William M. Raines High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

William M. Raines High School

3663 RAINES AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32209

http://www.duvalschools.org/wmrh

Demographics

Principal: Vincent Hall R

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (43%)
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 is pending approval by the Duval 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

William M. Raines High School

3663 RAINES AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32209

http://www.duvalschools.org/wmrh

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	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	98%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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 prepare for educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is prepared for college, career, and life.

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
Hall, Vincent	Principal	It is the principal's responsibility to provide the instruction leadership and support to assistant principals and teachers in the varying content areas. Teachers and administrators receive immediate feedback from classroom/common planning observations to ensure high quality planned lesson are aligned to the standards and delivered at a level three achievement level. The principal is is also the community engagement leader consistently providing opportunities for business and faith-based partnerships to support the academic and non-academic needs of our students and their families.
Stallings, Brandie	Assistant Principal	Ms. Stallings is the administrator responsible for ensuring the school's master schedule meets the state and district requirements for teachers and students. She ensures students are scheduled based upon the district's master scheduling guidelines.with teachers who have demonstrated strengths based upon data and certification to teach the content. She also acts the school's designee and administrator over the ELA and reading department.
Scarlett, Anthony	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader supervising Science and electives
Williams, Natasha	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader Supervising Math and ESE.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/27/2020, Vincent Hall R

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

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (43%)
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	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	

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	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/27/2020

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	452	438	344	247	1481
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	55	46	25	173
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	100	66	84	340
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	40	48	0	107
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201	190	142	105	638

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	70	64	46	29	209

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	18	7	7	2	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	2	2	24

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	452	438	344	247	1481
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	55	46	25	173
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	100	66	84	340
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	40	48	0	107
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201	190	142	105	638

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	70	64	46	29	209

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	18	7	7	2	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	2	2	24

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	20%	47%	56%	15%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	35%	48%	51%	28%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	42%	42%	29%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	37%	51%	51%	46%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	44%	52%	48%	50%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	47%	45%	33%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	39%	65%	68%	50%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	32%	70%	73%	41%	64%	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	19%	48%	-29%	55%	-36%
	2018	19%	48%	-29%	53%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	21%	48%	-27%	53%	-32%
	2018	19%	49%	-30%	53%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

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	38%	67%	-29%	67%	-29%
2018	37%	63%	-26%	65%	-28%
Compare		1%			

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	31%	68%	-37%	70%	-39%
2018	35%	64%	-29%	68%	-33%
Compare		-4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	32%	57%	-25%	61%	-29%
2018	37%	61%	-24%	62%	-25%
Compare		-5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	40%	61%	-21%	57%	-17%
2018	32%	57%	-25%	56%	-24%
Compare		8%			

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	8	26	29	21	33	33	26	25		100	89
BLK	20	36	32	38	44	37	38	31		92	94
HSP	18	40		25							
MUL	30										
FRL	18	34	31	36	43	38	36	32		94	94

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	19	12	19	54		16	17		96	77
BLK	19	33	36	34	52	35	35	34		91	92
HSP	10	30									
MUL	33	60		40				40			
FRL	17	32	37	35	51	39	34	34		91	93

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	1	14	18	15	33		35	35		84	88
BLK	14	28	28	46	52	33	49	40		92	87
MUL	50	50									
FRL	13	28	30	42	47	33	49	39		92	84

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	461
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	
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
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
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	28
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	30
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	46
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.

All questions need to be answered

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

-

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.

-

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

-

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

-

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

1. -
2.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our focus is standards-based aligned planning, tasks, and assessments. In the 19-20 school year, less than 40% of our teachers demonstrated strengths in standards based instructional planning aligned to tasks and assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	Based upon the instructional review rubric, the vast majority of core content area teachers will be able to create and deliver standards aligned instruction and assessments, as measured by the Standards Based Walk-through Tool.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vincent Hall (hallv@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing the learning arcs framework,, teachers will engage in high quality common planning and professional learning community sessions, yielding students opportunities to demonstrate standards aligned grade level mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the Opportunity Myth, it is our professional responsibility to ensure students are exposed to standards aligned instruction, and to ensure their preparedness for assessments designed by the state in addition to the following years progression of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Train leadership team and teachers of the relationship of the SIP and Standards-based initiative requirements.

Person Responsible	Vincent Hall (hallv@duvalschools.org)

Provide professional development sessions focusing on unpacking the standards and knowledge required to deliver effective standards aligned instruction. These sessions will also focus on analyzing student work an providing effective feedback.

Person Responsible	Natasha Williams (williamsn3@duvalschools.org)

Utilize district support to assist in identifying learning gaps in Tier 2 instruction.

Person Responsible	Anthony Scarlett (scarletta1@duvalschools.org)

Identify and equip lead teachers via the gradual release model to develop agendas for common planning and facilitate weekly common planning sessions. Ultimately resulting in sole ownership of teachers.

Person Responsible	Vincent Hall (hallv@duvalschools.org)

District specialist and administrators will provide differentiated support for the accountable content areas teacher groups, as identified during PLC, common planning, and weekly observations. (All administrators)

Person Responsible	Brandie Stallings (stallingsb@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2020 5 Essentials Report, there was a 4% drop in the area of supportive environment. Forty-four percent of the students taking the survey conveyed they did not feel as if the teachers kept their promises. Thirty-six percent disagreed with the teachers willingness to listen to them. The supportive environment was noted as my weakest area, and identified the school to be not yet organized. A supportive environment is needed for student academic achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	At least 50% of the students taking the survey in 20-21 will record an increase in trust in the teacher and the teacher's willingness to listen to them.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vincent Hall (hallv@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	There will be professional development training for teachers pertaining to classroom management procedures, grading procedures, and teaching students living in poverty.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The teachers at Raines want to be here, but often lack the understanding of the students they teach. When teachers become frustrated due to a lack of experience with students who live in poverty, they tend to respond negatively. The professional development planned for teachers will provide resources and understanding of students.

Action Steps to Implement

Continuous professional development opportunities on dealing with students living in poverty and other team building opportunities.

Person Responsible	Vincent Hall (hallv@duvalschools.org)

Teacher and Student incentives.

Person Responsible	Vincent Hall (hallv@duvalschools.org)

CHAMPS training and continuous classroom management clinics throughout the year.

Person Responsible	Vincent Hall (hallv@duvalschools.org)

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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.

na

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.

Needs to be completed

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.