Hendry County Schools

Labelle High School

2020-21 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: 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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%)
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.

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	99%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kelley, David	Principal	1. Over see all instructional programs, 2. Evaluate Coaching science and CTE teachers 3. Oversee all maintenance.
Sprouse, Eva Marie	Dean	1.Discipline grades 9-10 2. instructional coach social studies and PE. 3. Safe Schools coordinator
Howard, Amanda	Dean	1. Guidance overflow, 2. RTI Coordinator 3. ESE School Coordinator and Liaison to ESE district office, 4. Reading,English, ESE, and Art Instructional Coach 5. Test Coordinator 6. Website Coordinator. 7. Builds Master schedule
Lee, David	Instructional Coach	David Lee is over our math department oversee's math placement ,books, teacher assignment. Does do coaching and modeling.
Onorato, Diane	Instructional Coach	Marzano Coach, all pacing guides, new teachers, RTI, reading specialist
Bass, Tammy	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Tammy Bass

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.*

0

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

78

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	315	315	320	310	1260
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	97	92	125	373
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	25	16	9	76
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	48	91	10	196
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	31	27	4	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	86	47	12	245
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Bio pass rate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	0	82
US History pass rate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	0	54
Algebra Pass rate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	18
Geometry pass	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	0	53
Acceleration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	45

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	

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	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/11/2020

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	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

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	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

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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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	
	(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	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%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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

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
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%	0
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%	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

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%	0

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%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	65
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	56
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.

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 Mathematics 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?

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Algebra 1 proficiency rates have dropped to 18%. This rate going forward will put our above average graduation rate at risk.
Measurable Outcome:	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 Kelley (kelleyd@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. Explore Albert io testing platform becoming more Florida Standards Based friendly. Block a-1 and then Block algebra 1 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 Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and 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.
Measurable Outcome:	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 and an ACT School Day in October so that students have the opportunity to receive 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 Steps to Implement

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)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Using Benchmark Data from 2019 compare the change in instructional platforms to BenchMark Data in Math, Social Studies, Biology, Reading, and ELA. Also, looking at curriculum changes in Social Studies, for example adding Pre AP World History to the curriculum and pairing US Government and Florida History. In Math the introduction of a new math, Advanced Topics in Math for incoming Freshman, block Algebra 1A to Block Algebra 1. Also, had good results with Block Geometry for lower 25% of seniors in 2019 December test. All of the bench marks were in Study Island last year we will use Albert io for certain BenchMark test items. All students will be given a pretest in ALL subject areas (core). Review for the 10th grade FSA will happen in 11th grade English and Reading for Fall test.
Measurable Outcome:	Using Albert. iO should help with specific testing issues such as standards alignment, test familiarity, and having some choice on varying test questions. 11th graders will be tracked throughout the year using the Fall FSA retake, the SAT, and ACT School Day test results. We will also track Math Data through our ACT and SAT pass rates. We will compare coordinate pass rates for each test. Also use practice test platforms for each test.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Howard (howarda@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence based strategies are already used and have gotten better results. We are looking to improve on our benchmark testing and individual learning plans. We are also looking to see best results with the ACT and SAT for Math Concordant. National pass rates are better on the ACT.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We experienced a big jump in Math Gains. We have had small increase in ELA Gains over the past 3 years and would like to see those increase to state average. Using consistent benchmark testing teachers can gain a better understanding of each students need. In Math we have relied on the PERT test for a concordant score, it will be going away after this year. We must find the best fit for our students to test.

Action Steps to Implement

Use Albert.iO as often as the standards allow. Draw comparisons between Albert.iO and Study Island within subject area's. Use platforms for SAT and ACT for test prep and draw comparisons with national state and our own pass rates for concordant state scores.

Person Responsible	David Kelley (kelleyd@hendry-schools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Reading and Math independent Learning Strategies and Benchmark testing

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.

Positive Culture & Environment
LaBelle High School encourages positive culture through our Cowboy Code:
1. Be Courteous
2. Be Organized.
3. Be Dependable
4. Be Engaged.
Signs are posted in the classrooms and hallways. All teachers are involved in the Cowboy Cash Program that rewards students for positive behaviors. Majority of teachers have been trained in our Mentoring Program, Check and Connect. Check and Connect is the only research based program in the United States for truancy. Our school improvement plan includes incorporating new clubs and activities that includes all students through activities and fellowship. Teachers already understand their roles as mentors and school leaders.Stakeholders understand that there are many pieces from our community that must be included to promote a positive school culture. Everyone from the Governor, to the superintendent, to the last freshman must have positive input. Students must feel they have achieved and helped build a good culture. Dual Enrollment, Career Pathways, AP, CTE Programs all lead to goals and setting goals lead to positive interactions between students staff and parents.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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