

Citrus County Schools

Lecanto High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lecanto High School

3810 W EDUCATIONAL PATH, Lecanto, FL 34461

<https://lhs.citrusschools.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Jason Koon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/10/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	55%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Citrus County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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	8
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lecanto High School

3810 W EDUCATIONAL PATH, Lecanto, FL 34461

<https://lhs.citruschools.org/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

High School
9-12

2018-19 Title I School

No

2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

55%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

23%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

2018-19
B

2017-18
B

2016-17
B

2015-16
B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Citrus County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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.

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

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Newman, Shawyn	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Scheduling
Stubenbort, Alexander	Assistant Principal	PD and Technology
Hopper, Ernie	Assistant Principal	Facilities and Discipline
Koon, Jason	Principal	Sucess and Safety of all at LHS

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164	173	183	215	735
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	69	76	70	312
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	44	70	76	209
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	76	75	65	309

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	93	82	81	82	338

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	61	40	51	74	226
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

88

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/22/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	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
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	58%	57%	56%	57%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	53%	51%	48%	48%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	41%	42%	34%	38%	44%
Math Achievement	45%	56%	51%	52%	53%	51%
Math Learning Gains	38%	39%	48%	42%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	40%	45%	34%	42%	45%
Science Achievement	85%	80%	68%	66%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	79%	73%	73%	73%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	164 ()	173 ()	183 ()	215 ()	735 (0)
One or more suspensions	97 (0)	69 (0)	76 (0)	70 (0)	312 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	19 (0)	44 (0)	70 (0)	76 (0)	209 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	93 (0)	76 (0)	75 (0)	65 (0)	309 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
09	2019	58%	54%	4%	55%	3%
	2018	56%	52%	4%	53%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	58%	54%	4%	53%	5%
	2018	55%	49%	6%	53%	2%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	72%	11%	67%	16%
2018	58%	61%	-3%	65%	-7%
Compare		25%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	75%	4%	70%	9%
2018	74%	71%	3%	68%	6%
Compare		5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	70%	-21%	61%	-12%
2018	45%	65%	-20%	62%	-17%
Compare		4%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	42%	57%	-15%	57%	-15%
2018	42%	52%	-10%	56%	-14%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	28	38	29	31	37	33		50		80	14
ELL	17	42									
ASN	79	72					91	83		100	82
BLK	36	33	20	18	36			80		93	54
HSP	53	51	36	34	30	47	86	82		86	60
MUL	55	50		29	30			76		100	40
WHT	60	56	40	49	40	49	86	80		93	52
FRL	52	50	39	41	40	46	78	73		91	45

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	16	32	28	25	40	37	31	46		62	13
ELL				10	42						
ASN	87	74		47	40		84			100	87
BLK	42	35		45	25		60			76	44
HSP	54	44	21	49	51	40	69	53		82	70
MUL	54	52		47	40		71	86		77	50
WHT	56	47	33	53	42	35	64	72		87	57
FRL	48	40	32	46	38	36	59	71		80	43

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	20
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	612
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	20
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	2
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends.

The Geometry achievement scores were at 42% last year placing us 15% under the district average. Factors for low performance include, but are not limited to: teacher turnover, long term subs filling subject area positions, lack of a consistent and purposeful PLC, etc.

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

The only declines our school experienced last year were in our Math Achievement scores and our Math Learning Gains. As previously stated, our math department underwent a lot of change last year and did so without a well organized PLC to guide instruction.

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.

We are 10 points below the state in Math Learning Gains. We believe staffing is part of the equation while a lack of collaboration and coordination of lessons and strategies also contributed.

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

The largest jump was experienced by our Science Achievement scores. In Science achievement, our score grew by 19%. At the beginning of last year, we reorganized teachers' schedules to better serve our biology students. Furthermore, students rotated

from Environmental Science their 9th grade year to the Biology course in 10th grade. This transition better prepared them for success. This cycle will continue in the 2019-20 school year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The most pressing concern is the over 700 students with a lower than 90% attendance rate. Furthermore, the incoming freshman class has 97 students with 1 or more referrals.

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

1. Increasing mathematics achievement and gains by at least 5%
2. To accelerate the rate of positive gains in ELA achievement scores to reach 63% by the 2019-20 school year
3. To implement an attendance policy to battle growing absenteeism (MTSS, etc.)
4. Maintaining rigor and achievement in History with an ever evolving staff
5. Implementing a progressive discipline plan to fidelity that builds culture while holding students to a high expectation (Cognito, Mental Health, etc)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Mathematics Achievement and Learning Gains
Rationale	For two years in a row, Lecanto High School's Math Achievement and Learning Gains scores have decreased while other departments steadily increase.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	5% gain in Math Achievement 3% gain in Math Learning Gains 3% increase across the board on the Math Federal Percent of Points Index for SWD
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shawyn Newman (newmans@citrussschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Attention must be placed on instructional strategies and unpacking the standards to effectively address our bottom quartile, ELL, and SWD populations. This shift will be supported by purposeful, data-driven PLC groups that assess data, create lessons, and build assessments collaboratively.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Bayside High School is a Florida public school that practically mirrors the demographics of Lecanto High School. In 2012, they implemented purposeful, data-driven PLCs in their math department resulting in a 13% increase in Algebra EOC scores over the course of 3 years (59% in 2012-13 to 72% 2014-15)
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create Professional Learning Communities 2. Actively review 2018-19 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. Sharing best practices for student learning (Spiraling techniques, new content enhancement, etc)
Person Responsible	Shawyn Newman (newmans@citrussschools.org)

#2	
Title	English Language Arts Achievement and Bottom Quartile Learning Gains
Rationale	Although Lecanto High School has had steady gains in the areas of ELA Achievement, Learning Gains, and Bottom Quartile Learning Gains; the Bottom Quartile Learning Gains still falls below the State average by 6%.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ELA Achievement increase by 5% -ELA Learning Gains increase by 3% -Bottom Quartile Learning Gains Increase by 3% -Increase Achievement scores in the subgroups of ELL and SWD by 3% on the Federal Percent of Points Index
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Alexander Stubenbort (stubenborta@citrusschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Attention must be placed on instructional strategies and unpacking the standards to effectively address the bottom quartile, SWD, and ELL populations. This shift will be supported by purposeful, data-driven PLC groups that assess data, create lessons, and build assessments collaboratively.
Rationale for Evidence-based 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.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create Professional Learning Communities 2. Actively review 2018-19 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. Sharing best practices for student learning (Spiraling techniques, new content enhancement, etc)
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

- Increase Acceleration by 4% in each cohort (accurate tracking mechanism will be developed, review of current data, and purposeful improvements for student placement)
- Decrease number of total students below 90% attendance via home visits of at risk students, PBIS rewards for positive attendance, and an attendance campaign school-wide.
- Decrease total number of student OSS days by 10% via opting for Restorative practices when appropriate and reassigning disciplinary actions within the discipline plan.
- Increase interest in College and Careers via campus beautification
- Increase implementation of AVID strategies via teacher Professional Development

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

NA

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

- *Students have the opportunity to receive social and emotional instruction as needed through their counselor's office hours and/or Panther Hour.
- * Individual counseling and/or mentoring is available for all students with the guidance counselor, deans, social worker, and/or school psychologist (as needed).
- * All staff are provided with professional development for Kognito and Student Mental Health First Aide.
- *TAP (Teachers as Advisers Program) includes social emotional TIER 2 Character Ed lessons and student self-advocacy
- *Referral to outside agencies for mental health as needed
- *Professional learning communities throughout campus
- *Social skills of the week via the school Morning Show
- *MTSS supports are created for positive rewards for students with positive behavior via Character Counts and Positive Referrals .
- *All students have the option to enroll in social-emotional courses

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

NA

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

NA

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

NA