds to reduce student dropouts and improve the graduation rate.

Monitoring:

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

The administration team will meet weekly to analyze data based on attendance measures implemented. Teachers will monitor student attendance and notify administration of students in jeopardy of attendance rule violations so administrators can discuss with students and create positive behaviors which ultimately will enhance overall student achievement. Administration will also have attendance reports to review through FOCUS.

The principal will engage all stakeholders in ensuring that attendance is a priority including parent engagement, student attendance early intervention, incentives for students, and allocation of resources.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

By motivating students to be accountable for their attendance this will enhance their self pride and ultimately lead to academic success. Academic success leads to positive behavior and a positive school culture.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The purpose is to increase student achievement by motivating the students to be to class on time and be held accountable for their actions pertaining to attendance which ultimately leads to positive behavior and school pride. Academic success, positive behavior, and a positive school culture leads to the ultimate goal of ensuring that every student graduates on time with post-secondary achievement (AP, AICE, Dual Enrollment, CTE Industry Certification).

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.

- Weekly administrative team meetings to review and analyze data
- Support our teachers with tardy sweeps
- Monitor students throughout the day via hall passes
- Meet with senior students in jeopardy of not meeting 90% graduation requirement
- Consistent FOCUS monitoring

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

By When: End of school year 2023-2024

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

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.

Our USH EOC showed the greatest decrease (9%) from 2022. 53% of our USH EOC students had passing scores where the state average was 63% and our district average at 51%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the number of students passing the USH EOC to equal the state average and exceed the District average.

Monitoring:

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

As a school, every Wednesday, teachers will meet in one location to collaboratively plan within their departments and support teachers. Teachers will have to answer two questions that focus on intervention for students who have not met mastery yet and those who already have reached mastery. Administration is part of the collaboration on Wednesdays to help facilitate and monitor to help plan interventions to reach targeted students. Teachers will be able to review weekly the interventions to assess the effectiveness of interventions and make necessary adjustments using data that is collected through formative and summative assessments in intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Donna Jesaitis (jesaitisd@lake.k12.fl.us)

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.)

The USH team of teachers have opted to return to paper and pencil work, focusing on the DBQ process and student writing. The team has also analyzed years of EOC exams and identified the essential standards found most often on the EOC exam. These same teachers are collaborating consistently and more often than once a week, due to the fact that their offices and classrooms are all connected. The team will create and use common assessments on Performance Matters and will also utilize the Lake County Common Assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By focusing on a collective intervention approach and strong collaboration, our high school will ensure that each student receives the support they need to succeed on the USH EOC. Through ongoing collaboration, data analysis, and commitment, we will empower our students to reach their highest potential.

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. Collaboratively develop formative and summative assessments that are centered around the essential standards.
2. The team will identify students who are performing poorly on the common assessments.
3. Teachers will use their SOAR time, the Intervention Block, to review standards that students missed.
4. Teachers will use a summative or formative assessment to see if mastery has been met and determine where re-teaching is necessary.
5. During Wednesday collaboration, teachers use the data from the assessments to see which students need support and analyze common assessments.

Person Responsible: Scott Underwood (underwoods@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.