

Lafayette District Schools

Lafayette High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lafayette High School

160 NE HORNET DR, Mayo, FL 32066

<https://www.lafayette.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Stewart Hancock

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2007

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
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)	90%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
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 Lafayette 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

Building a community of learners.

Provide the school's vision statement

To provide all students with educational opportunities within a safe environment conducive to learning, which will enable them to become successful students and positive, productive citizens.

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
Hancock, Stewart	Principal	
Palomino, Cathy	Instructional Coach	
Hanson, Tim	Dean	
Ginn, Paula	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2007, Stewart Hancock

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.*

7

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12

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)	90%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
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	106	84	97	84	97	91	72	631
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	1	0	1	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	12	26	16	14	17	7	115
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	17	26	11	12	13	3	119
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	22	26	12	12	12	110
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	11	11	4	0	0	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	17	6	12	13	6	6	5	65

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	2	2	4	1	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	2	6	4	23

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/19/2020

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	92	103	96	91	98	76	82	638
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	7	4	1	24
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4	15	20	16	3	76
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	27	35	16	18	32	7	148

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	1	6	1	6	2	7	1	24

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	1	3	3	3	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	6	6	2	24

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	92	103	96	91	98	76	82	638
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	7	4	1	24
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4	15	20	16	3	76
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	27	35	16	18	32	7	148

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	1	6	1	6	2	7	1	24

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	1	3	3	3	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	6	6	2	24

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	56%	0%	56%	58%	0%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	0%	51%	64%	0%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	0%	42%	62%	0%	44%
Math Achievement	64%	0%	51%	72%	0%	51%
Math Learning Gains	43%	0%	48%	68%	0%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	0%	45%	58%	0%	45%
Science Achievement	65%	0%	68%	75%	0%	67%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	70%	0%	73%	69%	0%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
06	2019	43%	43%	0%	54%	-11%
	2018	49%	49%	0%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	36%	36%	0%	52%	-16%
	2018	53%	53%	0%	51%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
08	2019	64%	64%	0%	56%	8%
	2018	73%	73%	0%	58%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
09	2019	68%	68%	0%	55%	13%
	2018	52%	52%	0%	53%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
10	2019	58%	58%	0%	53%	5%
	2018	64%	64%	0%	53%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	67%	67%	0%	55%	12%
	2018	66%	66%	0%	52%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	61%	61%	0%	54%	7%
	2018	84%	84%	0%	54%	30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	47%	47%	0%	46%	1%
	2018	62%	62%	0%	45%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	53%	53%	0%	48%	5%
	2018	69%	69%	0%	50%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	77%	0%	67%	10%
2018	84%	84%	0%	65%	19%
Compare		-7%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	70%	0%	71%	-1%
2018	73%	73%	0%	71%	2%
Compare		-3%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	68%	68%	0%	70%	-2%
2018	66%	66%	0%	68%	-2%
Compare		2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	69%	0%	61%	8%
2018	63%	63%	0%	62%	1%
Compare		6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	33%	33%	0%	57%	-24%
2018	77%	77%	0%	56%	21%
Compare		-44%			

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	21	38	26	38	46	38	23	35			
ELL	35	40		94	43						
BLK	43	43	30	48	38		50	60			
HSP	53	50	33	69	43	46	66	70	62	100	64
MUL				42							
WHT	58	58	42	66	43	39	67	75	85	96	89
FRL	44	51	38	60	44	41	60	66	67	95	76

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	15	37	38	32	46	47	33	38			
ELL	30	80									
BLK	35	45	45	47	66	57	40	50			
HSP	54	66	58	77	71	79	78	76	58	94	88
MUL	40	70									
WHT	62	65	65	74	66	52	79	72	57	87	85
FRL	50	61	60	67	68	57	68	63	52	85	86

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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	690
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	45
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	42
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	
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	58
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

Learning gains of our bottom 25% in Reading and Math. We made a substantial amount of growth of our bottom 25% in 2018; our data from 2019 shows we regressed in this area. We have held meetings with our leadership teams including departmental chairs which focused on implementing strategies to engage and motivate these students.

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

Learning gains of our bottom 25% in Reading and Math, and our overall learning gains in Math. We made a substantial amount of growth of our bottom 25% in 2018; our data from 2019 shows we regressed in this area. We have held meetings with our leadership teams including departmental chairs which focused on implementing strategies to engage and motivate these students.

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

Learning gains of our bottom 25% in Reading and Math, and our overall learning gains in Math. (See explanation in previous question). With regard to Math, we had higher achievement levels in 2018 than in previous years; therefore, gains were more difficult to attain. When transitioning students from 7th grade Math to Algebra 1, it is more difficult to achieve learning gains.

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

Middle School Acceleration. We had a higher percentage of students who achieved a passing score on their 7th grade Math FSA assessment participate in Alg. 1 as 8th graders. We've also implemented CAPE funded Industry Certifications in 7th and 8th grade during the 2017-2018 school year.

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

Attendance less than 90%. This will be an even greater challenge as we deal with the COVID pandemic and offer an at-home option for students.

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

1. Increase learning gains of our bottom 25% in Reading and Math.
2. Increase proficiency and learning gains of our students with disabilities.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Students with Disabilities subgroup below 41% on ESSA Federal Index

Measureable Outcome: Student performance of our Students with Disabilities Subgroup will improve by 8% in the 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stewart Hancock (shancock@lcsbmail.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Implemented an ESE PLC, led by Alissa Hingson, Director of Teaching and Learning Services. Professional learning provided by Marcus Sowcik for ESE, general education instructors, and paraprofessionals that focuses on high impact strategies for students with disabilities. Promote an atmosphere of success to build student confidence.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The ESE PLC will help to inform, focus, and unite the ESE department with common goals and best practices. Professional learning provided by an experienced ESE educator will enhance knowledge and understanding for all stakeholders.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement ESE PLC
2. Set up Professional Learning Sessions with Marcus Sowcik
3. Offer Professional Learning that focuses on strategies to promote success in the classroom and build student confidence.

Person**Responsible**

Stewart Hancock (shancock@lcsbmail.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase proficiency of bottom 25% in Reading and Math. After reviewing our school data, this was our greatest area of need and concern for the 2020-2021 school year.
Measureable Outcome:	The bottom 25% of students will increase learning gains to 55% in Reading and Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stewart Hancock (shancock@lcsbmail.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Improve student foundational reading skills (vocabulary, decoding, etc). Students will receive individualized instruction to target their specific needs and deficiencies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our focus is on the areas of our students' greatest needs. Getting back to the basics to establish foundational skills is essential to our students' ultimate success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Purchase and train teachers on the use of iReady
2. Purchase and train teachers on the use of Vocabulary.com

Person Responsible Cathy Palomino (cpalomino@lcsbmail.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance is vital to student success, and communication with parents helps to ensure students are regularly attending school. At LHS, each day that a student is absent, a call is made to the parent informing them of the absence. When a student reaches 4 unexcused absences in a class in a nine week period, a letter is sent home. On the 7th unexcused absence, a parent meeting is required. On the 15th unexcused absence, the student's grade will default to a 59% for the 9-week grading period. Our goal is that the face-to-face meetings will help deter excessive absenteeism.

When this school year began, we had 115 students choose to stay home and receive their education through our "Hornets at Home" program. One unique policy we adopted was to require students to come to campus two days each week to take assessments. This helps to give our students some routine and helps us ensure they are staying on track with what our brick and mortar students are doing. As of 11-1-20, we only have 23 students continuing with "Hornets at Home."

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.

LHS implements many strategies and techniques to build positive relationships with families and encourage involvement. Students are recognized for academic and extracurricular achievement. Teachers send home reminders and information to parents using the Remind 101 app and are able to conference with parents when needed. Parents have access to students grades on Skyward and Edgenuity, and teachers post assignments with detailed instructions on Google Classroom. Deficiencies are sent home each 9 weeks. Parents are able to find the school's mission vision on the school's website along with a calendar of upcoming events and recognition of school and student success. Parents also complete a survey that allows them to voice concerns and input regarding LHS. The data is compiled and drives future decisions.

A School Advisory Council made up of parents, community members, and school staff meets monthly or as needed.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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