

Santa Rosa County School District

Jay High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Jay High School

3741 SCHOOL ST, Jay, FL 32565

<http://www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/schools/jhs/>

Demographics

Principal: Benjamin West

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
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)	47%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (54%) 2014-15: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 was approved by the Santa Rosa County School Board on 10/10/2019.

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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Jay High School

3741 SCHOOL ST, Jay, FL 32565

<http://www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/schools/jhs/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>High School 7-12</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>39%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>5%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Santa Rosa County School Board on 10/10/2019.

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.

Provide all students an educational and social foundation to become productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jay High School students will leave our institution, college and career ready, as critical problem solvers prepared to face 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
Knowlton, Stephen	Principal	Instructional Leader, Responsible for the every day function of the school
Underwood, Wes	Assistant Principal	Responsible for Discipline and Facilities
Caupp, Beth	School Counselor	Provides academic/emotional counseling for our student body as needed.
Fischer, Junia	Teacher, ESE	Head of ESE Department
Rowell, Rhett	Dean	Dean of Students
Youngblood, Lance	Teacher, K-12	Athletic Director
Rowell, Lana	Instructional Media	Media Specialist - in charge of our Media Center and SGA adviser

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	85	79	85	69	73	75	466
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3	6	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	21	11	9	16	5	77
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	36	37	21	23	14	149
	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	9	15	8	9	112	5	158

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	2	2	2	1	2	1	10

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

32

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/24/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	9	7	6	10	9	24	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	6	0	5	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	9	5	15	8	5	61
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	18	20	18	13	2	99

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	19	10	7	12	8	3	59

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	52%	67%	56%	54%	64%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	55%	51%	52%	53%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	45%	42%	49%	41%	41%
Math Achievement	54%	65%	51%	56%	61%	49%
Math Learning Gains	46%	49%	48%	44%	48%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	45%	45%	39%	37%	39%
Science Achievement	54%	91%	68%	63%	71%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	66%	79%	73%	64%	81%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	85 (0)	79 (0)	85 (0)	69 (0)	73 (0)	75 (0)	466 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	18 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	15 (0)	21 (0)	11 (0)	9 (0)	16 (0)	5 (0)	77 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	18 (0)	36 (0)	37 (0)	21 (0)	23 (0)	14 (0)	149 (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 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	43%	59%	-16%	52%	-9%
	2018	42%	56%	-14%	51%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	48%	68%	-20%	56%	-8%
	2018	69%	71%	-2%	58%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
09	2019	54%	65%	-11%	55%	-1%
	2018	69%	61%	8%	53%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
10	2019	69%	64%	5%	53%	16%
	2018	69%	65%	4%	53%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	38%	54%	-16%	54%	-16%
	2018	49%	56%	-7%	54%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	53%	76%	-23%	46%	7%
	2018	55%	77%	-22%	45%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	39%	62%	-23%	48%	-9%
	2018	46%	66%	-20%	50%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	86%	-13%	67%	6%
2018	85%	69%	16%	65%	20%
Compare		-12%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	75%	-22%	71%	-18%
2018	53%	75%	-22%	71%	-18%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	78%	-3%	70%	5%
2018	74%	78%	-4%	68%	6%
Compare		1%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	54%	73%	-19%	61%	-7%
2018	51%	67%	-16%	62%	-11%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	66%	-8%	57%	1%
2018	63%	65%	-2%	56%	7%
Compare		-5%			

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	15	32	35	26	31	30	21	27			
WHT	52	47	38	55	47	33	53	66	53	98	63
FRL	38	41	39	43	40	32	36	60	31	100	50
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	17	38	29	24	39	36	13	30			
WHT	61	55	45	56	50	41	58	66	58	97	65

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
FRL	53	57	50	46	45	41	42	54	24	93	50
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	15	30	24	25	38	31		55			
WHT	54	53	50	56	44	38	64	65	59	90	56
FRL	43	47	42	50	41	33	54	45	50	80	50

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	55
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	605
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	55
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	46
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.

Data component - Math Lowest 25 percentile @ 32%

Ineffective instruction. Instructional change was implemented and plan to see an improvement with said change.

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

Data component - English Language Arts Achievement total @ 52% from 61%.

Inexperienced teachers. Added new instructors along with another year of experience will produce a better outcome.

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.

Data component - Math lowest 25 percentile @ 32% (state was at 45%)

Ineffective instruction. Instructional change was implemented and plan to see an improvement with said change.

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

Data component - Social Studies - improved 64% to 66%

Instructional staff instituted different instruction methods and received multiple forms of professional development.

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

The most concerning data point from the EWS data is the number of level 1 students in our 8th and 9th grade cohorts. They will become a critical review point for our MTSS team this year.

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

1. Math Lowest 25 Percentile
2. English Language Learning Gains
3. English Language Lowest 25 Percentile

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Students with Disabilities Subgroup
Rationale	Students in this subgroup demonstrated the least amount of growth in Math and ELA scores. They also represent our lowest 25% in both categories.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our students in our lowest 25 percentile in Math and ELA will show a 5% growth in scores on the state tests respectively.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephen Knowlton (knowltons@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Motivation activities - positive postcards home - one per semester; PBIS slips to promote good behavior in school; Teacher talks - individualized feedback to build confidence and relationships.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By motivating our students to behave in class and take ownership of their learning, this will provide a greater effort level by the students to complete classwork. Determination of success will include the number of PBIS slips given out and number of postcard returned to the school. Teachers will be asked to document the teacher talks and give feedback to the MTSS committee regarding students grades/performance after talks.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Issue postcards to faculty/staff. 2. Issue PBIS slips to faculty/staff. 3. Track return of postcards to school 4. Track/gauge feedback regarding teacher talks
Person Responsible	Wes Underwood (underwoodw@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Improving ELA learning gains 7th grade
Rationale	This data point was identified as one of our areas needing improvement based on 2018-19 FSA scores.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Learning gains in 7th grade ELA score will be 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephen Knowlton (knowltons@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide all 7th grade students with career enhanced curriculum (PAES Lab) designed to broaden their communication skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By enhancing their overall communication capabilities, these students will be exposed to greater skill comprehension.
Action Step	
Description	1. Participate in PAES Lab activities 2-3 times per week. 2. Document activities through Waypoint program.
Person Responsible	Junia Fischer (fischerj@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	ELA Learning gains for 8th grade
Rationale	This data point was identified as one of our areas needing improvement based on 2018-19 FSA scores.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Provide all 8th grade students with career enhanced curriculum (PAES Lab) designed to broaden their communication skills.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephen Knowlton (knowltons@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide all 8th grade students with career enhanced curriculum (PAES Lab) designed to broaden their communication skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By enhancing their overall communication capabilities, these students will be exposed to greater skill comprehension.
Action Step	
Description	1. Participate in PAES Lab activities 2-3 times per week. 2. Document activities through Waypoint program.
Person Responsible	Junia Fischer (fischerj@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

#4	
Title	Improve Math overall learning gains
Rationale	This data point was identified as one of our areas needing improvement based on 2018-19 FSA scores.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Learning gains will improve by 5% overall on the 2019-20 FSA test.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephen Knowlton (knowltons@santarosa.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Our math instructors will use research-based supplemental material to include Algebra Nation and the PAES Lab curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The supplemental material has shown statistical positive results on student achievement/growth.
Action Step	
Description	1. Participation in the PAES Lab 2-3 times per week. 2. Implementation of Algebra Nation twice per week.
Person Responsible	Wes Underwood (underwoodw@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

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).