Marine Science Education Center

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Marine Science Education Center

1347 PALMER ST, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

http://www.duvalschools.org/msec

Demographics

Principal: James Ledford

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2020

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)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	31%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: F (0%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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.](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

Marine Science Education Center

1347 PALMER ST, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

http://www.duvalschools.org/msec

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	%

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	2015-16
Grade	F

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.

To provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every Student is inspired and prepared for success in high school, 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
Ledford, James Dean	Principal	Instructional Leader, Oversee all activities held on campus
Shoemaker, Nathan	Assistant Principal	Lesson Plans, Facilities, Scheduling, Graduation Rate

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/15/2020, James Ledford

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.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
3

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)	Alternative Education

2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	31%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: F (0%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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	0	0	7		7
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/30/2020

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	35	35
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
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	0	0	0	35	35
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
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	4	4

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	

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%	47%	56%	0%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	48%	51%	0%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	42%	0%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	51%	51%	0%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	52%	48%	0%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	47%	45%	0%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	65%	68%	0%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	70%	73%	0%	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					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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					
2018					
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					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
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
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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	

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 Marine Science Center does not take all of the state assessments.

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

The Marine Science Center does not take all of the state assessments.

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 Marine Science Center does not take all of the state assessments.

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

The Marine Science Center does not take all of the state assessments.

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

The Marine Science Center does not take all of the state assessments.

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

1. Increase overall graduation rate
2.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Vast Majority of Marine Science Center core content classes were below average when observing Assessing Student Learning. Students were not given a chance to determine mastery of standards. Most of the lesson were not aligned to the learning arc and many task were not aligned to FSA standards. This indicates most of our students are not given a chance to perform at grade level.
Measurable Outcome:	The Vast Majority of the Marine Science Center's core content classes will be above average around Assessment of Student Learning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nathan Shoemaker (shoemakern@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 assessment
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	MSC should ensure students are getting the opportunity to show mastery of the standard Students task should be on the appropriate level of the learning arc and task should be aligned to the standard. This will provide students with success when faced with the assessments designed by the state, along with the following year's progression of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Train lead teacher on the standard walkthrough form - specifically in the assessing student learning category.

Person Responsible	James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)

Train teachers to use common planning procedures that enable teachers to build lessons and create tasks that are aligned to the standards.

Person Responsible	Nathan Shoemaker (shoemakern@duvalschools.org)

Provide training for teachers during PLCs that allow them to obtain information needed to produce a product during common planning.

Person Responsible	Nathan Shoemaker (shoemakern@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will collaborate and work with each other during common planning lead by the following individual;

John King

Person Responsible	Nathan Shoemaker (shoemakern@duvalschools.org)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our next area of focus is around building teacher influence and taking a collective responsibility among staff members. We believe this will improve through leadership development. Every student will benefit across all curriculum as the faculty influences each other in a positive manner to improve their overall instructional deliveries. Building leadership among the faculty will allow them to take more of a collective responsibility of the overall environment and academic needs of the school.
Measurable Outcome:	We would like to show an increase in the following areas Building Teacher Influence Collective Responsibility
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nathan Shoemaker (shoemakern@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using department heads more around decision making that affects specific departments. Ensuring Professional Learning Communities are being utilized in all areas. Identifying teachers that can lead Professional Development sessions during common planning times
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using lead teachers to lead will help provide examples of teachers working with administration to improve specific areas of their departments. D Ensuring professional learning communities are being utilized in all areas will give all subject areas the tools to assist each other and grow as educators. During common planning is when teachers have the most influence on each other. Identifying teachers that can lead professional development will bring more collective responsibility as teachers will buy-in more learning from colleagues.

Action Steps to Implement

Set up schedule for department meetings throughout the year. Create agendas and submit them to the administration prior to the meeting

Person Responsible	Nathan Shoemaker (shoemakern@duvalschools.org)

Ensure all teachers have common planning among specific courses. Set up norms for each professional learning community that will enable them to create a positive and productive common planning meetings

Person Responsible	Nathan Shoemaker (shoemakern@duvalschools.org)

Monitor lesson deliveries through all subject areas and speak with teachers regarding presenting best practices.

Person Responsible	Nathan Shoemaker (shoemakern@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Continue working with students on post-graduate plans.

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.

1. When the students first visit the school the administrator has a conference with the student and the parents to describe the purpose of the PBD program. At this time the student's academic strength and weakness are discussed. We also evaluate why the student was not successful in a traditional school.
2. The administrator passes on the conference information to the teacher so they can start to have ideas of how to build a relationship with the student.
3. We do numerous activities to learn about the students' cultures. We celebrate student's birthdays, have classroom discussions about social backgrounds. We also do team building activities that involve the students and the staff.
4. Once a month we have a student faculty lunch for the school that is prepared by the students and faculty.
5. At the end of the first nine weeks we have a dinner for all students and their parents.
6. We celebrate all holidays by having a student faculty lunch.
7. The perceptions of teachers, students, and parents regarding school culture and environment are assessed using the Gallup and TNTP survey instruments. This feedback provides direction for strengthening specific areas of the school culture and environment.
The school is open 1.5 hours before school starts and all students are welcome to be at school early. The school is also is open for students to stay after school. The students can bring in food and eat there breakfast here at the school. We also have a relationship with organizations that donate food to the school for the students. The administrator has an open door policy, and teachers and staff who are dedicated to the students. The school also has a partnership with the Beaches Resource Center which provides free counseling for students in need. According to our Gallup poll, the students seem to feel safe at school.
The students have a set schedule of class times and break times, this helps to minimize the number distractions throughout the day. The academic teacher and the vocational teacher communicate daily, to set up a daily schedule to minimize daily distractions.
We also have a very precise set of rules and consequences that are covered by the staff at the beginning of the year. At the end of each day the staff discusses any problems that have occurred throughout the day and makes any changes in daily activities that will minimize distractions.

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**