

Orange County Public Schools

# Jones High



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# 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

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: C (42%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Jones High

801 S RIO GRANDE AVE, Orlando, FL 32805

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

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	100%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	99%

## School Grades History

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

## 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.**

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

### 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
Kirby, Allison	Principal	The principal is accountable for the total school program through teaching and learning (instructional leadership); all components of academic programs (all subject areas); and School Improvement Plan implementation. They 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. They supervise and lead all school-based leadership members, who serve to further the school's mission and vision by functioning as instructional leaders and inclusive leaders through shared decision making in assigned areas.
King, Anthony	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals have administrative responsibility for the school in the absence of the Principal. They provide instructional and non-instructional observations/assessments and work with staff to identify appropriate research based instructional strategies and analyze academic and behavioral data while providing actionable feedback to teachers. They 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.
Coleman-Jones, Tiana	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals have administrative responsibility for the school in the absence of the Principal. They provide instructional and non-instructional observations/assessments and work with staff to identify appropriate research based instructional strategies and analyze academic and behavioral data while providing actionable feedback to teachers. They 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.
Lowe, Brandon	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals have administrative responsibility for the school in the absence of the Principal. They provide instructional and non-instructional observations/assessments and work with staff to identify appropriate research based instructional strategies and analyze academic and behavioral data while providing actionable feedback to teachers. They 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.
Jackson, Alex	Dean	Deans analyze student behavior data to collaboratively develop behavior intervention plans with a strong focus on restorative justice.
Steele, Lula	Dean	Deans analyze student behavior data to collaboratively develop behavior intervention plans with a strong focus on restorative justice.
Deas, Christopher	Dean	Deans analyze student behavior data to collaboratively develop behavior intervention plans with a strong focus on restorative justice.



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Krumdick, Justin	Other	The Testing Coordinator coordinates the implementation and certification of required state and district testing; Maintains a high level of security for all testing documents; Trains school-based test administrators and proctors for assessments; and follows state and district requirements related to testing.
Williams, Brandon	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist and Digital Coach supervises the organization and operation of the Media Center; Help students with digital device issues as well as manage the process of reporting lost/stolen devices according to OCPS Policies; and helps teachers with digital device issues and software issues, referring to proper team or personnel when necessary.
Clark, Jessica	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach analyzes student achievement and teacher observation data to inform lesson planning and interventions that relate to instruction; supports all Tigers with instructional strategies to increase student success; and develops and implements school-wide Professional Development
Taunton, Alec	Other	The College and Career Specialist assists students with their post-graduation plans; plans and organizes college visits and information sessions; works with guidance department for student success; and supports campus-wide initiatives for student succes.
Bennett, Corey	Other	The SAFE Coordinator utilizes referrals and analyzes attendance and behavior data points to develop crisis intervention plans, connecting students and families to appropriate resources.
Kaissar, Kristina	Attendance/ Social Work	The Social Worker utilizes referrals and analyzes attendance and behavior data points to develop crisis intervention plans, connecting students and families to appropriate resources.
Thomas, Maria	Other	The Staffing Specialist coordinates with school staff, District Staffing Specialists (DSS), administrators, teachers, evaluators, families, and parent representatives to convene all Individual Education Plans (IEPs) and Intervention Tier 3-Education Planning Team (EPT) meetings at the school. They also facilitate and provide training to school staff relative to ESE procedures, least restrictive environments, PEER, and other issues involving ESE.
Curry, Whitney	Other	The MTSS Coordinator analyzes student behavior data to collaboratively develop behavior intervention plans with a strong focus on restorative justice; they utilize referrals and analyze attendance and behavior data points to develop crisis intervention plans, connecting students and families to appropriate resources.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 7/11/2017, Orlando Norwood

**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.*

3

**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.*

14

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

96

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: C (42%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A

<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	509	452	383	386	1730
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152	139	132	137	560
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	140	73	45	361
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	285	64	62	535
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	234	158	145	628
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185	145	148	162	640
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170	144	59	170	543

**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	251	288	183	202	924

**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	9	1	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	23	15	17	70

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Saturday 6/13/2020

**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	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

**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	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

## 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	
	(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	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

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
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
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%	0

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%	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
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0



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%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

#### Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Learning gains in English Language Arts (ELA) was the lowest data point for Jones High School based on 2018-2019 data (note: 2019-2020 data not available for analysis). Data to highlight includes:

- 32% demonstrated learning gains in 2019 compared to 36% the prior year
- This is a stark contrast of the district average of 53% and state of 51% for ELA learning gains
- Lowest 25th percentile learning gains dropped to 26% in 2019 from 34% the prior year
- Q3 Progress Monitoring Activity (PMA) Data showed that the Jones average for 10th grade ELA was 46.8% compared to the district average of 57.9%.

Improvements were made in learning gains and the lowest 25th percentile for mathematics, but 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.

ELA Lower 25th percentile declined from 34% in 2018 to 26% in 2019. The main factor was new teachers being 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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was ELA proficiency. By comparison, 56% of Florida students demonstrated proficiency in ELA in 2019, while only 24% of students at Jones High School demonstrated proficiency. We continue to see this trend with relevant Q3 PMA data were Jones was 46.8% compared to the district average of 57.9%.

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

Most improvement was demonstrated in Science Achievement. 55% demonstrated proficiency in 2019 compared to 36% the prior year.

New actions included:

- 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?**

Based on 2018-2019 EWS data and Q3 PMA data, the concern continues to be ELA proficiency. A component of this concern is ensuring that teachers are forming relationships with our students in ELA and aggressively seeking best practices in grading. This concern also leads to a major focus on lowest 25th percentile in ELA proficiency.

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

1. Continue to target lowest 25th percentile in ELA
2. Increase learning gains in ELA and Math
3. Focus on SEL strategies campus-wide and virtually
4. Employ proven best practices to support all students and teachers
5. Teacher retention and training

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Other specifically relating to Student Proficiency Across Content Areas**

Based on latest relevant data, an area of focus for this school year will relate to student performance. Jones High School student performance in all measured areas is below district and state averages in both proficiency and in learning gains. Based on the prior data:

**Area of**

**Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

- 24% demonstrated English Language Arts (ELA) proficiency compared to 55% (district) and 56% (state)
- 20% demonstrated Math proficiency compared to 43% and 51%
- 55% demonstrated Science proficiency compared to 70% and 68%
- 57% demonstrated Social Studies proficiency to 73% for both

A number of variables affected demonstrations of proficiency and learning gains which will be supported through school-based actions.

Jones High School students will increase proficiency in all tested content areas:

**Measurable Outcome:**

As a continuation of the 2018-2019 school year, 30% of 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:**

Evidence-based strategies being implemented concerning student performance include teacher development through PD series within the PLC; a bolstered school-wide intervention strategy to support lowest 25th percentile students; using data in and out of the classroom to monitor student performance and analyze best strategies; and school and community initiatives for student engagement and family support.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

These strategies are a continuation of 2019-2020 initiatives for student achievement. They will continue to be used and monitored this school year.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Data from PMAs and unit culminating tasks will be used to analyze student proficiency in tested content areas.

**Person Responsible**

Allison Kirby (allison.kirby@ocps.net)

Teachers, with support from instructional coaches and administrators, will reteach and adjust future lesson plans as informed by PMA data.

**Person Responsible**

Allison Kirby (allison.kirby@ocps.net)

Average daily attendance will be tracked by the Attendance Clerk and the Parent Engagement Liaison in order to assure attendance averages and will coordinate home visits with the Social Worker and SAFE Coordinator.

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

Students 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. They will track student progress on all common assessments, grades, and attendance to ensure appropriate learning gains are met.

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

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** [no one identified]

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will decrease the percentage of students not on grade level on their academic achievement. Only 24% of students are on grade level on state assessment ELA tests and only 20% of students are on grade level on state assessment mathematics tests.

**Measurable Outcome:** We anticipate an impact of culture and climate can improve our Early Warning Systems indicator data. Students scoring a level 1 on statewide assessments will be reduced by 10% and students failing a language arts or mathematics course will be reduced 10%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Allison Kirby (allison.kirby@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

**Action Steps to Implement**

We will use a process to examine the current school climate and culture. Determine relevant strategies to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration across the school and implement strategies for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture.

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

We will establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning at your school with adults and students.

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

We will use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and social and emotional learning where faculty and staff will understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies and understand the connections between social and emotional learning and instructional strategies.

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

We will monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

We will intentionally teach and model social behaviors and include SEL strategies to address needs of our ESE/ELL students.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**The two areas of focus discussed: continuing to target lowest 25th percentile in ELA; Increasing learning gains in ELA and Math; Focusing on SEL strategies campus-wide and virtually; Employing proven best practices to support all students and teachers; and Teacher retention and training.**

## 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.

Jones High School collaborates with internal and external stakeholders to ensure that all students, staff, and families are provided 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. In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as School Advisory Council (SAC), to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture. Jones High School is also a registered Community Partnership School Implementation Site.

### 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.**

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Other: Student Proficiency Across Content Areas</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Social Emotional Learning</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>