

Orange County Public Schools

Jones High



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	22

Jones High

801 S RIO GRANDE AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

<https://joneshs.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Orlando Norwood

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2017

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: C (42%) 2014-15: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Orange 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	22

Jones High

801 S RIO GRANDE AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

<https://joneshs.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	70%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	99%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	D	D	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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 lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

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
		<p>Members of the School Leadership Team serve to further the school's mission and vision by functioning as instructional leaders and inclusive leaders through shared decision making in assigned areas.</p> <p>Allison Kirby, Principal Brandon Lowe, Assistant Principal of Instruction Anthony King, Assistant Principal Daniel Abalo, Assistant Principal Tiana Coleman-Jones, Assistant Principal Justin Krumdick, Instructional Coach Brandon Williams, Media Specialist and Digital Coach Alex Jackson, Dean Lula Steele, Dean Christopher Deas, Dean Corey Bennett, SAFE Coordinator Kristina Kaissar, Social Worker Mavrikis Bolden, College and Career Counselor Maria Thomas, Staffing Specialist Whitney Curry, MTSS Coordinator Jessica Clark, Curriculum Resource Teacher Tiffany Campbell, Guidance Counselor Alec Taunton, Testing Coordinator</p>
Kirby, Allison	Principal	<p>Under the leadership of the Principal, each member of the leadership team is responsible for monitoring assigned data points that relate to student achievement and school goals and are responsible for taking appropriate action. The Principal and Assistant Principals monitor all school data points, prescribing and overseeing appropriate efforts and initiatives that ensure successful attainment of the school's mission and vision with a keen focus on student success.</p> <p>The Curriculum Resource Teacher, Instructional Coach, and Curriculum Leads analyze student achievement and teacher observation data to inform lesson planning and interventions that relate to instruction.</p> <p>Deans and the MTSS Coordinator, supported by Program Monitors, analyze student behavior data to collaboratively develop behavior intervention plans with a strong focus on restorative justice.</p> <p>The SAFE Coordinator, MTSS Coordinator, and Social Worker utilize referrals and analyze attendance and behavior data points to develop crisis intervention plans, connecting students and families to appropriate resources.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		The Staffing Specialist, Curriculum Compliance Teacher, and MTSS Coordinator work closely with faculty, support facilitators, and paraprofessionals to monitor a variety of data points for early warning indicators and academic achievement in order to inform individual education plans and fidelity of implementation.
King, Anthony	Assistant Principal	
Lowe, Brandon	Assistant Principal	
Krumdick, Justin	Other	
Williams, Brandon	Instructional Media	
Jackson, Alex	Dean	
Kaissar, Kristina	Attendance/ Social Work	
Thomas, Maria	Teacher, ESE	
Curry, Whitney	Other	MTSS
Taunton, Alec	Other	Testing
Clark, Jessica	Instructional Coach	
Coleman-Jones, Tiana	Assistant Principal	
Abalo, Daniel	Assistant Principal	
Bolden, Mavrikis	Other	College and Career Counselor
Bennett, Corey	Other	SAFE Coordinator
Campbell, Tiffany	School Counselor	

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	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	91	100	105	381
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	109	59	24	318
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	274	235	166	80	755
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219	272	69	23	583

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	225	226	123	58	632

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	11	9	7	24	51
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	40	43	47	178

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

80

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/23/2019

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	66	99	101	92	358
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	85	59	46	310
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	307	198	138	88	731
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	270	221	5	7	503

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	279	193	97	60	629

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	0	0	66	99	101	92	358
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	85	59	46	310
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	307	198	138	88	731
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	270	221	5	7	503

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	279	193	97	60	629

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	24%	55%	56%	25%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	32%	53%	51%	33%	46%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	40%	42%	32%	34%	41%
Math Achievement	20%	43%	51%	18%	34%	49%
Math Learning Gains	38%	49%	48%	32%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	46%	45%	43%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	55%	70%	68%	44%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	57%	73%	73%	28%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	85 (66)	91 (99)	100 (101)	105 (92)	381 (358)
One or more suspensions	126 (120)	109 (85)	59 (59)	24 (46)	318 (310)
Course failure in ELA or Math	274 (307)	235 (198)	166 (138)	80 (88)	755 (731)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	219 (270)	272 (221)	69 (5)	23 (7)	583 (503)

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
09	2019	27%	52%	-25%	55%	-28%
	2018	23%	50%	-27%	53%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	18%	50%	-32%	53%	-35%
	2018	22%	49%	-27%	53%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

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	53%	67%	-14%	67%	-14%
2018	35%	62%	-27%	65%	-30%
Compare		18%			
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	60%	69%	-9%	70%	-10%
2018	41%	65%	-24%	68%	-27%
Compare		19%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	16%	63%	-47%	61%	-45%
2018	20%	61%	-41%	62%	-42%
Compare		-4%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	21%	53%	-32%	57%	-36%
2018	27%	65%	-38%	56%	-29%
Compare		-6%			

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	14	19	13	14	35		50	59		88	60
ELL	17	27	27	15	30	38	50	58		73	79
BLK	24	31	26	18	38	49	53	56		86	73
HSP	29	36	29	37	53		78	69		85	65
FRL	22	29	24	20	36	43	55	56		87	72
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	12	34	28	10	20	27	16	11		52	19
ELL	6	33	35	10	21		22	27		85	36
BLK	24	36	35	24	28	35	36	40		90	32
HSP	18	30	22	27	27		32	62		83	50
FRL	24	36	33	24	28	35	36	41		91	33
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	4	18	23	7	32	45	19	17		61	9
ELL	6	21	23	8	27	29	17	19		77	40
BLK	25	33	31	18	31	42	45	27		92	37
HSP	15	32	29	18	33	40	26	29		80	
WHT	40										
FRL	25	33	32	18	31	42	44	28		92	31

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	45
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	40

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	499
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
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.

Learning gains in English Language Arts (ELA) continue to be the lowest data points for Jones High School. 36% of students demonstrated ELA learning gains in 2018; 32% demonstrated learning gains in 2019. 24% of students measured demonstrated proficiency in mathematics in 2018; 20% demonstrated proficiency in 2019. While improvements were made in mathematics learning gains and the lowest 25%, it is still a trend that the majority of students are not demonstrating proficiency. Contributing factors include the lack of foundational skills in math and regressed Lexile levels for both math and ELA. Another contributing factor identified includes teachers not fully engaged in best practices to consistently facilitate proficiency.

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

While proficiency in ELA remained the same, ELA Lower 25% declined 8-points from 34% in 2018 to 26% in 2019. Factors include new teachers hired late which impacted planning and collaboration within the PLC.

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.

The biggest gap between Florida and Jones High School performance data point is in demonstrated in ELA proficiency. 56% of Florida students demonstrated proficiency in ELA in 2019, while only 24% of students at Jones High School demonstrated proficiency.

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

Science proficiency improved significantly. In 2018, 42% of Jones High School students demonstrated proficiency; 55% demonstrated proficiency in 2019.

Throughout the 2018-2019 school year, significant investment occurred in the coaching of science teachers. An Orange County Public Schools (OCPS) Program Specialist worked closely with teachers throughout the year analyzing student performance on Progress Monitoring Activities (PMA), creating remediation plans, and adjusting lesson sequencing as necessitated by student performance data. Teachers learned how to apply PMA data to instructional planning. Further, significant efforts were made to develop a targeted series of reviews leading up to the End of Course exams.

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

Our concern is proficiency in ELA. We believe one of the contributing factors is forming relationships with our students in ELA and aggressively seeking best practices in grading. Our ELA 10th-grade students saw an increase in course failure by 16%. We will work closely with our teachers to ensure culturally responsive actions are taken, with proper background knowledge of the student, to encourage appropriate academic decisions so that students successfully complete the course.

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

1. Target lowest 25% in math and ELA
2. Increase ELA learning gains
3. Teacher retention
4. Employ proven best practices to support all students and teachers
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Student Proficiency Across Content Areas
Rationale	Jones High School student performance in all measured areas is below Florida averages in both proficiency and in learning gains. In 2019, 24% of students demonstrated English Language Arts (ELA) proficiency; 20% demonstrated Math proficiency; 55% demonstrated Science proficiency; and 57% demonstrated Social Studies proficiency. A number of variables affected demonstrations of proficiency and learning gains which will be supported through school-based actions.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Jones High School students will increase proficiency in all tested content areas. By May of 2020, 30% of grade 9 and 10 students will demonstrate ELA proficiency; 30% of Algebra 1 and Geometry students will demonstrate proficiency; 60% of Biology students will demonstrate proficiency; and 62% of US History students will demonstrate proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Allison Kirby (allison.kirby@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corrective Programs and an Executive Area Director of the OCPS High School Office will meet weekly to walk classes and analyze data alongside the principal and assistant principals. • Data from Progress Monitoring Activities (PMA) and unit culminating tasks will be used to analyze student proficiency in tested content areas. • Teachers, with support from instructional coaches and administrators, will reteach and adjust future lesson plans as informed by PMA data. • Average daily attendance will be tracked by the Attendance Clerk and the Parent Engagement Liaison in order to assure attendance averages remain above 95% weekly. They will take appropriate action as prescribed by district policy. • The Attendance Clerk and Parent Engagement Liaison will coordinate home visits with the Social Worker and/or other school administrators. • The Social Worker and SAFE Coordinator will provide professional development to teachers in how to work with students in crisis. • Students having been identified as being in the lowest quartile will be scheduled in to support courses and tracked by instructional support personnel, assigned directly to those students. This instructional support personnel will track student progress on all common assessments, grades, and attendance to ensure appropriate learning gains are met. • Administrators will tier teachers in three categories based on the intensity of need: instructional methodology, classroom management, and discipline. • The Curriculum Resource Teacher will work intensively with Instructional Methodology Tier I teachers, completing a full coaching cycle with each during the first grading period. • The Instructional Coach will work intensively with Classroom Management Tier I teachers, completing a full coaching cycle with each during the first

grading period.

- Deans will work intensively with assigned Discipline Tier I teachers, completing a full coaching cycle with each during the first grading period.
- Coaching cycles for Tier II teachers will begin immediately after Tier I cycles are completed.
- A literacy coach will be made available to support all teachers through coaching observations that focus specifically on the implementation of close reading strategies in ELA and non-ELA classes.
- The literacy coach will coordinate activities with the District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) and facilitate DPLC initiatives to increase literacy through the implementation of close reading strategies in all classrooms.
- City Year mentors/instructors will be assisting in ELA and Math classes. City Year will also participate in a professional learning community, providing critical insight as to the progress of students and their goals.

Person Responsible	Allison Kirby (allison.kirby@ocps.net)
---------------------------	--

#2	
Title	Narrow Achievement Gap
Rationale	<p>100% of Jones High School students are economically disadvantaged as reported on Survey 3 of the 2018-2019 school year. 99% of Jones High School students are racial minorities as reported on Survey 2 of the 2017-2018 school year. Evidenced as a lagging indicator in the 2018 school grade, 89% of the students expected to graduate from Jones High School in 2017 school year did so. As a component of the 2019 school grade, it is anticipated that the graduation rate will increase to 92% in 2018-19.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>A higher percentage of Jones High School students will meet all graduation requirements and graduate on time with plans for a specific college or career path. The Jones High School graduation rate will increase in May 2020 to 93%.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Allison Kirby (allison.kirby@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corrective Programs and an Executive Area Director of the OCPS High School Office will meet weekly to walk classes and analyze data alongside the principal and assistant principals. • An administrator will monitor Minority Achievement Office (MAO) initiatives that focus on narrowing the achievement gap. • An administrator will be assigned to eliminate the duplication of efforts and ensure that mentors and initiatives are being utilized in a way that is effective and streamlined. • The graduation status of seniors will be tracked intensively and constantly by administration. • Seniors that have not demonstrated acceptable reading proficiency will be scheduled for additional ELA support until they demonstrate proficiency, at which point their interventions will be adjusted as needed. • A comprehensive mentoring plan will be established for each senior that has not met all graduation requirements.

- An off-site SAT/ACT preparation consultant tutor will be utilized to support students and improve scores to the point of concordance.
- Credit recovery courses will be ingrained in student schedules to improve GPAs and earn credits lost.
- Additional acceleration options will be made available through Industry Certification integration into coursework and a partnership with Valencia State College.
- Students that are not enrolled in the International Baccalaureate program will be permitted into individual IB classes in order to experience high-level rigorous coursework and work to earn a college and career readiness indicator.
- Students enrolled in IB courses will be permitted to take the AP Exam equivalence with permission of the course instructors.
- SAT will be administered on Saturdays on-site, and Jones High School will fund the administration for all JHS students that demonstrate need.
- Positive behavior intervention will occur through a Senior Scholar Pass to school activities for all seniors that have met all graduation requirements and have demonstrated college and career readiness.

Person Responsible

Allison Kirby (allison.kirby@ocps.net)

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).

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.

The school plans to build on the improvements made in parent-school relationships as demonstrated through the AdvancEd Parent Survey, resultant of improvements made in parent outreach. The school will continue to improve the utilization of a variety of

communication methods including School Messenger, newsletter (Tiger's Roar), the school's website, fliers, marquee, remind text alerts, social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and YouTube), Skyward, Canvas, and personalized calls to parents to effectively communicate with our families and community. Jones High School anticipates that 96% of all families will be actively involved as measured by attendance at family-oriented school functions.

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.

Jones High School provides social-emotional needs by utilizing the services of the guidance counselors, the SAFE Coordinator, the Staffing Specialist, the Behavior Specialist, the school psychologist, members of City Year- Orlando, the City of Orlando Paramore Kids Zone, the City of Orlando COMPACT Mentoring Program, Professional Opportunity Program for Students, Inc., 100 Black Men of Orlando, Inc. and the Jones High School Tiger Den. The various services offered through these entities include academic counseling, grief counseling, tutoring, mentoring, scholarships, career training, internships, referrals, and providing donations for basic needs.

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

Incoming students are encouraged to attend summer school sessions designed to smoothly transition from middle school to high school. During summer school and during the school year, learning occurs with an emphasis on the study skills needed to be successful in high school. All incoming students meet both individually with their counselor as well as in a whole group setting with counselors, deans, and administration to be informed on strategies for high school success.

Outgoing students meet individually with their guidance counselors and in a whole group setting with the guidance department and administration to discuss their transition to their post-secondary plans.

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.

Jones High School utilizes the following sources of data to drive the continuous monitoring of the problem-solving process: Instructional Management System (IMS), Student Management System (Skyward), Educational Data Warehouse (EDW), Performance Matters (UNIFY), common formative assessments, Postsecondary Education Readiness Tests (PERT), Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA), etc. Multiple sources of data are used to drive the problem-solving process in order to gain different perspectives of the effectiveness of the factors listed above and allows for a more comprehensive evaluation of the implemented structures. The instructional leadership team is responsible for monitoring the data. The data drives the lesson planning process in professional learning communities.

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

Students will formally meet with their guidance counselor and the Advanced Studies Coordinator twice a year to assist them with the direction which is needed to be successful throughout their high school career and to ensure that they are on track for academic success and achievement. Other meetings are held informally when unanticipated situations arise on an individual basis. Additionally, guidance counselors will continuously review student schedules to make sure they meet graduation needs and student-goal requirements.

Once the student schedules are organized to ensure that the course of study is personally meaningful, the Advanced Studies Coordinator and the student's teachers will nurture and develop the natural academic abilities of each student through high-quality instruction in the classroom. Teachers will foster meaningful relationships with students and will organize their instruction by using a student-centered approach. By ensuring that each classroom is an academic environment conducive to learning, knowledge acquisition, improved comprehension, and strong critical thinking, we believe our students will flourish.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Proficiency Across Content Areas	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Narrow Achievement Gap	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00