

Citrus County Schools

Lecanto High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lecanto High School

3810 W EDUCATIONAL PATH, Lecanto, FL 34461

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

Demographics

Principal: Jason Koon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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 is pending approval by the Citrus County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Jason Koon

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

89

Demographic Data

2020-21 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 .	

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	470	451	468	431	1820
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	57	44	53	200
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	90	69	54	290
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	94	74	60	270
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	91	79	60	311
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	58	52	62	239
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	53	15	46	161

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	99	118	90	89	396

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	13	11	4	27	55
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/25/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	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%
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%
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

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
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

Black/African American Students	
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 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 2020-21 school year.

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

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 2020-21 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 AND Mental Wellness 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	For two years in a row, Lecanto High School's Math Achievement and Learning Gains scores have decreased while other departments steadily increase.
Measurable Outcome:	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@citruschools.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 Steps to Implement

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@citruschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and 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%.

Measureable Outcome:
 -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 Steps to Implement

1. Create Professional Learning Communities
2. Actively review 2019-20 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

Person Responsible Alexander Stubenbort (stubenborta@citrusschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

-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

-Heterogeneously group 11th Grade ELA courses via IB SL to match the ongoing shift towards school-wide ELA heterogeneous grouping

-Incorporate Mental Wellness First Aid training for staff and students as mandated by the state

-Build capacity for Culturally Relevant Teaching practices through the ideas and ideals of AVID's CRT course.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

First and foremost, our School Advisory Council committee team is our vehicle to assure that students, parents, teachers, administrators, and community stakeholders share responsibility in making important decisions that directly impact the day-to-day culture at Lecanto High School. Furthermore, through bringing community programs into our school (including, but not limited to: Women Training Women, Men Training Men, Armed Forces recruiters, Veterans in the Classroom, ASPIRE etc.) we assure that our culture is informed by and reflective of the community of Citrus County.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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