

Putnam County School District

Q.I. Roberts Jr. Sr. High School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	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

Demographics

Principal: Joe Theobold

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (77%) 2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (80%)
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 is pending approval by the Putnam 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 7-12	Yes	85%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Putnam 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.

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Theobold, Joe	Principal	Instructional Leadership, management of school function and facility, development of curriculum, instruction, practices, and outreach.
Thornton, Tammie	Assistant Principal	Instructional leadership and coaching, support in school management, curriculum development, instructional practices, and outreach.
Bennett, Amanda	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Support in instruction and technology, progress monitoring and intervention, management and outreach.
Dehart, Jana	Other	Assessment coordinator, data analysis, and curriculum guidance.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Joe Theobold

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

482

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

1

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	114	78	78	81	57	69	477	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	23	19	21	17	21	137	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	1	5	2	1	26	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	3	7	1	23	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	7	8	5	7	42	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	1	1	0	12	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	1	1	0	12	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	5	7	5	4	6	4	31

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Friday 9/2/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	15	18	16	19	19	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	4	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	11	11	8	6	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	17	9	22	13	82
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	1	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	8	2	8	6	9	4	37

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	7	2	1	0	0	0	10	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	15	18	16	19	19	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	4	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	11	11	8	6	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	17	9	22	13	82
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	1	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	8	2	8	6	9	4	37

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	7	2	1	0	0	0	10	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	86%	28%	51%				85%	31%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	70%						61%	34%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	71%						63%	27%	42%
Math Achievement	71%		38%				71%	25%	51%
Math Learning Gains	43%						50%	43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						40%	42%	45%
Science Achievement	90%	7%	40%				83%	39%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	94%	8%	48%				93%	49%	73%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2022					
	2019	81%	38%	43%	52%	29%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	88%	41%	47%	56%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	83%	54%	29%	67%	16%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	93%	60%	33%	71%	22%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	69%	49%	20%	61%	8%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	73%	43%	30%	57%	16%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	65	53		50	50						
BLK	70	70		54	38				75		
HSP	82	66		80	59			100	88		
MUL	96	83		67	33				73		
WHT	88	69	71	70	41	33	95	94	82	100	100
FRL	87	73	81	67	35	41	89	94	81	100	100
2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	82	73		50							
BLK	84	64	67	50	20		69	82	71		
HSP	86	71	64	50	27			90	71		
MUL	94	65		50	9						
WHT	82	56	56	68	20	23	80	90	76	100	100
FRL	86	62	67	65	24	25	88	86	77	100	100
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
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	848
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
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	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	79
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	70
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	77
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	77
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our trends were positive across the board. We still see a lag in math scores generally, though the growth and proficiency increased back to previous, pre-pandemic levels this year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Once again, our math proficiency and growth scores present the biggest opportunity for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

District-wide elementary math preparation has shown a lag with reading scores in previous years. We have seen this born out in our math progression when we attempt to move students through Algebra in 7th grade. While our pass-rates were decent, we saw a troubling decline through the upper grades in SAT scores. We have recreated our progression to include 7th grade accelerated math to improve pre-Algebra skills before going into algebra.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Reading growth and Math growth showed profound improvement. While the doubling of Math growth is the largest leap, the growth in reading is clearly the highest.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We introduced Global Perspectives across the grade levels and implemented a more whole-language approach to reading in ELA through the use of Book Studies.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Learning acceleration is achieved through the Cambridge International curriculum as well as AVID WICOR strategies.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Continued Cambridge PD and AVID PD

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The AVID structures are being implemented through cohorts, this year including two grade levels. The AVID Site Team continues to support a school-wide effort to implement strategies in instruction as well as executive functioning skills for all students.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We will continue to cultivate best practices in math including instructional coaching and the Impact Florida Partnership which our math department participated in last year. We are expanding it to include another math teacher this year and are supporting their instructional growth through coaching.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Math proficiency scores will increase to 75% this year on the FAST.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

FAST PM and FAST Sum.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joe Theobald (j2theobald@my.putnamschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Collaborative and student-led practices will be implemented in math this year following the math department's participation in Impact Florida.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Collaborative practices and student-led activities have shown to be a best practice as it offers student the chance to process content and gives immediate progress monitoring for teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Participation in Impact Florida

Person Responsible

Tammie Thornton (tthornton@my.putnamschools.org)

Coaching on instructional practices and feedback

Person Responsible

Joe Theobald (j2theobald@my.putnamschools.org)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

We use student, family, and staff surveys to develop plans and implement programs that support a positive school culture. We are highly student centered and encourage students to be part every step of school planning. They have a say in the curriculum offerings, school practices, and school cultural events. Families also have a great deal of input through SAC and PTO, guiding how we allocate resources and build the school culture we want.

Faculty and staff will be able to impact school culture even more this year with the addition of MyVoice, a real time survey platform which will help guide us by giving administration immediate feedback on how our efforts are being perceived. We will then use this information to develop programs for our monthly early release days.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Administration is responsible for setting the initial vision for school culture and enacting the appropriate steps that would lead to the accomplishment of this vision.

Staff are called upon to invest in the culture and give prompt feedback on ways to improve it.

Families are needed to inform, from an outside perspective, what impacts are being seen on overall school culture and its effectiveness on providing a safe and nurturing environment.

Students are needed to join the culture, drive it to a positive place, and aid, through mutual accountability, the successful survival of a positive culture.