Rosenwald High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Rosenwald High School

924 BAY AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jonathan Mcquagge

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK, 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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* Black/African American Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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 Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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

Rosenwald High School

924 BAY AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

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)
Combination School PK, 6-12	Yes	%

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

School Grades History

Year	**2012-13**	**2011-12**
Grade		

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

Rosenwald High School will provide a safe, structured, and supportive environment that inspires students to stay in school and graduate ready for college or careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

EDUCATION. GRADUATION. DESTINATION.

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
McQuagge, Jonathan	Principal	Jonathan McQuagge (principal) Provides a common and clearly defined vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing and supporting the school-wide instructional plan with fidelity, ensures the implementation of interventions and supports and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support intervention implementation and communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities.
Head, Debra	Teacher, K-12	Debra Head (Regular Education ELA and College Career Ready Teacher, Media Specialist, High School Dept. Chair) Provides information regarding core instruction, participates in student data collection, analysis, and evaluation, instruction/interventions for all tiers as defined by student needs, and evaluates the effectiveness of implementation strategies through on-going progress monitoring. Also, she serves on the district's ELA committee as our school liaison.
Karas, Carly	Teacher, K-12	Carly Karas (Regular Education Science Teacher, Activities Coordinator) Provides information regarding core instruction, participates in student data collection, analysis, and evaluation, instruction/interventions for all tiers as defined by student needs, and evaluates the effectiveness of implementation strategies through on-going progress monitoring. As the activities coordinator, she plans student-led activities throughout the year to enhance the culture and climate of the school. Also, she serves on the district's biology committee as our school's liaison.
Boyette, Crystal	Assistant Principal	Performs ongoing data collection and analysis to determine academic and social-emotional needs to the school; assist all teachers/paraprofessionals with professional development, serves as the advisor for curriculum and the implementation of academics and social-emotional learning programs.
James, Makeda	Other	
Boutwell, Barbara	Teacher, ESE	Provides information regarding core instruction, participates in student data collection, analysis, and evaluation, instruction/interventions for all tiers as defined by student needs, and evaluates the effectiveness of implementation strategies through on-going progress monitoring.
Steele, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Provides information regarding core instruction, participates in student data collection, analysis, and evaluation, instruction/interventions for all tiers as defined by student needs, and evaluates the effectiveness of implementation strategies through on-going progress monitoring.
Allison, Michael	Teacher, ESE	Provides information regarding core instruction, participates in student data collection, analysis, and evaluation, instruction/interventions for all tiers as defined by student needs, and evaluates the effectiveness of implementation strategies through on-going progress monitoring.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sirmans, Tracey	Other	Graduation Coach Examine data to identify students at risk of dropout, interact directly with students to assist with academic and social needs, develop and deliver intervention services, connect students and families to school and community services and resources, and help students develop goals for their future.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/2/2020, Jonathan Mcquagge

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
23

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK, 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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* Black/African American Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade

	2016-17: No Grade
	2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	8	26	31	42	39	24	19	189
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	19	30	27	20	13	128
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	21	21	19	11	5	99
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	9	4	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	12	9	5	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	21	28	27	15	14	128
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	24	26	23	9	8	108

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	7	23	27	35	33	21	14	160

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	3	3	4	13	8	3	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	24	20	19	13	9	100

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/28/2020

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	21	30	34	44	38	29	40	236
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	21	20	31	27	21	31	164
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	22	24	18	14	11	120
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	6	15	21	19	22	92
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	24	25	37	26	26	30	183

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	15	23	26	35	29	26	33	187

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	9	14	10	15	12	9	6	75
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	18	11	20	20	15	18	113

Prior Year - Updated

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	21	30	34	44	38	29	40	236
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	21	20	31	27	21	31	164
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	22	24	18	14	11	120
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	6	15	21	19	22	92
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	24	25	37	26	26	30	183

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	15	23	26	35	29	26	33	187

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	9	14	10	15	12	9	6	75
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	18	11	20	20	15	18	113

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	0%	73%	61%	0%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	64%	59%	0%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	58%	54%	0%	56%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	70%	62%	0%	68%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	57%	59%	0%	59%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	52%	0%	58%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	65%	56%	0%	67%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	86%	78%	0%	79%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(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
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	13%	58%	-45%	55%	-42%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	9%	54%	-45%	53%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	9%	52%	-43%	53%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
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	22%	71%	-49%	67%	-45%
2018	8%	64%	-56%	65%	-57%
Compare		14%			

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	23%	74%	-51%	70%	-47%
2018	48%	73%	-25%	68%	-20%
Compare		-25%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	64%	-64%	61%	-61%
2018	3%	64%	-61%	62%	-59%
Compare		-3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	10%	62%	-52%	57%	-47%
2018	15%	62%	-47%	56%	-41%
Compare		-5%			

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										69	
BLK								7		35	17
WHT				7						24	40
FRL	7	17		3	46		19	24		36	26
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	19
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES

ESSA Federal Index	
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	153
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	70%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	69
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	12
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	24
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	22
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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 that showed the lowest performance was out Black/African American Student subgroup. Contributing factors were that the students were behind academically and many have been retained 2 or more years.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was the Black/African American subgroup. One of the factors that contributed to this decline was how data was reviewed and minimal structures implemented to support data-driven decision making.

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 compared to the state average was the school graduation rate of the Black/African American subgroup.
State of Florida Black/African American Graduation Rate: 81.5%

Rosenwald High School Black/African American Graduation Rate: 20%
This subgroup data has consistently remained stagnant, however, contributing factors were that cohort groups continued to fall further behind and two to three years older than their kindergarten cohort.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the school graduation rate of Economically Disadvantaged.
The school was having monthly graduation team assistance meetings to progress monitor individual students and set a goal of graduating students within four years.

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

Black/African American Students
Federal Index-Black/African American Students 12%
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%: 2

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

1. Overall Graduation Rate
2. Black/African American Subgroup performance
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: Implement instruction focused on essential standards with a blended learning model Rationale: Struggling students who are 2 or more years behind their kindergarten cohort and need strategic teaching
Measurable Outcome:	The increased graduation rate of on-time graduates.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jonathan McQuagge (mcquaj@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement a school-wide online learning curriculum and blended learning. (Edgenuity)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The on-line learning curriculum is focused on essential standards with blended learning to address individualized student needs. A data-focused curriculum that enables teachers to individualize instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementation of on-line curriculum school-wide with fidelity using coaching as classroom supports.
2. Monthly graduation team assistance meetings to progress monitor individual students and set a goal of graduating students within four years.

Person Responsible	Crystal Boyette (boyetck@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

not applicable

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.

Rosenwald High School will involve parents, families, and other community stakeholders with ongoing planning, and implementation of our Positive Behavior Interventions and Support program (PBIS). Surveys

will be conducted of various stakeholders to include faculty/staff, students, parents, and community members to ensure the engagement of positive activities that will include incentives and rewards. Rosenwald has established a partnership with the City of Panama City that will provide beautification projects, mentors, guest speakers, and financial support when needed for activities. Partnerships with community businesses are being established that will contribute throughout the school year to our faculty and students as part of PBIS.

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.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00