Atlantic Coast High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Atlantic Coast High School

9735 R G SKINNER PKWY, Jacksonville, FL 32256

www.duvalschools.org/achs

Demographics

Principal: Michael George

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
2019-20 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 (65%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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 is pending approval by the Duval 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

Atlantic Coast High School

9735 R G SKINNER PKWY, Jacksonville, FL 32256

www.duvalschools.org/achs

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 9-12	No	36%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

Our Mission is to provide educational excellence in every school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision is to ensure every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career and life.

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
Spaulding, Zeina	Principal	n/a
Smith, Michael	Assistant Principal	
Humphreys, Julie	Assistant Principal	
George, Marie	Assistant Principal	
McMahon, Emily	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/30/2020, Michael George

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
127

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
2019-20 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 (65%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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.	

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	0	0	651	645	537	473	2306
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	141	73	44	402
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136	140	103	89	468
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	81	43	35	178
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	128	0	0	278
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	21	0	0	118

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	151	119	46	38	354

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	0	0	47	116	90	253
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	17	30

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/17/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	631	653	593	477	2354
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	94	68	123	381
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	235	235	186	146	802
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	88	88	46	47	269

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	0	47	116	90	0	253
Students retained two or more times	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	52%	47%	56%	48%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	48%	51%	43%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	42%	42%	33%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	56%	51%	51%	54%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	69%	52%	48%	42%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	47%	45%	37%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	74%	65%	68%	70%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	75%	70%	73%	71%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**				**Total**
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(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**
09	2019	50%	48%	2%	55%	-5%
	2018	48%	48%	0%	53%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	49%	48%	1%	53%	-4%
	2018	48%	49%	-1%	53%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

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

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	70%	67%	3%	67%	3%
2018	67%	63%	4%	65%	2%
Compare		3%			

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	72%	68%	4%	70%	2%
2018	71%	64%	7%	68%	3%
Compare		1%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	57%	-10%	61%	-14%
2018	37%	61%	-24%	62%	-25%
Compare		10%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	61%	-3%	57%	1%
2018	58%	57%	1%	56%	2%
Compare		0%			

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	35	45	44	44	55	40	57	34		85	48
ELL	22	46	45	47	73	71	50	58		81	86
ASN	81	66		71	70		84	83		98	96
BLK	36	46	38	41	56	37	62	64		95	77
HSP	41	41	41	55	73	58	69	73		95	82
MUL	56	49	31	64	80		86	81		94	94
WHT	64	62	64	68	74	66	81	81		90	81
FRL	39	46	45	46	67	56	62	70		91	74
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
SWD	28	38	24	44	56	46	35	58		81	39
ELL	25	43	38	36	58		42	43		81	86
ASN	74	58	36	71	72		88	81		97	81
BLK	33	37	21	40	48	37	43	63		86	69
HSP	49	53	41	49	61	73	69	64		88	80
MUL	51	40	17	47	44		80	78		88	76
WHT	64	57	35	64	74	69	83	80		94	78
FRL	42	42	25	46	54	54	60	62		86	67

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
SWD	19	26	15	30	31	17	35	61		58	30
ELL	11	26	26	24	48	50	27			71	47
ASN	71	59	70	61	40		85	76		84	76
BLK	31	35	28	42	40	36	56	61		92	29
HSP	43	44	34	51	39	38	65	71		83	55
MUL	39	36	29	43	33		79	71		100	36
WHT	57	45	33	61	45	42	76	76		89	55
FRL	32	36	29	43	39	34	59	65		82	35

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	63
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	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	695
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	71
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 ELA Lowest 25 Percentile showed the lowest performance. The contributing factor to last year's performance was students needed more instructional time mastering the standards in their English classroom.

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

Math Lowest 25 Percentile showed the least amount of growth from the prior year. Unfortunately, we have have math teacher turnover in the building. The Math PLC is at the beginning stages of learning the standards and the task demands. As a result, there was not much time cultivating lessons for differentiated instruction on a consistent basis.

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 compared to the state average was the ELA Learning Gains and US History EOC Proficiency. In both subjects, we were above the state average, but the difference between the two years was less than 2% points. The factor that contributed the most is that we did not offer consistent differentiated instruction in the classroom.

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 Math Learning Gains. During PLCs, the team focused on unwrapping standards and ensuring tasks were aligned to the standard.

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

As of 7/30/20, the data has not populated in EWS Part 1(D). Once data has been updated, potential areas of concern will be identified.

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

1. Math L25 (54%)
2. ELA L25 (45%)
3. ELA Proficiency (52%)
4. Math Proficiency (56%)
5. Biology EOC (74%)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The slight majority of the classrooms at Atlantic Coast High School show standards aligned instruction, tasks, or assessments. When students and teachers were asked about the rigor experienced in the classroom in the 5 Essentials Survey, most replied the rigor was adequate, indicating most of our students are experiencing the negative impact of the Opportunity Myth.
Measurable Outcome:	The vast majority of our current core content teachers will engage in successful standards-based instruction planning procedures using the Standards Walk-Through form.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zeina Spaulding (khanachetz@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Facilitate and monitor PLC and common planning sessions that result in instructional delivery that ensures students are exposed to standards aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order for students to be adequately prepared for state assessments, students must be consistently provided instruction, tasks, and assessments that are standards aligned. More specifically, students must have the opportunity to practice the task demands that will be given on the state assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate PLCs that promote conversations around the standard based instruction.

Person Responsible	Michael Smith (smithm6@duvalschools.org)

The PLC will unwrap the targeted standards that are being taught within the unit. When teachers are unwrapping the standards, they will identify the verbs and nouns of the standard. Also, they will use the Learning Arc Document throughout this process.

Person Responsible	Michael Smith (smithm6@duvalschools.org)

Administrators and teachers will engage in common planning to ensure that tasks and assessments are aligned to the appropriate component of the Learning Arc and that students have an equivalent FSA experience.

Person Responsible	Julie Humphreys (humphreysj@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will meet regularly on Thursdays to discuss their instructional review walks for the week. During these meetings, the admin team will focus on classrooms that did not have instruction or tasks that were aligned to the standard. The team will create weekly actionable steps based on needs in the building.

Person Responsible	Julie Humphreys (humphreysj@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Insufficient data was found in the climate survey domain that involves community involvement.
Measurable Outcome:	To ensure at least five point increase with parent involvement will show gains in the 2020-2021 the school climate 5 Essential Survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Humphreys (humphreysj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement a parent involvement activities throughout the school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order for parents to support their student with their high school academics, mental health, and post secondary, the school needs to provide parent involvement activities such as parent night presentations.

Action Steps to Implement

Admin will collaborate with the school counselors to brainstorm parent involvement topics for each quarter. We will advertise the parent involvement nights through all forms of social media.

Person Responsible	Julie Humphreys (humphreysj@duvalschools.org)

Admin and school counselors will facilitate parent involvement night for each quarter. Admin will record the presentation to be posted on the school website.

Person Responsible	Julie Humphreys (humphreysj@duvalschools.org)

Increase communication on a weekly, monthly, and quarterly basis with parents. Admin will create a quarterly newsletter, send out weekly robo calls, and create a Youtube video to communicate with the families upcoming school events.

Person Responsible	Zeina Spaulding (khanachetz@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will address the remaining school wide priorities through facilitating PLCs, Common Plannings. Also, the leadership team will meet on a weekly basis to analyze standard walk throughs to determine areas of growth within these priorities.

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.

The Positive Behavior Interventions and Support model will continue to be implemented at Atlantic Coast High School for the 2020-2021 school year. It is a planned approach for school behavior that emphasis: prevention of problem behaviors through proactive instruction of desired behavior; regular reinforcement of appropriate behavior; monitoring and correction of problem behavior; application of more intensive and individualized behavior support for students who do not respond to prevention effort.
Furthermore, the leadership team will build positive school culture by rewarding students for the academic and social behavior. For example, students who earn A/B Honor will receive an incentive each quarter such as an ice cream party as well as public recognition through our school newsletter. For students that do not receive a behavior referral, will be allowed to participate in school wide social events. Stakeholders such as the PTSA and SAC will be involved with planning the PBIS events as well as requesting donations from business partners.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.