

Liberty County School District

Liberty County High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Liberty County High School

12852 NW CR 12, Bristol, FL 32321

lchsbulldogs.com

Demographics

Principal: Eric Willis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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 Liberty 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Liberty County High School

12852 NW CR 12, Bristol, FL 32321

lchsbulldogs.com

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	Yes	64%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	19%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Liberty 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.

LCHS mission is to develop in every student a sense of PRIDE...

P--Performance through preparation

R--Respect

I--Integrity

D--Determination

E--Excellence through effort

Provide the school's vision statement.

Promoting a sense of pride and heritage while preparing for the challenges of tomorrow.

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
Willis, Eric	Principal	
Summers, Donna	School Counselor	
Harger, Ivy	Teacher, K-12	
Spikes, Kristina	Teacher, K-12	
Davis, Tim	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Hosford, Georgia	Teacher, K-12	
Austin, Sharon	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/15/2020, Eric Willis

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.*

1

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	0	99	89	71	77	336
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	38	33	42	154
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	22	8	7	65
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	79	82	57	72	290

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	2	2	1	5
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

Wednesday 7/15/2020

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	108	88	74	92	362
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	47	27	46	170
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	14	8	12	52
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	4	8	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	16	4	1	41

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	85	80	60	71	296	

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	2	1	0	1	4
Students retained two or more times	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	108	88	74	92	362
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	47	27	46	170
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	14	8	12	52
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	4	8	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	16	4	1	41

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	85	80	60	71	296

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	2	1	0	1	4
Students retained two or more times	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	66%	66%	56%	46%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	58%	51%	43%	43%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	44%	42%	35%	35%	41%
Math Achievement	63%	63%	51%	26%	26%	49%
Math Learning Gains	66%	66%	48%	36%	36%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	79%	79%	45%	35%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	75%	75%	68%	44%	44%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	78%	73%	72%	72%	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	62%	62%	0%	55%	7%
	2018	69%	69%	0%	53%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	68%	68%	0%	53%	15%
	2018	59%	59%	0%	53%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

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	69%	69%	0%	67%	2%
2018	57%	57%	0%	65%	-8%
Compare		12%			
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	78%	78%	0%	70%	8%
2018	69%	69%	0%	68%	1%
Compare		9%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	62%	-4%	61%	-3%
2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%
Compare		58%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	66%	0%	57%	9%
2018	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
Compare		12%			

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	41	68	50				80			83	20
BLK	39	50		40							
HSP	56	56		69							
WHT	71	60	52	67	70	77	79	79		90	77
FRL	60	61	46	54	65	73	68	79		77	74
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	42	56	50	36							
BLK	47	80									
HSP	52	81		50			57				
WHT	70	72	74	56	65	58	60	68		89	90
FRL	62	70	85	55	65	55	52	70		87	85
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		27		8						64	
BLK	27	45		7	9						
HSP	44	50		13	25						
WHT	47	42	37	30	41	38	48	78		91	84
FRL	37	47	48	22	28	21	37	56		82	64

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	69
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	693
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
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
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	43
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	60
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	72
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	66
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.

ELA lowest quartile was the data component that performed the lowest.

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

ELA lowest quartile showed a decline of 32% from 2018 to 2019

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.

ELA lowest quartile. Factors that contributed to this gap were extenuating circumstances due to Covid-19 pandemic.

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

Math lowest quartile showed the most improvement from 2018 to 2019. Yes, it is a trend.

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

Attendance is a potential area of concern

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

1. To support the ELA lowest quartile to make gains in reading from previous year's state assessment results
2. To decrease attendance issues using seat time policy
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Higher attendance correlates to higher achievement
Measurable Outcome:	Improved attendance for the 2020 - 2021 school year which should result in higher performance
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eric Willis (eric.willis@lcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Principal, Assistant Principal and Guidance Counselor
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Principal, Assistant Principal and Guidance Counselor will meet periodically with students that are in danger of becoming truant.

Action Steps to Implement

Implementing an attendance policy based on Florida Statue 1003.439(1)(a) which requires a minimum of 135 hours of instruction in the classroom (seat time) to receive credit for each course attempted. Students that do not meet the required seat time will receive an Incomplete for the attempted course until the allotted time has been in summer school.

Attendance report will be viewed on a weekly basis to assess at-risk students. Students deemed at-risk will be notified that they are in danger of not fulfilling the seat time requirement. If attendance does not improve, a child study team may be implemented to improve student attendance.

Person Responsible Eric Willis (eric.willis@lcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: ELA Lowest Quartile

Measurable Outcome: Only 44% of the students in the Lowest Quartile had learning gains on the ELA for the 2018-2019 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tim Davis (timothy.davis@lcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Write Score, Common Lit, and Tutoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Write Score will provide formative assessments, resulting data, and instructional resources for the Lowest Quartile students. Common Lit will provide research based instructional materials to support literacy development for the Lowest Quartile students. Teachers will provide tutoring to the Lowest Quartile students in ELA after school.

Action Steps to Implement

Write Score will provide hand-scored data that aligns to State Standards.

Common Lit will provide quarterly assessments allowing student growth to be tracked.

Tutoring will assist the Lowest Quartile students in ELA.

Person Responsible

Tim Davis (timothy.davis@lcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

We strive to maintain a positive school culture and environment through our dedication, enthusiasm and open

mindedness by speaking to parents, students and stakeholders with a positive tone.

We strive for high academic standards for all students by using frequent checks for understanding and implementing researched based best teaching practices.

We strive to have a collaborative staff by working in teams of subject areas and using current and relevant data to drive instruction.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Attendance				\$22,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	360-Rentals	0021 - Liberty County High School			\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Rentals, software ParentSquare, utilized to contact parents regarding student attendance.</i>			
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0021 - Liberty County High School	General Fund		\$20,000.00
			<i>Notes: Salary, other support personnel, guidance.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$47,678.28
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	360-Rentals	0021 - Liberty County High School	Title, I Part A		\$2,712.48
			<i>Notes: Web, based instructional software, Write Score.</i>			
	5100	360-Rentals	0021 - Liberty County High School	Title, I Part A		\$1,200.00
			<i>Notes: Web based instructional software, Common Lit.</i>			

	5100	360-Rentals	0021 - Liberty County High School	Title, I Part A		\$4,882.00
			<i>Notes: Web based instructional software, IXL.</i>			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0021 - Liberty County High School	Title II		\$4,000.00
			<i>Notes: Stipends for professional development in the area of B.E.S.T. standards to ensure curriculum alignment to new state standards.</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0021 - Liberty County High School	Title, I Part A	0.5	\$30,079.80
			<i>Notes: High qualified ELA teacher.</i>			
	6400	360-Rentals	0021 - Liberty County High School	Title, I Part A		\$4,804.00
			<i>Notes: Web based instructional software, Ren Learn.</i>			
Total:						\$69,678.28