

Escambia County School District

Northview High School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	9
Title I Requirements	11
Budget to Support Goals	11

Northview High School

4100 W HIGHWAY 4, Century, FL 32535

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) High School 9-12	2017-18 Title I School No	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) 52%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File) K-12 General Education	Charter School No	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) 26%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	C	C	B*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

To establish a learning environment that respects student diversity, encourages potential in all students and staff, and facilitates productivity in our future citizens, who will contribute to our nation's welfare and the global environment in a positive manner.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a school that empowers, inspires, and values students who will become responsible citizens who are capable of thinking critically, solving problems, and innovating ideas and who are committed to life-long education and individual successes.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title
Carroll, Megan	Teacher, Career/Technical
Weaver, Gayle	Principal
Pippins, Gerry	Assistant Principal
Calloway, Tammy	Teacher, ESE
Johnson, Laura	Teacher, K-12
Luker, Barbara	Teacher, K-12
Atallah, Rajah	School Counselor

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The faculty leadership team will strive to improve student motivation and success, to be a liaison between faculty and administration, and to be mentors and facilitators for professional development.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	7	5	6	2	20
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	17	15	6	62
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	33	37	11	90
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	35	45	20	146

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	28	31	10	89

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	9	9	3	29
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	9	4	25

Date this data was collected

Thursday 7/19/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	30	11	16	11	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	10	4	37
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	46	33	20	128
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	35	24	13	124
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	27	21	12	93

Year 2016-17 - 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	0	0	30	11	16	11	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	10	4	37
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	46	33	20	128
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	35	24	13	124
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total		
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	27	21	12	93

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The component that showed the lowest performance was the mathematics lowest 25th percentile. The comparison of two academic years seems to suggest that this is a trend.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component that showed the greatest decline was the category of math learning gains.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The biggest gap component compared to the state, with a 15 percentage point difference, was the mathematics lowest 25th percentile group.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component that showed the most improvement, with 22 percentage points, was the category of math learning gains.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

We believe more stability within the math department led to the improvement.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	51%	52%	56%	49%	46%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	51%	53%	43%	45%	46%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	40%	44%	34%	33%	38%
Math Achievement	39%	44%	51%	26%	36%	43%
Math Learning Gains	52%	51%	48%	28%	38%	39%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	40%	45%	45%	37%	38%
Science Achievement	55%	60%	67%	76%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	69%	71%	64%	63%	69%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	7 (30)	5 (11)	6 (16)	2 (11)	20 (68)
One or more suspensions	24 (7)	17 (16)	15 (10)	6 (4)	62 (37)
Course failure in ELA or Math	9 (29)	33 (46)	37 (33)	11 (20)	90 (128)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	46 (52)	35 (35)	45 (24)	20 (13)	146 (124)

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	2018	54%	49%	5%	53%	1%
	2017	47%	46%	1%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2018	46%	49%	-3%	53%	-7%
	2017	59%	47%	12%	50%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
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
2018	52%	57%	-5%	65%	-13%
2017	64%	58%	6%	63%	1%
Compare		-12%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2017					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	70%	65%	5%	68%	2%
2017	65%	59%	6%	67%	-2%
Compare		5%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	28%	51%	-23%	62%	-34%
2017	43%	51%	-8%	60%	-17%
Compare		-15%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	42%	48%	-6%	56%	-14%
2017	41%	43%	-2%	53%	-12%
Compare		1%			

Subgroup Data

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	10	24	24	12						82	21
AMI	90										
BLK	19	38	38	14			21	38		82	22
MUL	55	80									
WHT	55	47	28	42	56	31	59	78		85	52
FRL	33	39	32	33	58		33	72		78	42
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	20	36	32	22			42			54	
BLK	23	33	25	19	31			37		56	57
MUL	70	60									
WHT	56	44	28	35	30	17	68	71		94	56
FRL	47	43	30	28	29	15	59	60		74	60

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title Math

Rationale Students lacking the basic skills are becoming frustrated and this frustration is reflecting in negative thoughts and opinions about math and is impeding positive growth.

Intended Outcome Increase the percentage of all students who are proficient in both Geometry and Algebra to the spring 2019 state average.

Point Person Elbert Shugart (eshugart@ecsdfl.us)

Action Step

- Description**
- Each math class will have state, district, or teacher created EOCs or subject area assessments that will provide important feedback of student's overall understanding.
 - Teachers will be trained in Google Educator to align their subject delivery with the continual shift towards incorporation of technology. This is a useful tool in content distribution as well as differentiating instruction and media.
 - Every student will have his/her own Chromebook, which will allow the student to access math classrooms and work from anywhere.
 - Students will use labs for course recovery in addition to meeting graduation requirements and course deficiencies via Peak resource.
 - In addition to these area assessments, each student enrolled in a mathematics course will take an Algebraic skills test, as this is the foundation of high school mathematics.

Person Responsible Elbert Shugart (eshugart@ecsdfl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Review of Algebraic Skills Test Data

Person Responsible Elbert Shugart (eshugart@ecsdfl.us)

Activity #2

Title ELA
Rationale Many students enter 9th grade working and reading well below grade level.

Intended Outcome Increase the percentage of 9th & 10th grade students who are proficient in ELA to the spring 2019 average.

Point Person Vicki Baggett (vbaggett@ecsdfl.us)

Action Step

Description

- *Using the most recent FSA data, students are scheduled into the appropriate intensive reading or intensive language arts courses based on most recent reading level.
- Online labs are available for students who need to address deficiencies in graduation credits.
- Every student will have his/her own Chromebook, which will allow the students to access his/her Language Arts course material classrooms and work from anywhere.
- Teachers will be performing progress monitoring in English and Reading courses and will be able to adjust teaching standards timeframe accordingly, which will help increase student achievement.
- All students regardless of Proficiency level should be enrolled in at least one course with a certified Reading Endorsed Teacher, English teacher, or NGCAR-PD certified teacher.

Person Responsible Vicki Baggett (vbaggett@ecsdfl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Data meetings, evaluating USA Test Prep and commonlit.org results. Administer district-wide anchor testing and cluster tests throughout the school year.

Person Responsible Vicki Baggett (vbaggett@ecsdfl.us)

Activity #3

Title CTE certifications

Rationale Students who pass Industry Certifications increase the school's grade and enables students to become more employable.

Intended Outcome 70% of graduating seniors will obtain an Industry Certification.

Point Person Brandy White (bwhite1@ecsdfl.us)

Action Step

Description CTE teachers will provide ample opportunity for students to learn new programs and pass Industry Certifications.

Person Responsible Brandy White (bwhite1@ecsdfl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description CTE teachers will meet quarterly to evaluate the success rate of seniors with Industry Certifications.

Person Responsible Brandy White (bwhite1@ecsdfl.us)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Northview is not a Title I school.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Northview is not a Title I school.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Northview is not a Title I school.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Northview is not a Title I school.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Northview is not a Title I school.

Part V: Budget

Total:	\$0.00
--------	--------