Freedom Crossing Academy

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Freedom Crossing Academy

1365 SHETLAND DR, St Johns, FL 32259

http://www-fca.stjohns.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Gina Fonseca

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	13%
2018-19 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	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
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 was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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

Freedom Crossing Academy

1365 SHETLAND DR, St Johns, FL 32259

http://www-fca.stjohns.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	0%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19
Grade	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

Falcons Take FLIGHT

Focus
Leadership
Imagination
Grit
Heart
Team

At FCA, our expectation is for all students to be focused on their learning, become leaders in our school, use their imagination and creativity in the classroom, demonstrate grit when tasks become challenging, have heart and demonstrate outstanding character, and work together as a team in our school and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Breaking Barriers

It is our goal for our students, staff and school to 'break the barriers' that are holding us from the next step in our dreams and achievements. These could include such things as the fear to fail, misconceptions, a fixed mindset, self-esteem, etc.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Anderson, Allen	Principal	
Lime, Melissa	Assistant Principal	
Rugen, Amy	Assistant Principal	
Parrett, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Gregg, Neeti	Teacher, K-12	
Jenkins, Tyler	Teacher, K-12	
Marrinan, Suzanne	Teacher, K-12	
Zweigle, Allison	Teacher, K-12	
Kastor, Ginger	Teacher, K-12	
Lyons, Tracey	Teacher, K-12	

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	174	169	193	187	181	181	171	203	0	0	0	0	0	1459
Attendance below 90 percent	3	4	4	6	2	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	2	2	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	1	6	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	2	1	2	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
95

Date this data was collected or last updated
Sunday 9/15/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	33	35	38	40	28	49	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	263
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	9	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	1	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	33	35	38	40	28	49	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	263
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	9	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	1	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	77%	84%	61%	0%	84%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	67%	59%	0%	68%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	61%	54%	0%	70%	51%
Math Achievement	84%	88%	62%	0%	88%	58%
Math Learning Gains	66%	71%	59%	0%	73%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	66%	52%	0%	70%	50%
Science Achievement	73%	77%	56%	0%	79%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	95%	78%	0%	95%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	174 (0)	169 (0)	193 (0)	187 (0)	181 (0)	181 (0)	171 (0)	203 (0)	0 (0)	1459 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	3 (33)	4 (35)	4 (38)	6 (40)	2 (28)	6 (49)	2 (40)	0 (0)	0 (0)	27 (263)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	3 (1)	0 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	9 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	19 (1)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (3)	1 (9)	6 (9)	6 (12)	9 (0)	0 (0)	23 (33)

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	81%	78%	3%	58%	23%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	77%	3%	58%	22%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		80%				
05	2019	80%	76%	4%	56%	24%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		80%				
06	2019	70%	74%	-4%	54%	16%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		70%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	90%	82%	8%	62%	28%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	88%	82%	6%	64%	24%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		88%				
05	2019	81%	80%	1%	60%	21%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		81%				
06	2019	74%	74%	0%	55%	19%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		74%				
07	2019	0%	80%	-80%	54%	-54%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	73%	73%	0%	53%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
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					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	37	46	34	53	50	44	38				
ASN	91	73		98	91		60				
BLK	66	61	27	60	50	55					

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
HSP	67	61	33	75	68	42	75				
MUL	58	54		74	54						
WHT	79	60	53	86	65	60	77				
FRL	54	39	25	56	52	43	40				

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
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
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
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	463
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 Lowest 25% of our population was below both state and district average and was the schools lowest performing group as measured by growth. This population is largely comprised of ESE students. The additional support needed by this group was a struggle for our school last year. We started with two teachers, with one leaving our school shortly after the year started. The position was filled shortly before the holiday break at which time due to a growing population, we grew to 2.6 teachers in this area. All this change also resulted in several schedule changes for these students.

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

N/A - The school opened in 2019

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 Lowest 25% of our population was below both state and district average and was the schools lowest performing group as measured by growth. This population is largely comprised of ESE students. The additional support needed by this group was a struggle for our school last year. We started with two teachers, with one leaving our school shortly after the year started. The position was filled shortly before the holiday break at which time due to a growing population, we grew to 2.6 teachers in this area. All this change also resulted in several schedule changes for these students.

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

N/A - The school opened in 2019

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Our first area of concern is meeting the needs of our ESE population which also includes the lowest 25%.
Our second area of concern is that we fell below the district average in all areas. We feel all students should be at the minimum level of proficiency. Therefore, not having all areas at 100% is a concern.

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

1. Meeting the needs of our lowest 25% (This includes the needs of our ESE population)
2. Maintaining and improving upon the school culture of collaboration through the PLC Process to improve students achievement in both ELA and Math
3. Maintaining and improving upon the school culture of collaboration through the Capturing Kids Hearts Process to improve students achievement in both ELA and Math
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	ELA
Rationale	Based on our students scores from the 2018-2019 school year only 77% of our students meet proficiency. Also, only 46% of our bottom Quartile students in ELA made learning Gains. We believe that our students can and will achieve more this school year. Our Goal is for 100% of our students to meet proficiency!
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Each Grade level will collaboratively establish expectations and curricula for high quality ELA instruction. this is for all students to meet growth expectations with additional focus on those students in the lowest quartile.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jennifer Parrett (jennifer.parrett@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Each Grade Level will participate in the process of Professional Learning Communities (PLC's).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This strategy is a district based initiative. Evidence of it's effectiveness can be found at https://www.allthingsplc.info/evidence-of-effectiveness

Action Step

Description	1. Provide time for grade level teams and Middle School subject area teachers time to collaborate on a weekly basis. 2. Monitor and assist teams as they grow in the PLC process 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Amy Rugen (amy.rugen@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math
Rationale	Based on our students scores from the 2018-2019 school year only 84% of our students meet proficiency. Also, only 56% of our bottom Quartile students in ELA made learning Gains. We believe that our students can and will achieve more this school year. Our Goal is for 100% of our students to meet proficiency!

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Each Grade level will collaboratively establish expectations and curricula for high quality ELA instruction. this is for all students to meet growth expectations with additional focus on those students in the lowest quartile.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jennifer Parrett (jennifer.parrett@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Each Grade Level will participate in the process of Professional Learning Communities (PLC's).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This strategy is a district based initiative. Evidence of it's effectiveness can be found at https://www.allthingsplc.info/evidence-of-effectiveness
Action Step	
Description	1. Provide time for grade level teams and Middle School subject area teachers time to collaborate on a weekly basis. 2. Monitor and assist teams as they grow in the PLC process 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Amy Rugen (amy.rugen@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Focus on the Lowest 25%
Rationale	The proficiency levels and the learning gains of our lowest 25% in both Math and ELA are areas of concern for our school. In looking at student groups our lowest performing cohort is the 7th grade students. As the 'middle school' grades are the last opportunity Freedom Crossing Academy has to prepare these student for their future.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We believe all students can learn. We expect to see our lowest 25% student to show the same gains as the rest of the student population. We also expect to cut the number of level 1 and 2 students to be reduced by half school wide.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jennifer Parrett (jennifer.parrett@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Research for the strategy can be found at the following websites: http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/PB08_ClassSize08.pdf https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ852046.pdf
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We feel be adding additional resources (teachers) to help the needs of our lowest 25%, especially ESE students, these students can be helped to achieve a higher level of success. We will use the school and individual student scores on the FSA to measure the effectiveness of this strategy.
Action Step	
Description	1. Hire an additional teacher in the Middle School grades to create small class sizes, focusing on those containing the lowst 25% 2. Fully fund 4 ESE Teachers. This is beyond what the student population funds. This will create smaller case loads for the ESE teachers. 3. Implement a Learning Strategies Course for the Middle School ESE students for additional instructional support. 4. Level 1 and 2 students that are close to moving to the next level will be identified as each member of the MTSS Team will personally monitor and build a relationship with that student. 5.
Person Responsible	Allen Anderson (allen.anderson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

1. During the PLC Meetings, teams will address how they are specifically helping ESE Students and other students in the lowest 25%.
2. We believe that School culture is a vital part of student success. We will continue to focus on the following two processes to enhance a positive school culture:
A. Build positive relationships through the Capturing Kids Hearts CKH process.
B. Continue to focus on positive behaviors and to promote those behaviors, we will continue to use the Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS).
3. We will continue to send staff to training in PLC, CKH and PBIS processes.

4. As a new school we continue to focus on system, process and building improvements to improve school safety.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Focus on the Lowest 25%	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**