James Rickards High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

James Rickards High School

3013 JIM LEE RD, Tallahassee, FL 32301

https://www.leonschools.net/rickards

Demographics

Principal: Doug Cook
Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: D (37%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* 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 Leon 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of James S. Rickards High School is to produce graduates with skills and competencies to succeed on local, state, national, and international levels and who are responsible, self-supporting, and productive members of our society.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision for Rickards High School is to provide students with a caring, supportive learning environment that allows them to reach their maximum potential through quality programs, instruction and experiences.

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
Cook, Douglas	Principal	
Ansley, Zachary	Assistant Principal	
Barnes, Deborah	Assistant Principal	
Jones, Terraca	Guidance Counselor	
Holmes, Richard	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2012, Doug Cook

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.*
2

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
79

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: D (37%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Jeff Sewell]
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here].	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	484	421	334	316	1555
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	149	109	11	434
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	51	27	4	150
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	47	28	4	95
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	47	28	4	95
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183	148	99	6	436
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	102	60	8	295

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	17	12	3	1	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	23	9	2	52

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/14/2020

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	493	431	372	288	1584
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	111	99	75	416
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	47	39	24	136
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	159	119	99	577

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	79	71	59	43	252

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	493	431	372	288	1584
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	111	99	75	416
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	47	39	24	136
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	159	119	99	577

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	79	71	59	43	252

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	40%	57%	56%	39%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	52%	51%	43%	52%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	40%	42%	34%	37%	44%
Math Achievement	45%	56%	51%	39%	52%	51%
Math Learning Gains	44%	47%	48%	39%	42%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	47%	45%	37%	42%	45%
Science Achievement	76%	67%	68%	59%	64%	67%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	80%	82%	73%	68%	77%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	42%	58%	-16%	55%	-13%
	2018	39%	60%	-21%	53%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	38%	57%	-19%	53%	-15%
	2018	38%	58%	-20%	53%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	70%	22%	67%	25%
2018	66%	69%	-3%	65%	1%
Compare	26%				

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	93%	81%	12%	70%	23%
2018	100%	79%	21%	68%	32%
Compare		-7%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	51%	69%	-18%	61%	-10%
2018	47%	71%	-24%	62%	-15%
Compare		4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	40%	67%	-27%	57%	-17%
2018	32%	60%	-28%	56%	-24%
Compare		8%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	18	25	16	30	46					88	14
ELL	13	20	10								
ASN	89	64								94	94
BLK	32	42	35	41	40	44	72	78		93	36
HSP	38	35	18	64	52					90	44
MUL	57	48		71							
WHT	70	61		67	57		91	80		95	78
FRL	29	41	34	41	43	43	70	78		91	23

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 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**
SWD	16	33	27	23			18			73	14
ASN	96	66								100	100
BLK	32	41	37	37	38	34	57	65		89	35
HSP	52	37		55	40					100	50

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
MUL	38	36									
WHT	51	46		57	53		82			96	80
FRL	26	36	33	35	43	33	52	60		87	32

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	57
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	82
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	628
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Black/African American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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

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	52
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

Ela achievement performed the lowest for assessments in 2018-19. This has become a trend for lower performance when compared to District and State performance.

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

History EOC experienced the greatest decline form the previous years' performance 2017-18

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 biggest gap when compared to the state and district average was Geometry. The gap 2017-18 was 27% between school and district performance and 17% between state and school average performance.

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

Biology EOC had the largest gains from the previous years 2017-18, as it improved 26%.

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

Two potential areas of concern for James S. Rickards High School are attendance below 90% and low math scores.

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

1. Improve safety and security
2. Improve communication with community and parents
3. Increase graduation rate
4. Increase CTE rate
5. Increase the number of IB students receiving diploma and increase the number of dual enrollment students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:
No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

By using SAC meetings and SITE leadership meetings to re-evaluate our progress and monitor data sources.

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.

James S. Rickards High School leaders encourage all parents to become actively involved in educating their child. Based on our 2017-18 School Climate Survey, 80% of our parents agreed with the statement that the school leaders, staff and teachers, communicate with them regularly about the needs of their child (ren). Our goal is to improve our parent-school partnership, by strengthening it; along with improving home communication between school and parent to have a positive impact on parent involvement for students, particularly, on struggling students in the lower 25% percentile. We are working diligently to provide additional opportunities for parents to volunteer in numerous capacities of student achievement and to assist with ideas/information for continuous academic learning at home.

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

Total:	$7,000.00