Endeavor Academy

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Endeavor Academy

14063 KEN AUSTIN PKWY, Brooksville, FL 34613

www.edline.net/pages/hcsb_star

Demographics

Principal: Laura Burgess

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 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* 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	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hernando 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

Endeavor Academy

14063 KEN AUSTIN PKWY, Brooksville, FL 34613

www.edline.net/pages/hcsb_star

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)
High School 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

Grade

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.

To create a safe, caring and structured environment for at-risk students. Students are empowered to take responsibility for their social, behavioral and academic goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To develop a "new" beginning for at-risk students aimed at success. "Vita Nova"

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
Crognale, Steve	Principal	Monitor overall operation of the school.
Webster, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of ELA. Secretary of SAC. Endeavor department head - monitor student scheduling and academic progress for Endeavor.
Seroski, Keri	School Counselor	Monitors student academic progress towards promotion and graduation. Facilitates mental health counseling.
Brown, Calvin	Dean	Completes intakes for all incoming students and their parents/guardians. Monitors attendance data and student behavior.

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	4	4	16	52	18	14	12	13	133
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	2	9	31	11	10	10	9	82
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	11	6	11	4	0	43
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	28	10	9	4	3	65
Attendance below 80 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	28	9	7	9	5	67

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	1	2	14	45	16	13	10	11	112

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	3	8	9	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	9

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
21

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 7/24/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	36	14	9	3	6	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4	9	4	3	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	3	0	4	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	26	5	4	2	6	0	63

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	18	38	15	11	6	10	0	98

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	16	36	14	9	3	6	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4	9	4	3	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	3	0	4	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	26	5	4	2	6	0	63

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	18	38	15	11	6	10	0	98

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%	49%	56%	0%	42%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	45%	51%	0%	43%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	36%	42%	0%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	51%	51%	0%	49%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	45%	48%	0%	40%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	38%	45%	0%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	68%	68%	0%	67%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	71%	73%	0%	69%	70%

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	4 (0)	16 (0)	52 (0)	18 (0)	14 (0)	12 (0)	13 (0)	129 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (16)	0 (36)	0 (14)	0 (9)	0 (3)	0 (6)	0 (0)	0 (84)
One or more suspensions	2 (10)	9 (8)	31 (4)	11 (9)	10 (4)	10 (3)	9 (0)	82 (38)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 (4)	8 (3)	11 (7)	6 (3)	11 (0)	4 (4)	0 (0)	43 (21)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	2 (20)	8 (26)	28 (5)	10 (4)	9 (2)	4 (6)	3 (0)	64 (63)
Attendance below 80 percent	2 (0)	7 (0)	28 (0)	9 (0)	7 (0)	9 (0)	5 (0)	67 (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%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	9%	53%	-44%	52%	-43%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	10%	53%	-43%	56%	-46%
	2018	5%	54%	-49%	58%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
09	2019	23%	51%	-28%	55%	-32%
	2018	11%	50%	-39%	53%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
10	2019	18%	49%	-31%	53%	-35%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	53%	-53%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	25%	62%	-37%	54%	-29%
	2018	8%	63%	-55%	54%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				
08	2019	12%	50%	-38%	46%	-34%
	2018	2%	53%	-51%	45%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	5%	54%	-49%	48%	-43%
	2018	17%	56%	-39%	50%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019	53%	67%	-14%	67%	-14%	
2018	0%	58%	-58%	65%	-65%	
Compare		53%				
CIVICS EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019	36%	75%	-39%	71%	-35%	
2018	38%	74%	-36%	71%	-33%	
Compare		-2%				
HISTORY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019	43%	70%	-27%	70%	-27%	
2018	54%	68%	-14%	68%	-14%	
Compare		-11%				
ALGEBRA EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019	16%	59%	-43%	61%	-45%	
2018	19%	62%	-43%	62%	-43%	
Compare		-3%				
GEOMETRY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State	
2019	27%	55%	-28%	57%	-30%	
2018	0%	45%	-45%	56%	-56%	
Compare		27%				

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	7			20	20						
WHT	10	18		13	32						
FRL	8	10		8	40			18			
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	14
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	97
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	90%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	12
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	15
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	12
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.

Grade 8 Science showed the lowest performance, with only 5% proficiency. This is attributed to the students at our alternative school being enrolled in an Environmental Science course that is not aligned to the grade 8 FCAT Science assessment. Our students are placed at our center when they are overage for their cohort and in many cases have taken the course in years prior, and others are placed temporarily at our center.

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

The greatest decline was in grade 8 Science, with a 12% decrease from 2018-2019. This can be attributed to the students being enrolled in 2019 taking Environmental Science, because they are placed with us due to their overage status. They are taking their high school coursework, but we are required to test them on the enrolled grade level.

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 component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was grade 8 ELA. Endeavor/Discovery students demonstrated 10% proficiency, which is a 46% gap from the state average. This cohort is historically low performing due to transition and attendance, as evidenced by the EWS data; however, this cohort did make 10% gains over their grade 7 ELA assessment.

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

The data component that showed the greatest improvement was 7th grade math at an improved rate of 25% based on the cohort comparison of 17%. Student instruction is individualized due to the Edgenuity curriculum program utilized at Endeavor/Discovery. Students are able to work at their own pace and get individualized instruction and support from teachers.

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

The data component that showed the greatest area of concern is student attendance. The majority of students show daily attendance below 80%. Per requirements to exit the Endeavor program all students are required to maintain attendance of 90% or higher for the school year.

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

1. Attendance
2.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase Instructional Time by Increasing Attendance Rate
Rationale	According to ESSA data, there are three (3) low performing subgroups: Students with Disabilities: 12% proficiency White students: 15% proficiency Economically Disadvantaged students: 12% proficiency
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Each under-performing subgroup (Students with Disabilities, White students, and Economically Disadvantaged students) will increase their proficiency by 3%, as measured by the 2020 Florida assessments and End of Course examinations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Steve Crognale (crognale_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Attendance will be monitored weekly on an individual student basis. Weekly attendance data will be shared through departmental data chats. Strategies to intervene in poor attendance trends are developed and implemented, with a focus on encouraging students to come to school, thereby increasing their instructional time and ultimately, their achievement. Students for whom attendance and academic intervention strategies are successful are able to transition back to their zoned school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If students are not in school, they cannot make the academic gains, nor reach the required 90% attendance rate, both of which are required for eligibility to transition back to their zoned schools. The program at Endeavor is designed to bring academically and/or behaviorally deficient students back on track with their cohort.

Action Step

Description	1. daily calls home; regular parent conferences 2. weekly data chat meetings with staff for strategic intervention development 3. daily point cards (academics, attendance, and behavior) 4. PBS rewards 5. students transition back to zoned school
Person Responsible	Steve Crognale (crognale_s@hcsb.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).

Sea Horse mental health class is provided for targeted students who show need for assistance. Hernando County Schools, in a partnership with BayCare Health systems, has implemented Sea Horse

which is a grant funded mental health program that is designed to teach coping and life skills to students to help improve mental health.

Other counselors, such as the school Social Worker, school Psychologist, Drug Counselors and Behavior Specialists visit the school on a regular basis. Community partners such as the Hernando County Health Dept., as well as the Dept. of Juvenile Justice provide small group sessions for anger management, building healthy relationships, and information on life skills and health and wellness. After school tutoring will be available for students to receive additional individualized help with their coursework so that they remain on track academically.