Interlachen Jr Sr High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Interlachen Jr Sr High School

126 N STATE RD 315, Interlachen, FL 32148

www.putnamschools.org/o/ihs

Demographics

Principal: Amber Symonds

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2016

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)	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 (47%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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 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

Interlachen Jr Sr High School

126 N STATE RD 315, Interlachen, FL 32148

www.putnamschools.org/o/ihs

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	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	37%

School Grades History

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

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.

To ensure the academic program of Interlachen High School is rigorous, relevant, and provides the students with the tools needed to become provides the necessary skills for post secondary life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Interlachen High School focuses on pushing students towards their individual full potential through challenging curriculum, positive relationships, and community involvement.

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
Helms, Bryan	Principal	As principal, Mr. Helms oversees the school's professional development needs, facilitates staff professional development, conducts observation and provides developmental support, oversees curricula and resource implementation and needs. He is also responsible for monitoring all systems of the school including instructional and behavioral data.
Reed, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	As Assistant Principal, Ms. Reed conducts observations and provides follow-up support. She performs monthly data analysis on the Early Warning Systems (attendance, course failures, and discipline). She coordinates professional learning for the staff.
Eubanks, Joy	Assistant Principal	As Assistant Principal, Ms. Eubanks conducts observations and provides follow-up support. She also assists with the Multi-Tierred System of Support. She works alongside the Guidance department to closely monitor our seniors and the course progression of all students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/1/2016, Amber Symonds

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 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)	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 (47%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219	196	165	136	716
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	78	61	74	307
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	68	26	20	190
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	20	4	3	48
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	17	6	1	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	52	38	30	209
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	0	0	0	85

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	63	30	35	226

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	2	1	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	9	3	4	37

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	177	164	149	716
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	68	53	75	261
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	67	44	35	212
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	52	25	26	177
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	47	37	27	222

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	44	27	24	146

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	13	9	5	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	10	4	30

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	226	177	164	149	716
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	68	53	75	261
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	67	44	35	212
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	52	25	26	177
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	47	37	27	222

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	51	44	27	24	146

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	13	9	5	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	10	4	30

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	45%	31%	56%	36%	28%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	34%	51%	45%	40%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	27%	42%	39%	41%	41%
Math Achievement	35%	25%	51%	35%	27%	49%
Math Learning Gains	50%	43%	48%	24%	27%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	42%	45%	21%	28%	39%
Science Achievement	50%	39%	68%	46%	53%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	61%	49%	73%	52%	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					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	42%	41%	1%	55%	-13%
	2018	38%	38%	0%	53%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		42%				
10	2019	42%	41%	1%	53%	-11%
	2018	42%	38%	4%	53%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
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	49%	54%	-5%	67%	-18%
2018	39%	58%	-19%	65%	-26%
Compare		10%			

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	58%	51%	7%	70%	-12%
2018	55%	53%	2%	68%	-13%
Compare		3%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	25%	49%	-24%	61%	-36%
2018	24%	43%	-19%	62%	-38%
Compare		1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	31%	43%	-12%	57%	-26%
2018	49%	50%	-1%	56%	-7%
Compare		-18%			

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	32	27	19	30	53		32	47		91	3
BLK	24	32	31	14			31	36		92	25
HSP	41	51	50	25	31		45	75		91	15
MUL	42	29		50				60			
WHT	50	45	29	40	56	45	56	61		89	21
FRL	41	42	35	32	45	52	55	60		89	15

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	27	51	41	20	42		60	37		70	
BLK	33	54	43	38	58			40		63	30
HSP	46	55		31	50		60	50		78	33
MUL	43	36									
WHT	43	54	54	41	63	59	50	56		77	29
FRL	40	52	48	41	58	50	50	49		74	19
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	9	24	19	29	47		25	24		36	10
BLK	23	33	33	33	33		35	47		48	10
HSP	33	47	42	28	14		44	61		52	18
MUL	27	57									
WHT	39	46	39	36	25	28	50	52		67	45
FRL	31	42	38	36	20	23	43	52		59	39

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	474
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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

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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	45
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	49
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	47
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.

The data component showing the lowest performance was Biology. The data projected 42% proficiency for the upcoming end of course exam. The greatest contributing factor was teacher retention.

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

The mid-year Biology data showed the greatest decline from the prior year's data. Teacher mastery in content area is a contributing factor in the decline of the data.

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.

Biology data had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Our student data projected 42% proficiency while the state average was 68% proficiency. The retention of highly qualified teachers with content knowledge contributed to this gap.

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

According to our student data, College and Career acceleration showed the most improvement. Our leadership team created pathways for CTE certifications with continuous progress monitoring of our students progress and success. We also provided more opportunities for assessing students to qualify for dual enrollment to have access to college courses. In addition, we added additional college courses offered on campus. Providing college courses on campus allowed students with transportation issues to be able to access college courses without leaving our school campus.

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

After reflecting on the EWS data, we noticed a decline in our exceptional education student's proficiency on state assessments and end of course exams. In addition, attendance continues to be an area of concern.

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

1. Teacher Retention
2. Professional development in effective instructional strategies
3. Attendance for students and staff

4. Continuous progress monitoring of student data
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Grade Level Appropriate Standard-Based core Instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase student achievement and learning gains in Algebra, ELA, and ESSA Subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bryan Helms (b2helms@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will focus on grade-level appropriate standard based planning for all subjects.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standard-based planning will ensure appropriate grade-level content is presented to all students daily during al fore instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborative standard-based planning
2. Professional development focused on standard-based unit development.
3. Professional Learning Communities focus on core instruction
4. New teacher Support
5. Conditions Walk and Rigor

Person Responsible	Bryan Helms (b2helms@my.putnamschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School leadership teams conduct a district unified comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) towards the end of each school year. The CNA report on how resources including personnel, instruction, and curriculum are aligned to identified needs. Student programming outcomes are monitored both in the CNA and district school data report-outs conducted quarterly.

Projects are monitored for auditing purposes by the Office of Federal Programs. Audit boxes for each program are maintained and aligned to pertinent work papers and Federal and State Guidance.

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.

Student-Athletes and Student Government form a cooperative group and offer tours for the incoming students and parents on schedule distribution day. The Guidance Department will work to create a smooth welcome and transition process for incoming freshmen, as well as any new student entering the school.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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