



---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

# Samuel W. Wolfson High School

7000 POWERS AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32217

<http://www.duvalschools.org/wolfson>

## Demographics

**Principal: Christopher Begley**

Start Date for this Principal: 1/12/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (46%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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](http://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**

Samuel Wolfson School for Advanced Studies and Leadership fosters academic excellence through comprehensive curricula and rigorous studies.

**Provide the school's vision statement**

Pursuit of excellence through valor, integrity and perseverance.

### 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
Begley, Christopher	Principal	
Ball, Jr.	Assistant Principal	
Lucas, Janetta	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Thursday 1/12/2017, Christopher Begley

**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.*

6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12

<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (46%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 7/13/2020

**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	1	318	218	130	102	769
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4	5	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	33	13	0	59
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	21	16	20	97

**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	1	0	0	0	1

**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	10	25	34	69
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4

**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	1	318	218	130	102	769
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4	5	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	33	13	0	59
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	21	16	20	97

**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	1	0	0	0	1

**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	10	25	34	69
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4

**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	63%	47%	56%	53%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	48%	51%	47%	49%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	42%	42%	33%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	50%	51%	51%	50%	51%	51%
Math Learning Gains	55%	52%	48%	49%	55%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	47%	45%	51%	50%	45%
Science Achievement	73%	65%	68%	50%	61%	67%



School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	79%	70%	73%	61%	67%	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	67%	48%	19%	55%	12%
	2018	55%	48%	7%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	56%	48%	8%	53%	3%
	2018	52%	49%	3%	53%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	71%	67%	4%	67%	4%
2018	49%	63%	-14%	65%	-16%
Compare		22%			

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					
<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	79%	68%	11%	70%	9%
2018	61%	64%	-3%	68%	-7%
Compare		18%			
<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	53%	57%	-4%	61%	-8%
2018	43%	61%	-18%	62%	-19%
Compare		10%			
<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	47%	61%	-14%	57%	-10%
2018	50%	57%	-7%	56%	-6%
Compare		-3%			

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	38	29		20	55					83	60
ELL	25	39	42	42	71		45			91	90
ASN	31	40		73						100	73
BLK	45	45	40	36	38	43	51	72		92	77
HSP	62	41	30	48	53		74	83		92	91
MUL	71	64					60				
WHT	87	61		73	76	92	93	92		96	84
FRL	49	44	35	42	41	52	54	76		92	79

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
SWD	43	42		40			20			80	42
ELL	32	52	43	50			27	45		75	73
ASN	53	56					50	85		100	82
BLK	40	40	28	39	38	40	36	53		88	75

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
HSP	56	51	55	60	55		54	56		76	77
MUL	53	33		36							
WHT	87	62		68	63		82	68		87	80
FRL	47	45	32	48	47	53	47	55		84	75

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	62
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	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	684
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

**Asian Students**

Federal Index - Asian Students	63
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	54
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	84
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
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**

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

**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**

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

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

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

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Ensure that all students at Samuel Wolfson School for Advanced Studies are offered the equivalent experience that they will see in the assessments at the end of the year. The majority of classroom grades and scores on summative and/or end of year assessments have limited correlation.

**Measureable Outcome:** The vast majority of our current teachers will implement classroom assessments that are aligned to the complexity of the standards as measured by the standards walkthrough document.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Christopher Begley (begleyc@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** To facilitate PLC and common planning to create equivalent experiences aligned to assessments would ensure ALL students develop the capacity to understand content that is complex and challenging.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students that develop the capacity to understand content that is complex and challenging, will directly impact performance on assessments.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1) Teachers collaborate to identify targeted content aligned to the standards.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Begley (begleyc@duvalschools.org)

2) Teachers review the data on a regular basis to identify students needing extended remediation of the standards not mastered.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Begley (begleyc@duvalschools.org)

3) Teachers and admin to continuously review the district assessment data to improve students' achievement of rigorous standards-based instruction tested.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Begley (begleyc@duvalschools.org)

4) Teachers and admin participate in district provided Professional Development to identify effective instructional strategies for low performing students and how to scaffold their learning.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Begley (begleyc@duvalschools.org)

5) Admin to conduct frequent Standards-Based Instructional walk-throughs to observe the aligned instruction.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Begley (begleyc@duvalschools.org)

6) Teachers analyze tests results to diagnose student learning, improve assessments and instruction, and modify their instructional strategy to re-teach the rigorous content.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Begley (begleyc@duvalschools.org)

7) Teachers collaboratively analyze and revise assignments and assessments to increase the cognitive complexity and alignment to standards.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Begley (begleyc@duvalschools.org)

8) Teachers create blended learning opportunities that challenge students to perform at higher levels of learning from a variety of sources.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Begley (begleyc@duvalschools.org)

**#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Ensure that all students at Samuel Wolfson School for Advanced Studies enrich their partnership of trust with teachers. According to the 5Es survey, Wolfson students could increase their connection of trust.

**Measurable Outcome:** The vast majority of our current teachers will implement classroom protocols that will raise the confidence of the students that they have a genuine connection with their teachers. This will be measured by an increase in the 5Es standard of teacher/student connection.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:** To facilitate faculty meeting, PLCs and common planning to create procedures and protocols to make elevate the connection between students and teachers.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students who develop the confidence in teacher/student relationships will directly impact performance on assessments and grades.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers will participate in either coaching, tutoring, sponsoring of clubs to build relationships with students.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Begley (begleyc@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will input grades in a more timely manner - not just what is expected in their contract.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Begley (begleyc@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will employ a system of logging in turned in assignments so that the students feel confident that their work is not being lost.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Begley (begleyc@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will quickly give feedback on assigned material so that the students do not have a delay in their learning.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Begley (begleyc@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will grade and log into FOCUS all assignments so that students and parents are ensured receipt of the work giving validation to their effort.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Begley (begleyc@duvalschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**



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

## 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.

### **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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>