

Leon County Schools

Lawton Chiles High School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Lawton Chiles High School

7200 LAWTON CHILES LN, Tallahassee, FL 32312

<https://www.leonschools.net/chiles>

Demographics

Principal: Joseph Burgess

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2019

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)	12%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Leon 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

The mission of Lawton Chiles High School is building a tradition of excellence by providing an environment where students are challenged to be active learners, leaders, achievers and contributors within a global community.

Provide the school's vision statement

Lawton Chiles High School will be an engaging, safe and respectful learning environment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

Our Principles:

The structure and curriculum of Lawton Chiles High School is based upon many strong beliefs. Among the top principles are those which stakeholders feel are paramount to student success.

They are as follows:

- Education is a life-long process.
- Students maximize performance by developing self-discipline and effective critical thinking, academic and leadership skills.
- Diversity can enhance students' understanding of all people and cultures.
- Students should be active learners and have ownership of their learning.

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
Burgess, Joseph	Principal	
Pickens, Calli	Assistant Principal	
Lightfoot, Jeff	Assistant Principal	
Swope, John	Assistant Principal	
Overstreet, Marguerite	Psychologist	
Tekel, Paige	Teacher, ESE	
Thai, Amanda	Teacher, ESE	
Layton, Megan	Teacher, K-12	
Benton, Jennifer	Guidance Counselor	
Taylor, Jenny	Other	
Hampton, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	
Buchanan, Buck	Teacher, K-12	
Pierce, Heather	Other	

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	513	586	520	470	2089
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	47	53	45	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	24	27	32	89
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	44	37	24	146

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	18	18	14	61

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

98

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

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	
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	12	
Students with two or more indicators	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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	84	88	89	340
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	29	21	10	103
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	24	27	32	89
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	44	37	24	146

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	35	35	34	26	130

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	80%	57%	56%	79%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	52%	51%	62%	52%	53%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	40%	42%	49%	37%	44%
Math Achievement	77%	56%	51%	74%	52%	51%
Math Learning Gains	49%	47%	48%	46%	42%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	47%	45%	56%	42%	45%
Science Achievement	90%	67%	68%	81%	64%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	85%	82%	73%	90%	77%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	513 (0)	586 (0)	520 (0)	470 (0)	2089 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	40 (0)	47 (0)	53 (0)	45 (0)	185 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	6 (0)	24 (0)	27 (0)	32 (0)	89 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	41 (0)	44 (0)	37 (0)	24 (0)	146 (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	81%	58%	23%	55%	26%
	2018	82%	60%	22%	53%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	79%	57%	22%	53%	26%
	2018	75%	58%	17%	53%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

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	90%	70%	20%	67%	23%
2018	81%	69%	12%	65%	16%
Compare		9%			
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	86%	81%	5%	70%	16%
2018	89%	79%	10%	68%	21%
Compare		-3%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	69%	-10%	61%	-2%
2018	66%	71%	-5%	62%	4%
Compare		-7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	67%	18%	57%	28%
2018	77%	60%	17%	56%	21%
Compare		8%			

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	35	38	37	52	63	64	55	71		95	26
ASN	87	67	20	86	62		89			100	92
BLK	59	58	44	54	32	57	71	66		98	45
HSP	76	51	45	67	53	69	87	93		95	68
MUL	82	58	60	79	44		88			100	63
WHT	82	61	51	80	51	70	93	88		100	65
FRL	62	48	43	60	44	48	68	69		98	29

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	32	43	40	42	42	50	50	50		84	26
ASN	96	84		81	54		100	91		97	86
BLK	53	53	45	50	36	42	54	83		94	52
HSP	78	65	57	70	36		86			84	56
MUL	62	42		53	42		55			100	46
WHT	81	62	50	79	47	60	84	90		99	67
FRL	56	50	46	54	55	67	64	77		89	39

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	722
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	75
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	58
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	70
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	72
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	74
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	57
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

Chiles High School had two data components that performed at the lowest percent of 49%. First, our Math Learning Gains, but it is an upward trend from 2018 46%. Secondly, our English Language Arts Learning gains for the lowest 25% was at 49% for a second year in a row.

This seems to be a trend and the school is implementing strategies and improvements to increase learning gains for our bottom 25%. This is a school focus this 2019-2020 school year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year of 2018 is the Social Studies Achievement score. In 2018 90% of students who took the United States History End of Course Exam passed with an Achievement Level of 3 to 5. In 2019 85% of students who took the United States History End of the Course Exam passed with an Achievement Level of 3 to 5.

As the number of students who are taking AP United States History is increasing within our student population, the number of students enrolled in U.S. History general decreases. The average reading level for our general courses is an Achievement Level of 2. Our ELA and Social Studies department are working to integrate more reading in the content strategies to assist our struggling readers in areas such as vocabulary focus, data chats, and progress monitoring.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

The data component that had the biggest gap when compared to the state average was ELA Achievement and Math Achievement. The Math Achievement for Chiles was 77% and the State average was 51%. That shows a difference of 26 percent points. The ELA Achievement for Chiles was 80% and the State average was 56%. That shows a difference of 24 percent points.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the Math Lowest 25th Percentile that increased from 56% in 2018 to 68% in 2019. Chiles High School took on the focus of looking and working with our lower 25% students. For the upcoming year we will add to our progress monitoring system the creation of data chats and remediation of those standards that students are still not mastering.

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

Two of the potential areas of concern for Lawton Chiles High School would be our percent of students who were Level 1 on statewide assessments and students who have attendance below 90%.

*Students with an IEP will meet with their case managers to assist with learning

strategies to support classes and prepare for EOCs

* Students with an IEP who take the Unique Skills resource class will develop study strategies and take practice tests to review areas where improvement is needed

* Teachers will encourage students to take honors and AP classes to foster a sense of self confidence and success

* Club sponsors and coaches will encourage regular attendance by meeting with students and holding them accountable for being present at school

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

1. ELA Learning Gains for the bottom 25%
2. Math Learning Gains
3. Percent of Subgroups in Acceleration classes
4. Students with attendance below 90%
5. ELA Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Percentage of students in the area of Social Studies Achievement
Rationale	We have a decrease in our overall percentage of students receiving achievement level 3-5 on the United States History EOC. As our number of students historically receiving an achievement level of 1 or 2 on the FSA ELA increases it will affect the United States History EOC. These students have difficulty with the comprehension strategies required to achieve a proficient score on the US History EOC. Also, as our number of students who are enrolled in AP US history increases, the number of high achieving students in United States History decreases.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	As we use a more complex state measure of history, our school goal is to have at least 78% of our students proficient in this area on the 2020 US History End of Course Exam scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Calli Pickens (pickensc@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will access their students' scores on FOCUS for FSA ELA 10th grade at the beginning of the school year to determine the specific areas of concern through curriculum and reading strategies that are designed to help students improve.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will be involved in department and district professional development activities that support the area of reading in the content area.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will identify struggling students based on bottom 25% data and FSA ELA scores. 2. Teachers will use progress monitoring mid-year and the diagnostic to target standards needed to be retaught 3. Teachers will use the content pacing guide and EOC review 4. ESE Case Managers support students with EOC reviews and practice tests 5. Teachers can implement content area vocab to assist with reading comprehension
Person Responsible	Oscar Brennan (brennano@leonschools.net)

#2	
Title	Percentage of students in the area of Algebra 1
Rationale	We have a number of students who historically achieve low grades in their math courses. These students don't have the prior knowledge required to receive a proficient score on the Algebra EOC. We have a number of high achieving students who complete Algebra 1 and the subsequent EOC in middle school. Because these students' scores are not included in our overall scores, it is difficult to improve the percentage of proficiency.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	As we use a more complex state measure of math, our school goal is to have at least 55% of our students proficient in this area on the 2020 Algebra 1 End of Course Exam scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Calli Pickens (pickensc@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will access their students' scores on FOCUS at the beginning of the school year to determine the specific areas of concern for their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will use the data collect to modify their instruction in our Algebra 1 classes. Standards that they pinpoint as failing will be retaught through classroom instruction.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will use progress monitoring mid-term. 2. Teachers will use the district pacing guide and curriculum map. 3. Teachers will use the district Algebra 1 EOC End of Course Review. 4. Teachers and the department head will review progress monitoring data to gear instruction. 5. ESE Case Managers will support students by providing supplementary lessons to assist with Algebra 1 skills.
Person Responsible	Gaye Mclanahan (mclanahang@leonschools.net)

#3	
Title	Percentage of students in the area of Geometry
Rationale	We have a number of students who historically achieve low grades in their math courses. These students lack prior knowledge required to receive a proficient score on the Geometry EOC. We have a number of high achieving students who complete Algebra 1 and Geometry and the subsequent EOC in middle school.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	As we use a more complex state measure of math, our school goal is to have at least 70% of our students proficient in this area on the 2020 Geometry End of Course Exam (EOC) scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Calli Pickens (pickensc@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will access their students' scores on FOCUS at the beginning of the school year to determine the specific areas of concern for their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will closely monitor those students who are in Geometry that have yet to pass the Algebra 1 EOC as that is a requirement for graduation.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will use the course pacing guide and curriculum map 2. Teachers will progress monitor their students twice a year 3. Teachers will use data chats with students 4. ESE Case Managers supplement Geometry lessons with prior skills needed 5. EOC practice tests given to determine areas of need and improvement
Person Responsible	Gaye Mclanahan (mclanahang@leonschools.net)

#4	
Title	Percentage of students in the area of English/Reading/Writing
Rationale	Historically, we have a number of students who are in honors level classes who score a level 2 or 3 on the FSA ELA 9th and 10th grade assessment. These students are difficult to progress to the next level of proficiency. We have a number of students who consistently score a level 4 or 5 on the FSA. These students sometimes have difficulty maintaining the high level with the progressive difficulty of the ELA FSA exam.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	As we use a more complex state measure of English/Language Arts, our school goal is to have at least 72% of our students proficient in this area on the 2020 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Calli Pickens (pickensc@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers access their students' scores on FOCUS at the beginning of the school year to determine the specific areas of concern for their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will address their concerns through curriculum and reading strategies that are designed to help the students improve. Teachers are involved in professional development activities that support the area of reading.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will identify students below proficiency level and their students included in the bottom 25% 2. Teachers will use progress monitoring twice a year 3. Teachers will use data chats to inform students of their progress 4. ESE teachers supplement ELA lessons with vocabulary, writing, grammar, and comprehension strategies 5. Students will take regular practice tests and review areas that need improvement
Person Responsible	Andrew Shoenberger (shoenbergera@leonschools.net)

#5	
Title	Percentage of students in the area of Biology
Rationale	We have a number of students who historically score a level 2 or 3 on the FSA. These students have difficulty with the reading required to receive a proficient score on the Biology EOC. We have a number of high achieving students who completed high school biology and the subsequent EOC in middle school. Because these students' scores are not included in our overall scores, it is difficult to improve the percentage of proficiency.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	As we use a more complex state measure of science. our school goal is to have at least 75% of our students proficient in this area on the 2020 Biology 1 End of Course Exam (EOC) scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Calli Pickens (pickensc@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers access their students' scores on FOCUS at the beginning of the school year to determine the specific areas of concern for their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will access their concerns in these areas through curriculum and reading strategies that are designed to help the students improve.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will use the district process monitoring 2. Teachers will use the district pacing guide and curriculum map 3. Students will use review guides to track content learned 4. ESE teachers will review material to take practice tests in Unique Skills 5. Teachers will complete content chats to support students with areas they need additional support in
Person Responsible	Bonni Warren (warrenb@leonschools.net)

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)

Teachers will access their student data scores at the beginning of the year to identify our bottom 25% in both Math and ELA. Both Math and ELA will begin to use data chats, progress monitoring and reading strategies to improve instruction for our bottom 25%. Guidance, Our testing coordinator, OFI coordinator, Dean and APAs will work and mentor students who are within one or more early warning category. Student who fall into both the categories of attendance below 90% and level 1 on statewide assessments will be continuously monitored through our Student Affairs department.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Percentage of students in the area of Social Studies Achievement				\$2,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1141	120-Classroom Teachers	1141 - Lawton Chiles High School	Title II		\$2,500.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Percentage of students in the area of Algebra 1				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1141	120-Classroom Teachers	1141 - Lawton Chiles High School	Title II		\$2,000.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Percentage of students in the area of Geometry				\$300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1141	120-Classroom Teachers	1141 - Lawton Chiles High School	Title II		\$300.00
4	III.A	Areas of Focus: Percentage of students in the area of English/Reading/Writing				\$7,164.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1141	120-Classroom Teachers	1141 - Lawton Chiles High School	Title II		\$7,164.00
5	III.A	Areas of Focus: Percentage of students in the area of Biology				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1141	120-Classroom Teachers	1141 - Lawton Chiles High School	Title II		\$500.00
Total:						\$12,464.00