

Clay County Schools

R. C. Bannerman Learning Center



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

R. C. Bannerman Learning Center

608 MILL ST, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://blc.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Stephanie Palmer

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK, 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 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	CS&I
* 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 Clay 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

R. C. Bannerman Learning Center

608 MILL ST, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://blc.oneclay.net>

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 PK, 6-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2012-13
Grade	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

Bannerman Learning Center's mission is to create a positive, safe and supportive environment that promotes excellence in teaching and learning. The unique potential of each individual is recognized and encouraged in a challenging and diverse setting. Through the growth and advancement of students and staff, knowledge and skills are gained to meet life's challenges and develop active, responsible citizens for our democratic society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bannerman Learning Center exists to prepare all students to be successful in a positive manner in a competitive workplace and community. Students will thrive in a safe and welcoming environment, foster mutual respect between students and staff while focusing on returning to their home school or preparing to enlist in the military, enroll in college or become gainfully employed.

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
McKinney, Mark	Principal	Responsible for implementing and facilitating PBIS programs while providing professional development for staff that fosters growth in PBIS, SEL programs, and raising the academic expectations of students, faculty and staff.
Cox, Brian	Assistant Principal	Assist principal in all aspects of instruction and operation of school functions.
Flagg, Pamela	Teacher, ESE	As ESE Support Facilitator, Ms. Flagg will support both specialized instruction and the implementation of differentiated instruction for all students regardless of their ESE status. She will also serve in a leadership role in support of the principal and assistant principal related to school improvement planning and delivery, as well as oversee school-wide initiatives such as SEL programming.
McKenzie, Erin	Teacher, ESE	As Behavior Management Teacher, Ms. McKenzie will assist school-wide initiatives related to student engagement, discipline, and classroom behavior management.

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	15	21	27	30	47	83	223
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	8	16	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	18	35	43	119

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

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	3	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2

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

25

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/21/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide 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

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	0%	57%	61%	0%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	53%	59%	0%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	53%	54%	0%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	52%	62%	0%	47%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	49%	59%	0%	48%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	46%	52%	0%	42%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	54%	56%	0%	48%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	77%	78%	0%	79%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	15 (0)	21 (0)	27 (0)	30 (0)	47 (0)	83 (0)	223 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	1 ()	2 ()	4 ()	7 ()	8 ()	16 ()	38 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	2 (0)	9 (0)	12 (0)	18 (0)	35 (0)	43 (0)	119 (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.

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
06	2019	0%	64%	-64%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	5%	59%	-54%	52%	-47%
	2018	6%	54%	-48%	51%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	22%	62%	-40%	56%	-34%
	2018	20%	67%	-47%	58%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
09	2019	19%	61%	-42%	55%	-36%
	2018	10%	56%	-46%	53%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
10	2019	2%	57%	-55%	53%	-51%
	2018	13%	58%	-45%	53%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	10%	70%	-60%	55%	-45%
	2018	0%	68%	-68%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	14%	63%	-49%	54%	-40%
	2018	5%	58%	-53%	54%	-49%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	10%	49%	-39%	46%	-36%
	2018	6%	52%	-46%	45%	-39%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	10%	64%	-54%	48%	-38%
	2018	17%	67%	-50%	50%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	4%	72%	-68%	67%	-63%
2018	0%	90%	-90%	65%	-65%
Compare		4%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	14%	80%	-66%	71%	-57%
2018	13%	78%	-65%	71%	-58%
Compare		1%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	29%	80%	-51%	70%	-41%
2018	13%	78%	-65%	68%	-55%
Compare		16%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	4%	65%	-61%	61%	-57%
2018	5%	66%	-61%	62%	-57%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	7%	64%	-57%	57%	-50%
2018	17%	61%	-44%	56%	-39%
Compare		-10%			

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	21
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	169
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	80%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	23
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	23
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	20
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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 areas of lowest performance are in ELA (5th and 10th), biology, algebra, and geometry. The unique nature of our student population means that they already come at-risk for failure and disengagement. These areas are somewhat specialized that we will need to do more to communicate with last attended school to better assist with transition.

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

The two areas of greatest decline and concern are 10th grade ELA and geometry. These high school classes had the most disruption over the course of the year regarding student engagement that we will focus more on management techniques and student ownership of the work.

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.

All of our state assessment data falls well below state levels, again because of the unique nature of our student population. Students spend anywhere from 45 to 90 days - with some even longer - making the window for impact somewhat elusive at times though not impossible to affect.

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

The 8th and 9th grade ELA cohorts and the US History cohort saw impressive gains for our school last year. New teachers and greater support for these two areas resulted in movement that is in the right direction.

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

We are a school of students that fall almost exclusively in the multiple warning categories due to the nature of our mission.

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

1. Improving school-wide climate and culture.
2. Support classroom teachers with instructional techniques specific to our unique mission.
3. Implement SEL and PBIS strategies that are deliberate and carefully calibrated, while also strategically inserted into the content specific curriculum maps.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Instructional Planning, Delivery, and Differentiation
Rationale	If we support teachers in the development of instructional strategies specific to the at-risk nature of our student body, and provide for them the tools and ideas to increase student engagement, we will see better student outcomes on state assessments, and improved teacher efficacy.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	50% of students in all grade levels and sub-categories will demonstrate learning gains on the FSA ELA. 25% of students will demonstrate proficiency on the Geometry EOC. 50% of teachers will participate regularly in PLC planning and development of differentiated instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mark McKinney (mark.mckinney@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students will use text annotation to make meaning and provide evidence to support answers. Teachers will utilize read-discuss-read protocol in both ELA and Intensive Reading classes. Content level teachers will encourage pre-writing and pre-reading strategies and utilize Cornell note-taking. Students will be encouraged to immerse themselves in content-rich grade level texts. 11th and 12 grade students are presented opportunities to meet concordant scores through extensive ACT, SAT, PERT and PSAT preparation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	All strategies are evidence-based and provide opportunities for high levels of student engagement. Teachers will have the opportunity to provide TIER 2 and Tier 3 interventions with support from literacy team, administration and Support Facilitator.
Action Step	
Description	1. Creation of Literacy Action Team 2. Schoolwide reading initiative using Achieve and IReady 3. Evaluation of strategies in professional learning communities 4. Common planning to monitor standards 5. Coaching provided by district specialists.
Person Responsible	Mark McKinney (mark.mckinney@myoneclay.net)

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.

25 minutes of daily social emotional learning using the Blson Mindset Moment through the 7 mindsets curriculum.

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

Students meet with Dean of Climate and Culture or Behavior Site Coach for intake meeting. Supports are provided upon return to home school through re-entry meeting

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.

The leadership team meets on a weekly basis to address fidelity of programs. School Advisory Council meets on a quarterly basis to review resources, and to be provided input by community partners.

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

Business and faith based partnerships take place through the Northeast Florida Builders Association, Military Recruiters, Clay County Sheriffs Department and other entities.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Planning, Delivery, and Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: School Climate and Culture	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00