Endeavor School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Endeavor School

3010 OLD LAKE MARY RD, Lake Mary, FL 32746

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0311

Demographics

Principal: Paul Harshman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* 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	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Seminole 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.](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

Endeavor School

3010 OLD LAKE MARY RD, Lake Mary, FL 32746

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0311

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-12	No	%

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

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Seminole 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.

To ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be successful in the educational, career, and community mainstream.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Endeavor aligns with Seminole County Public Schools vision to be a premier school district in the State of Florida and to be recognized nationally for high standards, academic performance and offering students customized educational pathways 24/7/365.

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
Harshman, Paul	Principal	Principal - Endeavor - Upper (7-12) and Hopper - Lower (K-6) Houses
Russo, Grace	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal - Hopper - Lower House (K-6)
Curran, Carissa	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal - Endeavor - Upper House (7-12)
Merthie, Tamicka	Teacher, ESE	Curriculum/Department Chair Endeavor (7-12)
Mead, Marcy	Teacher, ESE	Curriculum/Department Chair - Hopper (K-6)
Whyte, Regina	School Counselor	Mental Health and Guidance Counseling, Individual Education Plans, Behavior Intervention Plans, Evaluations

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	5	7	9	7	5	3	36
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	1	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4	2	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	1	0	0	8

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	3	4	6	4	2	2	21
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)
14

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/26/2019

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	
One or more suspensions	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	
Level 1 on statewide 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	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%	77%	61%	0%	83%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	65%	59%	0%	70%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	62%	54%	0%	63%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	81%	62%	0%	75%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	69%	59%	0%	65%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	67%	52%	0%	62%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	76%	56%	0%	78%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	86%	78%	0%	86%	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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	7 (0)	9 (0)	7 (0)	5 (0)	3 (0)	36 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	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 (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)	2 (0)	5 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	6 (0)	8 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	23 (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	
03	2019						
	2018						
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019						
	2018						
Cohort Comparison		0%					
05	2019						
	2018						
Cohort Comparison		0%					
06	2019						

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	58%	-58%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	61%	-61%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	61%	-61%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	61%	-61%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	61%	-61%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	32%	-32%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	46%	-46%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	57%	-57%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	72%	-72%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	74%	-74%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	72%	-72%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	75%	-75%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	77%	-77%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	61%	-61%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	66%	-66%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	64%	-64%	57%	-57%
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	6	30			27						
FRL	7										
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
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

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	16
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	63
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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 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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	7
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.

Endeavor School and Hopper Center are co-located ESE centers who serve students with emotional/behavior disabilities many of whom are also economically disadvantaged. Endeavor School's Federal Percent of Points Index reflects deficiencies in achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students.

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

N/A - No prior year data available.

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.

N/A - No data available for comparison.

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

N/A - No prior year data available.

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

N/A - No prior year data available,

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

1. Student owned progress monitoring
2. Student Performance Academic
3. Student Performance Behavioral
4. Attendance Monitoring
5. Emergency Protocols

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students
Rationale	As an ESE center we serve only students with disabilities many of whom are economically disadvantaged.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase achievement and learning gains for the specified subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Paul Harshman (paul_harshman@scps.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Lessons aligned to Florida Standards at the appropriate level of complexity with ongoing feedback loop between leadership and teacher, students and teachers and student with students and PLC focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

Action Step	
Description	1. Student owned progress monitoring 2. Provide teachers with ongoing instructional feedback resulting from regular classroom observations. 3. Provide ongoing professional development for all staff that focuses on the Art and Science of Teaching, Project based and high engagement learning, and instructional best practices. 4. Provide ongoing professional development that focuses on best practices for behavioral intervention and classroom management. 5. Facilitate Professional Learning Communities that focus on trauma informed care, restorative practices, and the effectiveness of intervention plans. 6. Explore, develop, and implement new technology to enhance instruction,engage students in academics, gather information, and communicate knowledge.
Person Responsible	Paul Harshman (paul_harshman@scps.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).