

Hernando County School District

Explorer K 8



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	10
Title I Requirements	11
Budget to Support Goals	13

Explorer K 8

10252 NORTHCLIFFE BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34608

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/ek8>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	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	47%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	C	C	B*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

All stakeholders in our community will work collaboratively to promote an environment of high expectations where all of our young explorers will have the opportunity to receive a quality, interactive education in a nurturing, safe and secure environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Explore today....Conquer tomorrow!

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title
Braithwaite, Lisa	Principal
Fischer, Jocelyn	Teacher, K-12
Sardogan, Carmela	School Counselor
Weed, Donald	Administrative Support
Anderson, Erin	Teacher, K-12
MacGregor, Andrew	Assistant Principal
Roman, Jillian	Administrative Support
Dill, JB	Administrative Support
Grinnen, Scott	Administrative Support
Kling, Marguerite	Teacher, K-12
Mentasti, Chris	Administrative Support
Smith, Joshua	Assistant Principal

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Explorer K-8's School Based Leadership Team meets once a month to discuss and problem solve school needs as indicated by i-Ready data, early warning indicators, as well as student, parent and teacher feedback. The SBLT follows up each month to report back on issues resolved, things in process, and new items for consideration.

The administrators set the agenda, facilitate the meetings and seek information regarding progress in School Improvement Goals. Administrators also set long and short term goals for the team to accomplish.

The administrative support team and teacher members examine the data, provide feedback to the administrators, accomplish the long and short term goals as set by administrators. The Assessment Teacher also prepares and analyzes data to discuss with teachers, and problem solve barriers that inhibit EK8's progress in accomplishing our goal.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	12	6	14	20	21	11	19	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	4	12	12	23	51	100	134	144	114	0	0	0	0	594
Course failure in ELA or Math	11	7	5	14	0	0	3	7	1	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	48	53	29	79	23	0	0	0	0	246
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	2	8	10	14	31	41	50	51	40	0	0	0	0	247

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		11	7	5	14	0	0	3	7	1	0	0	0	48
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)		8	2	4	11	3	2	2	8	6	0	0	0	46

Date this data was collected

Thursday 9/6/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	33	29	30	20	24	27	27	36	29	0	0	0	0	255
One or more suspensions	5	12	36	21	20	79	94	68	43	0	0	0	0	378
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	7	5	5	0	2	5	12	1	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	77	106	107	114	85	0	0	0	0	505

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	2	5	7	6	11	40	60	22	16	0	0	0	0	169

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	33	29	30	20	24	27	27	36	29	0	0	0	0	255
One or more suspensions	5	12	36	21	20	79	94	68	43	0	0	0	0	378
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	7	5	5	0	2	5	12	1	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	77	106	107	114	85	0	0	0	0	505

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	2	5	7	6	11	40	60	22	16	0	0	0	0	169

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

ELA lowest quartile performed the lowest, with 35% of the bottom quartile students making gains. Yes, this is a trend.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

ELA lowest quartile showed the greatest decline from prior year, dropping 8%.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

ELA lowest quartile Learning Gains shows the greatest gap when compared to the state, with a difference of 17%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Explorer K-8's Science scores increased by 6% from the previous year. This is not a trend.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Science resource teacher worked with 5th and 8th grade teachers and students in the planning and delivery of standard's based lessons focused on high student engagement. Weekly student work analysis allowed teachers to spiral back to address standards which needed additional emphasis. An FCAT boot camp allowed the students to review for the state assessment during the weeks prior to the exam.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	62%	60%	49%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	52%	57%	49%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	48%	52%	43%	45%	49%
Math Achievement	54%	68%	61%	56%	67%	56%
Math Learning Gains	51%	63%	58%	60%	62%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	57%	52%	62%	58%	48%
Science Achievement	50%	63%	57%	44%	57%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	82%	77%	69%	82%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	11 (33)	9 (29)	12 (30)	6 (20)	14 (24)	20 (27)	21 (27)	11 (36)	19 (29)	123 (255)
One or more suspensions	4 (5)	12 (12)	12 (36)	23 (21)	51 (20)	100 (79)	134 (94)	144 (68)	114 (43)	594 (378)
Course failure in ELA or Math	11 (12)	7 (7)	5 (5)	14 (5)	0 (0)	0 (2)	3 (5)	7 (12)	1 (1)	48 (49)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (16)	48 (77)	53 (106)	29 (107)	79 (114)	23 (85)	246 (505)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (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
03	2018	69%	62%	7%	57%	12%
	2017	60%	61%	-1%	58%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	42%	53%	-11%	56%	-14%
	2017	41%	55%	-14%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
05	2018	40%	53%	-13%	55%	-15%
	2017	51%	54%	-3%	53%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2018	48%	53%	-5%	52%	-4%
	2017	48%	52%	-4%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
07	2018	40%	51%	-11%	51%	-11%
	2017	42%	51%	-9%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2018	46%	54%	-8%	58%	-12%
	2017	42%	49%	-7%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	69%	67%	2%	62%	7%
	2017	61%	66%	-5%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	43%	60%	-17%	62%	-19%
	2017	55%	66%	-11%	64%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
05	2018	40%	56%	-16%	61%	-21%
	2017	40%	57%	-17%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
06	2018	40%	53%	-13%	52%	-12%
	2017	43%	53%	-10%	51%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2018	56%	63%	-7%	54%	2%
	2017	67%	61%	6%	53%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2018	60%	53%	7%	45%	15%
	2017	46%	53%	-7%	46%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	50%	56%	-6%	55%	-5%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	45%	56%	-11%	50%	-5%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		45%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	67%	74%	-7%	71%	-4%
2017	61%	76%	-15%	69%	-8%
Compare		6%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	88%	62%	26%	62%	26%
2017	94%	59%	35%	60%	34%
Compare		-6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	45%	-45%	56%	-56%
2017					

Subgroup Data

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	16	31	26	27	50	48	37	19			
ELL	10	45	48	31	55	68	17				
ASN	67	70		73	60						
BLK	40	21	23	39	41	46	26	55			
HSP	43	42	36	49	50	61	43	62	59		
MUL	49	47		45	54	50	53	64			
WHT	51	45	38	59	52	53	56	73	32		
FRL	44	40	37	51	48	53	48	63	36		

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	40	42	14	46	50	18	24			
ELL	18	44	54	34	58	50	27				
ASN	60	38		73	69						
BLK	41	49	35	41	52	52	42	58			
HSP	39	45	42	51	59	57	30	62	29		
MUL	43	47	38	39	44	58	33				
WHT	53	51	47	60	57	61	51	65	47		
FRL	45	48	43	53	56	60	39	61	35		

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Explorer K-8's lowest quartile students in ELA will make learning gains.
Rationale	Students who are in Explorer K-8's lowest quartile have not been closing the gap toward grade proficiency. Only 35% of our lowest quartile students made gains, 17% lower than statewide data.
Intended Outcome	With increased focus, data awareness, targeted strategies, and scaffolded supports, 50% of students in the lowest quartile will make gains to close the gap toward grade level proficiency.
Point Person	Andrew MacGregor (macgregor_a@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	<p>Increase the number of teachers to be used as Resource Personnel.</p> <p>Create schedules for pushed-in support of students who are in the lowest quartile.</p> <p>Weekly data analysis of lowest quartile performance using the Student Work Analysis Protocol.</p> <p>Inclusion teachers will support Level 1 and Level 2 ESE students in their intensive reading classes in Middle School.</p>
Person Responsible	Lisa Braithwaite (braithwaite_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	<p>Growth monitoring reports in iReady will be assessed monthly to track progress.</p> <p>Student Work Analysis Protocol for formative assessments will be evaluated.</p>
Person Responsible	Jillian Roman (roman_j@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Title I parents are invited to join PTSA, SAC, and attend Title I meetings once a month. The Title I annual meetings will occur in October in which parents come to learn about the Title I program at Explorer and have meaningful conversations with teachers as they sign parent compacts. The Family Engagement Team meets at the county level to engage in District programs. Parents are invited to a Science and Math night to engage in activities with students to enhance their understanding of STEAM standards. Parents are invited to attend Explorer K-8's Pajama Read a Thon, Breakfast with Books, and Family Share Night activities. Grade levels sponsor nights to inform parents about FSA testing, curriculum, and expectations.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The Explorer K-8 MTSS Problem Solving Team provides leadership to help all stakeholders complying with the school's MTSS plan. Guidance counselors, behavior specialists, and the MTSS coordinator provide student support through individual and group meetings. Students are also serviced via; Functional Behavior Assessments (FBA) and Behavioral Intervention Plans (BIP). Guidance and other school staff also monitor student needs through behavior plans or other interventions. Our school's guidance counselors review behavior and discipline data via RtI-B to monitor progress to aid student support.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Pre-Kindergarten to Kindergarten: Explorer K-8 holds a "Kindergarten Round-Up" event in the spring, which parents are invited to so they can register their child(ren) for Kindergarten. Parents will also be able to meet the kindergarten teachers, join the PTSA or SAC, and find out about the Title I program. Elementary to Middle School: Fifth grade students transitioning to middle school are given the opportunity to 'shadow' a middle school student for a day. Fourth and Fifth grade students are also able to join a chorus club to begin developing skills that they will use when enrolled in the electives the next school year.

Middle to High School: Middle School students attend High School orientation sessions and invite High School guidance counselors to host question and answer sessions for current 8th graders. Middle School students are also invited to attend the District College and Career Readiness Night.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Individual student data, both academic and behavioral, is the basis for determining the development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). SIP development team teachers survey the staff, analyze student performance, discipline, and attendance data, and then develop the goals, barriers, strategies and evaluation processes and tools aimed at improving student performance at EK-8.

Professional Learning Communities meet weekly to examine performance data. The MTSS problem solving process is applied to the new data; data is analyzed, problem areas identified, interventions developed, and tracking methods established, then trainings and interventions are applied which are all designed to meet the SIP goals. The grade level teams re-evaluate these strategies as they review the next set of performance data and modifications are made when data indicates a need to fine-tune strategies as well as implement or exit students from the process. The MTSS team determines school-based, grade level, and subject-level needs. In addition, the team ensures students are receiving appropriate Tier 1, 2 and 3 services/interventions with fidelity. The team further evaluates the professional development needs of the staff and appropriate tools for the overall implementation of MTSS to increase successful infrastructure development.

Explorer K-8 is a school-wide Title I program. Following the Technical Assistance guideline provided by the LEA District Title I department, Explorer K-8 is dedicated to providing a supplementary Title I education service for all students. The Title I Facilitator (TIF) collaborates with the District's Coordinator of Family Involvement to build home support networks that will facilitate targeted student success. The TIF will coordinate with the SBLT to provide tutoring for targeted students based on the previous school year data: FSA, FCAT, iReady and SAM scores. The Title I (Part A) services at Explorer K-8 will be coordinated with other federally-funded programs, including use of Title II funds to support additional

research-based professional development programs and teacher recruitment and retention activities, use of Title III funds to support additional services for our English Language Learners (ELLs), use of Title X funds to provide additional services for our homeless students, and use of IDEA funds to support additional supplemental services for our disabled students (SWDs). District Title I funds are used to provide a specialized social worker who serves as the district's homeless liaison and who coordinates exemplary local public school homeless education programs and services.

Explorer K-8 implements PLC's with core curriculum teachers during scheduled times to discuss changes in instruction, strategies, and/or school improvement activities. Teachers will work in collaboration to disaggregate the student data for core curriculum using the Student Work Analysis Protocol (SWAP).

All Title I inventory is monitored by the Title I facilitator through the use of Alexandria.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Explorer K-8 establishes partnerships with businesses including our neighboring McDonalds, Winn Dixie, YMCA, Dance Xtreme, as well as People Helping People, and Weekend Blessings programs to reach out with Beta Club, student council, Career and Professional Education Course and eSchool students to promote college and career awareness.

Part V: Budget

Total:

\$0.00