

Hernando County School District

# Endeavor Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Endeavor Academy

14063 KEN AUSTIN PKWY, Brooksville, FL 34613

www.edline.net/pages/hcsb\_star

### Demographics

Principal: Laura Burgess

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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](http://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

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Endeavor Academy

14063 KEN AUSTIN PKWY, Brooksville, FL 34613

[www.edline.net/pages/hcsb\\_star](http://www.edline.net/pages/hcsb_star)

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
Brown, Calvin	Dean	Completes intakes for all incoming students and their parents/guardians. Monitors attendance data and student behavior.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 8/31/2020, Laura Burgess

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

21

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	2	5	0	14	37	3	9	11	7	88	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	0	8	7	3	34	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	10	22	2	8	6	4	55	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	12	0	4	5	1	31	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	15	0	5	4	1	37	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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		

**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	0	11	15	0	5	5	1	38

**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	9	17	0	0	0	0	26	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	13	20	0	4	1	7	49	

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 8/31/2020

**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		
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	

**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

**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	
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

**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	1	148	149	0	148170
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	4	0	0	0	13

**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	
	(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
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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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%	1

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	2

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%	2

## 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.**

Science Grade 8 continues to be the lowest performing with 5%. This is due to our students being behind in their course work and normally don't take 8th science as they're given a more rigorous high school course and have not been taught the course work that's on the test.

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

It remains to be grade 8 science. Students are not taught the material that they are tested on. The reason students are not taught 8th grade science at Endeavor is most are over age and taking high school courses to complete middle school requirements and earn high school credit in an effort to catch up to their cohort.

**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 greatest gap continues to be 8th grade ELA. Students demonstrated 10% proficiency, which is a 46% gap from the state average in 2019.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 7th grade math at an improvement rate of 25% based on the cohort comparison of 17%. Students have improved with the use of the Edgenuity curriculum program that's been implemented here at Endeavor/Discovery Academy.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

The largest issue getting in the way of student success is attendance. Many of the students miss a large amount of school unexcused and excused.

**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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

<b>Area of Focus</b>	Increase Instructional Time by Increasing Student Attendance Rate
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	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
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Continue working with under-performing subgroups (Students with Disabilities, white students, and Economically Disadvantaged Students) will increase their proficiency by 1%, as measured by the 2021 Florida assessment and End of Course exams
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Steve Crognale (crognale_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Students' attendance will be reviewed weekly on an individual basis. Weekly attendance data will be reviewed by administration and the data will be shared bi-weekly at departmental meetings with teachers and staff. At these meetings, strategies to intervene in poor attendance trends will be developed and implemented, with a focus on encouraging students to come to school, thereby increasing each students instructional time and ultimately improving their academic success. These students who improve will have an opportunity to return to their zone school.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Students who are not in school attendance 90% of the semester, also on average fail to maintain academic progress. Both attendance and maintaining a 2.0 grade point average is required for students to be eligible to return to their zone school. Endeavor Academy is structured to improve the individual student's academic and behavioral deficiencies, so he/she is able to successfully return to their zone school to complete their education and reach graduation.

#### Action Steps to Implement

- 1) Review of attendance data weekly
- 2) Daily calls home, regular parent conferences
- 3) Bi-Weekly data chats with faculty and staff to discuss student progress and develop interventions
- 4) Daily point cards charting attendance, academics, and behavior
- 5) PBS rewards
- 6) Students transition back to zone school

**Person Responsible** Steve Crognale (crognale\_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**Hernando County Schools, in partnership with BayCare Health systems, will be out to work with students to improve mental health.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

To build positive school culture once every four weeks the school puts on a cookout for faculty, staff, and students. Also, students can earn spot on field trips by maintaining 90% attendance, 2.0 GPA, and having no disciplines.

### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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