Labelle High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Labelle High School

4050 E COWBOY WAY, Labelle, FL 33935

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=3&sc_id=1171294169

Demographics

Principal: Tammy Bass

Start Date for this Principal: 6/19/2019

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)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Hendry 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.](http://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

Labelle High School

4050 E COWBOY WAY, Labelle, FL 33935

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=3&sc_id=1171294169

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	88%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hendry County School Board.

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.

The Mission of LaBelle High School is to:
• Provide a safe, caring and healthy environment where all can learn.
• Promote personal integrity and service to others.
• Encourage individual strengths, uniqueness and cultural diversity.
• Share responsibilities with students and parents.
• Help all to realize their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision……..

LaBelle High School students will be respectful, prepared, and engaged in the learning process.

LaBelle High School teachers will be professionals dedicated to preparing students for their individual futures and executing the policies set forth by the administration.

LaBelle High School parents will engage in a partnership with the school and their children.

The LaBelle High School Administration will set and equitably enforce policies that create and support an optimal learning environment.

By meeting these standards, the students, parents, and staff of LaBelle High School will be equal partners, sharing goals and high expectations, as students prepare for the future.

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
Kelley, David	Principal	
Bass, Tammy	Assistant Principal	
Skipper, Chelsa	Dean	
Sprouse, Eva Marie	Dean	
Howard, Amanda	Dean	
Lee, David	Instructional Coach	
Onorato, Diane	Instructional Coach	

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	322	316	287	312	1237
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	111	111	132	436
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	33	36	18	101
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	51	38	36	142
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	93	128	70	393

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	74	74	75	54	277

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	7	2	20

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
70

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 6/19/2019

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	107	141	143	126	517
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	23	17	13	86
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	57	35	9	168
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	86	47	12	245
	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	95	99	64	37	295

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	107	141	143	126	517
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	23	17	13	86
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	57	35	9	168
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	86	47	12	245
	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	95	99	64	37	295

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	44%	43%	56%	36%	35%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	47%	51%	44%	39%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	35%	42%	28%	27%	41%
Math Achievement	37%	32%	51%	42%	39%	49%
Math Learning Gains	61%	49%	48%	52%	53%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	47%	45%	50%	53%	39%
Science Achievement	87%	72%	68%	46%	45%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	66%	73%	55%	56%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	322 (0)	316 (0)	287 (0)	312 (0)	1237 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	82 (107)	111 (141)	111 (143)	132 (126)	436 (517)
One or more suspensions	14 (33)	33 (23)	36 (17)	18 (13)	101 (86)
Course failure in ELA or Math	17 (67)	51 (57)	38 (35)	36 (9)	142 (168)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	102 (100)	93 (86)	128 (47)	70 (12)	393 (245)

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	46%	44%	2%	55%	-9%
	2018	42%	40%	2%	53%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	38%	38%	0%	53%	-15%
	2018	44%	40%	4%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

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	82%	65%	17%	67%	15%
2018	50%	59%	-9%	65%	-15%
Compare		32%			

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	59%	62%	-3%	70%	-11%
2018	55%	55%	0%	68%	-13%
Compare		4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	22%	38%	-16%	61%	-39%
2018	21%	41%	-20%	62%	-41%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	41%	40%	1%	57%	-16%
2018	42%	42%	0%	56%	-14%
Compare		-1%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	9	25	24	21	42	50	50	37		84	19
ELL	10	32	31	16	53			14		64	
BLK	13	33								80	
HSP	40	45	32	35	60	62	85	56		88	45
WHT	57	58	55	44	63		91	72		91	51
FRL	39	46	37	35	66	62	90	56		87	40
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	31	29	10	27		33	43		68	5
ELL	7	26	29	21	29		13			100	20
BLK	36	36						40		74	14
HSP	42	48	32	30	43	26	50	57		91	40
WHT	48	51	44	40	42		56	61		91	48
FRL	41	49	36	30	43	32	51	54		90	36
2017 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	25	19	21	38	46	22	38		75	19
ELL		31	35	13			9				
BLK	15	38	27	31			17			80	
HSP	33	42	29	39	53	52	47	49		87	35
WHT	47	49	19	48	52	54	50	66		84	43
FRL	29	39	30	39	52	53	39	46		86	34

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	57
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	630
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

- math proficient and low 25% in ELA both 37%. Low 25% in ELA
The components all held ground However The 9th grade cohort ELA dropped from 9th- 10th 6%
Lack of knowledge of data. Many students did not make a gain in 10th grade. Teachers will need to explain to classes as data chat.

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

Students with Disabilities Dropped ELA 21 % to 9 % proficient Not as much emphasis on ESE students by grade. Refocus our Push in strategies and our learning strats class curriculum.

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.

Math proficiency - Our Algebra 1 scores were well below the State average, one of the biggest factors is that the students are entering 9th grade without the foundations needed to be successful on the EOC. The students entering 9th grade have consistently had below a 20% proficiency rate on the 8th grade Mathmatics FSA.
ELA regular Gains - Student growth is not reaching proficiency. Growth scores are continuing to increase, however due to the fact that previous year scores are drastically low, it is proving difficult to have gains that reach the proficiency level.

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

Math Gains Lower 25% and Math Gains overall grew to 61% and 62%. We started data monitoring through benchmark testing in the Algebra 1A and the Informal Geometry classes. Students entering 9th grade must have scored a 4 or higher on the 8th grade FSA Mathematics exam to be placed in Algebra 1. All other students are enrolled in Algebra 1A to increase foundational skills.

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

Gains in ELA need to rise to state level, along with proficiency. The Proficiency scores in math must increase. We must do even better this year at data monitoring with all EOC TEAMS..

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

1. Math proficiency in Algebra.
2. ELA Gains
3. SWD Overall proficiency Gaines in ELA
4. ELA proficient
5. Acceleration continue to move up.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	Algebra 1 proficiency rates have drooped to 18%. This rate going forward will put our above average graduation rate at risk.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	1. Summer math boot camp with 15 students that will be tracked into regular algebra and began using a new pacing guide. 2. More experienced teaching during summer. 3. Trying team teaching and different push in techniques. 4. Increase Algebra proficiency by 8%. 5. Go back to block scheduling for Geometry intensive seniors and Informal Geometry to help increase foundational knowledge. 6. Extensive progress monitoring through Study Island.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	David Lee (leed@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Continued monitoring of regular scheduled bench marking for both Algebra 1A and Algebra 1. Continued monitoring of regular scheduled bench marking for Informal Geometry and Geometry. Bench marking no less than every 3-6-9 weeks, math may want weekly. After school tutoring Block Scheduling for Geo seniors and informal Geo
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This Years math Gains increased with more consistent bench marking. What works with poverty is a system that can be celebrated and consistent.
Action Step	
Description	1. School wide buy in. 2. Math team dissecting own data. 3. Rewards for positive bench mark testing. 4. Resources for push in and team teaching. 5. Monitoring for non attendance and failures using Check & Connect mentors. 6. School wide weekly math question to be discussed in math and science, prize for the correct answer.
Person Responsible	David Lee (leed@hendry-schools.net)

#2	
Title	ELA Proficiency and Gains and Gains of lower 25%
Rationale	Proficiently and regular Gains showed no improvement. The Lower 25% had an increase of 5%. Our goal is for proficiency scores to be at our above the State rate.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	All three ELA areas at 53% or above. 1. Proficient 2. Gains 3. Lower 25% Gains
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tammy Bass (basst@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We have a high number of students with the potential to increase gains and only need a few points to move buckets. Our 10th grade students showed lack of motivation, therefore we will implement celebrations upon completion of Benchmark testing. Administration will have data chats with teachers at the beginning of the year to show where gains can be achieved and how individual scores break down. Teachers will have data chats with students on a regular basis. At the beginning of the second semester classes will complete cumulative review questions on a weekly basis. Additionally, will be to implement several computer based programs for remediation, including Study Island and Albert iO. Xtreme Reading has been implemented for 9th, 10th, and 11th grade students as a Tier 3 Reading Intervention. SAT School Days will take place in October and March, so that students have the opportunity to recieve a concordant score.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	1.Data chats, explaining rules, and test taking strategies will help students power through the 2nd day of testing 2. Research based curriculum comparisons 3. Individual instruction for remediation
Action Step	
Description	1. Bucket Gain chart explained to teachers. 2. Teachers use Bucket Gain Chart and individual FSA scores to conduct data chats with and set goals with students. 3. Monthly meeting with grade alike teachers to discuss data and pacing. (Study Island) 4. ELA Coach, Dr. Onaroto, working closely with 9-10 ELA teachers (meet with 11-12 to maintain pacing)
Person Responsible	Tammy Bass (basst@hendry-schools.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).

1. We will continue using research based instructional materials such as SIM and project based learning for all first year teachers.
2. We will use a research based program, Check and Connect, to increase attendance school wide.

3.Will continue to provide additional and upgraded technology to teachers and students. (one to one chrome books, promethian boards)