

Putnam County School District

Q.I. Roberts Jr. Sr. High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Q.I. Roberts Jr. Sr. High School

901 STATE ROAD 100, Florahome, FL 32140

www.putnamschools.org/o/qi-roberts

Demographics

Principal: Joe Theobold

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
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)	85%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Q.I. Roberts Jr. Sr. High School

901 STATE ROAD 100, Florahome, FL 32140

www.putnamschools.org/o/qi-roberts

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 7-12	Yes	59%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Q.I. Roberts Jr.-Sr. High School will provide high quality education for all students. The expectation is Excellence in all Endeavors.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Q.I. Roberts Jr.-Sr. High School will orient, educate, and graduate every student fully prepared for successful entry to and completion of a post-secondary education. Faculty and staff ensure student engagement and work collaboratively to create a respectful, positive learning environment where decisions are made in the best interest of students.

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
Theobold, Joe	Principal	Administer high quality professional development, lead the education of students, manage the safe and engaging school environment.
Thornton, Tammie	Assistant Principal	Administer high quality professional development, lead the education of students, manage the safe and engaging school environment.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 6/1/2019, Joe Theobold

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.*

0

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
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)	85%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	113	136	89	86	90	46	560	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	13	8	7	15	65	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	12	4	1	0	30	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	3	1	0	12	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	1	0	10	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	3	2	0	13	

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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/18/2020

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	28	13	13	7	4	10	75	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	11	6	3	2	32	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	5	9	9	15	55	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	1	0	10	

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	1	7	8	5	2	4	27	

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	28	13	13	7	4	10	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	11	6	3	2	32
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	5	9	9	15	55
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	1	0	10

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	1	7	8	5	2	4	27

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	85%	31%	56%	81%	28%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	34%	51%	58%	40%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	27%	42%	48%	41%	41%
Math Achievement	71%	25%	51%	57%	27%	49%
Math Learning Gains	50%	43%	48%	38%	27%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	42%	45%	36%	28%	39%
Science Achievement	83%	39%	68%	89%	53%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	49%	73%	98%	57%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(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
07	2019	81%	38%	43%	52%	29%
	2018	81%	38%	43%	51%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	88%	41%	47%	56%	32%
	2018	93%	47%	46%	58%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
09	2019	83%	41%	42%	55%	28%
	2018	78%	38%	40%	53%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
10	2019	85%	41%	44%	53%	32%
	2018	83%	38%	45%	53%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019					
	2018	0%	25%	-25%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018	0%	16%	-16%	45%	-45%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	54%	29%	67%	16%
2018	93%	58%	35%	65%	28%
Compare		-10%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	60%	33%	71%	22%
2018	92%	60%	32%	71%	21%
Compare		1%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	49%	20%	61%	8%
2018	75%	43%	32%	62%	13%
Compare		-6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	43%	30%	57%	16%
2018	82%	50%	32%	56%	26%
Compare		-9%			

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
BLK	73	55	61	58	42	33	71	86	70		
HSP	83	72	81	62	52		91		68		
MUL	85	69		80	80				82		
WHT	87	60	59	73	49	40	84	94	83	100	97
FRL	81	59	56	73	52	36	77	91	79	100	92

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
ASN	70										
BLK	69	62	50	67	63	62	82	92	75		
HSP	83	55	64	71	41		70		80		
MUL	82	82									
WHT	87	63	64	79	55	61	97	92	90	98	100
FRL	83	62	62	75	53	57	89	91	85	97	97
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
ASN				50							
BLK	66	51	47	38	28	18		100	72		
HSP	63	41	23	36	21	18	91	90	80		
MUL	89	61		47	32						
WHT	84	61	52	63	42	46	91	98	88		
FRL	76	49	49	42	28	25	87	98	78		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	821
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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

English Language Learners	
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	61
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	73
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	79
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	75
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	72
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Math scores, especially in the bottom quartile, are lowest. We have not used a differentiated approach to this in the past.

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

Math BQ. The lack of intervention and remediation.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Math BQ is the only piece of academic data we show a gap in.

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

Reading BQ. Intervention during Power Hour.

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

Students failing classes.

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

1. Bottom Quartile in math
2. Students passing all courses

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

We will focus on mathematics instruction, specifically related to intervention of the lowest performing 25% of students on FSA. BQ Math has been a low point in our data year to year as we have an accelerated program which pushes students who are sometimes not prepared for the level they start in. Because of this we have double blocked math in 7th grade and established a focus on these students with the plan to have students more prepared for the higher math our program progression requires.

Measurable Outcome:

We will show a minimum of a years growth for 75% of our BQ math scores this year using FSA and ALEKS data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joe Theobald (j2theobald@my.putnamschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

ALEKS intervention tasks will be used to design a specific course of intervention for our students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

We use ALEKS material regularly in math and the renewed focus on these students and their pathway will lead us to a better outcome for them in both the annual and long-term growth we wish to see.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a list of the students we will be focusing on using past FSA data.

Person Responsible

Amanda Bennett (abennett@my.putnamschools.org)

We will focus planning and intervention time on these students and the specific pathways their data leads them to.

Person Responsible

Tammie Thornton (tthornton@my.putnamschools.org)

We will regularly monitor their progress and have reflective practices to discuss the progress and the implications of the information, moving to change plans when needed.

Person Responsible

Joe Theobald (j2theobald@my.putnamschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will support collaborative practices throughout the school with targeted observation and feedback. We will work closely with the math department to implement strategies that improve collaborative processing as it seems that math is an area we struggle in consistently.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We use Lauren's Kids curriculum as a school wide Tier 1 resource for teaching SEI. We also talk daily about our core values as a school: Quality, Integrity, Respect, and Mutual Accountability. We use surveys to find what the students see as issues we can address both with the climate and with instruction, and we use this student input to create our SIP and professional development plans.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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