
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	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Taylor County High School

900 N JOHNSON STRIPLING RD, Perry, FL 32347

http://taylorcountyhighschool.ipage.com/public_html/

Demographics

Principal: Heather Mccoy.

Start Date for this Principal: 10/6/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Taylor County School Board on 10/20/2020.

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

Taylor County High School

900 N JOHNSON STRIPLING RD, Perry, FL 32347

http://taylorcountyhighschool.ipage.com/public_html/

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	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Taylor County School Board on 10/20/2020.

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 Taylor County High School is to enable all students to become successful in a global society by preparing them for college/career through rigorous academic programs and a collaborative partnership with the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All Taylor County High School students will achieve college and career success while becoming productive citizens, willing to invest in the common good of all.

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
Gray, Dave	Assistant Principal	
McCoy, Heather	Principal	
Hodge, Deborah	Instructional Coach	
Metcalf, Eddie	Dean	
Jandula, Sharon	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 10/6/2019, Heather Mccoy.

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.*

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.*

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 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)	96%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	0	204	139	138	105	586
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	34	32	28	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	18	54	55	157
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	21	5	1	87
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	

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	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	22	20	19	0	61
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/29/2020

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	0	183	161	112	113	569
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	28	31	27	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	29	4	44
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	134	94	51	393
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	51	44	23	177

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	21	25	19	16	81

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	8	11	6	7	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	2	1	22

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	183	161	112	113	569
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	28	31	27	115
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	29	4	44
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	134	94	51	393
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	51	44	23	177

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	21	25	19	16	81

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	8	11	6	7	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	2	1	22

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	40%	40%	56%	33%	33%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	48%	51%	34%	34%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	41%	42%	26%	26%	41%
Math Achievement	21%	21%	51%	42%	42%	49%
Math Learning Gains	23%	23%	48%	44%	44%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	19%	19%	45%	33%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	74%	74%	68%	48%	48%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	64%	73%	58%	58%	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	41%	40%	1%	55%	-14%
	2018	25%	24%	1%	53%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	41%	37%	4%	53%	-12%
	2018	39%	39%	0%	53%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

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	77%	72%	5%	67%	10%
2018	48%	48%	0%	65%	-17%
Compare		29%			

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	64%	62%	2%	70%	-6%
2018	73%	72%	1%	68%	5%
Compare		-9%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	26%	52%	-26%	61%	-35%
2018	15%	46%	-31%	62%	-47%
Compare		11%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	5%	4%	1%	57%	-52%
2018	37%	37%	0%	56%	-19%
Compare		-32%			

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	28	32	28	23	25			70		92	42
BLK	27	39	40	10	29	31	71	53		100	44
HSP	27	36									
MUL	46	50									
WHT	45	51	43	30	19		71	71		94	72
FRL	36	47	42	17	22	21	74	58		94	57
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	35	36	30	21	13	17	29	41		50	30
BLK	24	42	26	13	15	15	33	55		77	25
HSP	43	46		55	50						
MUL	13	27		20							
WHT	36	39	33	35	27	27	55	75		80	61
FRL	29	34	32	32	28	36	57	69		74	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	14	5		18	29	10	27	55		41	
BLK	19	23	14	21	37	26	22	32		94	17
HSP				40							

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
MUL	33	27		50	33						
WHT	38	39	34	47	46	41	57	66		80	55
FRL	28	33	29	38	41	31	44	54		74	35

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	49
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	492
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	32
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	50
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	47
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 achievement had the lowest performance. We changed our course progressions and only had one section of Geometry for the entire school. This was not an Honors class and was comprised of students who had not been successful on their state math assessments in the past.

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

Math achievement and learning gains. We changed our course progressions and only had one section of Geometry for the entire school. This was not an Honors class and was comprised of students who had not been successful on their state math assessments in the past.

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 achievement has the greatest gap compared to the state average. Our students who take Algebra 1 in the ninth grade have historically scored low on their state math assessments, so we have worked hard to make adjustments to their schedules to allow them to have more time to master content.

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

Science achievement had the most improvement. We have adjusted those course progressions as well to give students a better foundation before they get to the Biology EOC. We also worked closely with DOE and PAEC to provide additional support to our teacher to help our students be successful.

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

Attendance
Level 1 on 2019 State assessments

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

1. Reading achievement
2. Math achievement
3. Reading Learning Gains
4. Math Learning Gains
5. Maintaining proficiency in Science and History

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Daily standards based instruction using rigorous text to increase student proficiency on the 9th and 10th grade FSA ELA assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase student proficiency on 9th and 10th grade FSA ELA assessments by a minimum of 4% overall.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather McCoy (heather.mccoy@taylor.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	LATIC classrooms in ELA to increase student efficacy through enhanced educational opportunities including the use of NearPod, Flocabulary, Canvas, BrightFish and USA Test Prep.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By increasing student engagement through rigorous, standards-based instruction, our students will become more active in their education and have an increase in achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Daily standards-based instruction in Algebra 1 and Geometry using rigorous problems to prepare students for the EOCs at the end of the school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase student proficiency on the Algebra 1 and Geometry EOCs by 7% overall.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather McCoy (heather.mccoy@taylor.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	LATIC classrooms in Math including direct instruction and small group benchmark instruction as needed for students to become comfortable with the material they are presented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By increasing student engagement through rigorous, standards-based instruction, our students will become more active in their education and have an increase in achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Math/ ELA achievement - implementation of valid progress monitoring for all; data driven instruction for all; standards based instruction for all; Tier 3 support for Algebra/ Geometry Teachers

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 have bi-monthly SAC meetings to address building a positive school environment and assess where we are so our leadership team can make adjustments as needed. We also utilize our Student Council to help develop a school culture that encourages students to be involved in school events. Teachers are divided into both grade level teams and department level teams to ensure teachers are supported across academics, behavior, and personally to help promote student and teacher success. Through the use of technology supports, our teachers and staff share information with our students in a format and language that they understand and use.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00