

Okaloosa County School District

# Emerald Coast Career Institute N



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>  |

## Emerald Coast Career Institute N

500 ALABAMA ST, Crestview, FL 32536

[ no web address on file ]

### Demographics

**Principal: Nathaniel Chatman**

Start Date for this Principal: 5/29/2019

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>4-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Alternative Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 82%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students*                       |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: No Grade<br>2017-18: No Grade<br>2016-17: No Grade<br>2015-16: I (%) |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northwest   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Rachel Heide</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 Okaloosa 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>  |

## Emerald Coast Career Institute N

500 ALABAMA ST, Crestview, FL 32536

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School<br>4-12                       | Yes                    | %  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| Alternative Education                            | No                     | %  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2015-16 | 2011-12 | 2010-11 | 2010-11 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | I       |         |         | F       |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Okaloosa 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.

We are committed to improving academic achievement in an alternative setting that provides a unique variety on instructional style and strategies.

We are committed to providing every student with an opportunity to succeed academically, personally and socially through a partnership of and among students, teachers, administrators, parents and community members.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Fast Track North faculty and staff, in cooperation with families and the community, will ensure that each student will have the opportunity to reach his or her best personal potential in life. The school will provide the resources needed for each individual student's academic success.

### 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   |
|---------------|-----------|---|
| Anderson, Amy | Principal | Make personnel decisions, supervise student progress through accelerated-pace academic programs, determine student eligibility to participate in the program. |
|               |           |   |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 5/29/2019, Nathaniel Chatman

**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.*

0

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

4

#### Demographic Data

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>4-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Alternative Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 82%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students*                       |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: No Grade<br>2017-18: No Grade<br>2016-17: No Grade<br>2015-16: I (%) |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northwest   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Rachel Heide</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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 33 | 48 | 51 | 36 | 36 | 208 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 16 | 17 | 16 | 6  | 68  |       |
| 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  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 1   |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 6  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 8   |       |
|   | 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 |       |
| 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 | 3  | 11 | 16 | 5  | 3  | 38  |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 30 | 26 | 19 | 14 | 107 |       |

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

Friday 8/21/2020

#### 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 | 5 | 4 | 8  | 11 | 13 | 41 |       |
| 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 | 3 | 3  | 1  | 1     | 8  |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:



| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3  | 14 | 9  | 6  | 1  | 33    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 14 | 6  | 60    |

**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 | 5 | 4 | 8  | 11 | 13 | 41    |
| 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 | 3 | 3  | 1  | 1  | 8     |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3  | 14 | 9  | 6  | 1  | 33    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 14 | 6  | 60    |

**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%     | 69%      | 61%   | 0%     | 69%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 0%     | 63%      | 59%   | 0%     | 61%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 0%     | 59%      | 54%   | 0%     | 55%      | 51%   |
| Math Achievement            | 0%     | 80%      | 62%   | 0%     | 74%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 0%     | 73%      | 59%   | 0%     | 59%      | 56%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 0%     | 64%      | 52%   | 0%     | 50%      | 50%   |
| Science Achievement         | 0%     | 73%      | 56%   | 0%     | 65%      | 53%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 0%     | 84%      | 78%   | 0%     | 87%      | 75%   |

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|           | 4                                 | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  |       |
|           | (0)                               | (0) | (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 |
| 04                    | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                       | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                       | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                       | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                       | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 0%     | 66%      | -66%                       | 56%   | -56%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 0%     | 66%      | -66%                       | 58%   | -58%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 09                    | 2019 | 8%     | 61%      | -53%                       | 55%   | -47%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 0%     | 62%      | -62%                       | 53%   | -53%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 8%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 8%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 10                    | 2019 | 0%     | 61%      | -61%                       | 53%   | -53%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 15%    | 64%      | -49%                       | 53%   | -38%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -15%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 04                | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                       | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                       | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 0%     | 65%      | -65%                       | 46%   | -46%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 0%     | 65%      | -65%                       | 45%   | -45%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                       | 2018 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 0%     | 67%      | -67%                       | 48%   | -48%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 0%     | 66%      | -66%                       | 50%   | -50%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019        | 0%     | 71%      | -71%                  | 67%   | -67%               |
| 2018        | 7%     | 71%      | -64%                  | 65%   | -58%               |
| Compare     |        | -7%      |                       |       |                    |
| 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        | 0%     | 79%      | -79%                  | 70%   | -70%               |
| 2018        | 32%    | 79%      | -47%                  | 68%   | -36%               |
| Compare     |        | -32%     |                       |       |                    |

| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 0%     | 77%      | -77%                  | 61%   | -61%               |
| 2018         | 23%    | 78%      | -55%                  | 62%   | -39%               |
| Compare      |        | -23%     |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 0%     | 73%      | -73%                  | 57%   | -57%               |
| 2018         | 4%     | 64%      | -60%                  | 56%   | -52%               |
| Compare      |        | -4%      |                       |       |                    |

### 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 |
| WHT                                       | 17       | 60     |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 58                | 11                  |
| FRL                                       | 11       | 40     |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 52                | 15                  |
| 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 |
| WHT                                       | 17       | 60     |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 58                | 11                  |
| FRL                                       | 11       | 40     |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 52                | 15                  |
| 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 |
| WHT                                       | 17       | 60     |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 58                | 11                  |
| FRL                                       | 11       | 40     |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 52                | 15                  |

### 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  | 31   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | YES  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 2    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |      |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 122  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 4    |
| Percent Tested  | 84%  |

### Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     |     |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 0   |
| 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   | 37  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 30  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1   |

## 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.**

History EOC and Algebra EOC. Contributing factors: Main factor is the distance in time between taking the course and taking the EOC exam. Students can complete a course in 3 weeks at the beginning of the school year, but not take the EOC until March or April. There is not an opportunity built into credit recovery for spiraling back to reteach prior to the test.

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

History EOC. In addition to the pace and distance between subject taught and assessment, a possible factor is the number of students taking the test under these circumstance could have been greater than in previous years.

**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.**

History. Attendance, distance between taking the course and end of course assessment.

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

No data showed improvement. The least amount of loss was in Geometry EOC. No new actions.

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

Based on prior year's concerns, attendance and missing skills from previous grade levels were two areas of concern.

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

1. Attendance
2. Close learning gaps

3. Improve behavior
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Other specifically relating to Attendance

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Lack of consistent attendance, including timeliness, impacts student progression through courses and assessment scores. Leadership will continue MTSS processes begun last year, including inviting parents to attend MTSS meetings for their students to discuss the impact lack of attendance has on performance. Driver's licenses suspended, according to district and state guidelines.

**Measurable Outcome:** Ten students each missed more than 30 days throughout the school year. Focusing on the most frequently absent students, absences will decrease to no more than 5 per nine weeks in 7 out of 10 students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Amy Anderson (andersona1@okaloosaschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** MTSS is an evidence-based strategy that provides tiered supports for students in reaching a goal. This procedure will be used to work in concert with parents/guardians to focus on the importance of student attendance.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** MTSS is a state and district-adopted initiative for problem-solving initiatives among parents, students, and staff.

#### Action Steps to Implement

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** This area of focus is a critical component to assist students in bringing up their grades, proficiency and test scores. Several students arrive at Fast Track missing key foundational skills in both math and ELA. These gaps prevent students from accessing their education at the pace needed for credit recovery. Low test scores and repeated course attempts without success are the data that support this need.

**Measurable Outcome:** Using remediation software and techniques, Fast Track teachers will instruct students at their ability levels in areas in which they are exhibiting gaps that prevent them from accomplishing their goals to rejoin their cohort. Data will be collected through the programs used, and EOC results will be compared when available for cohort groups in Fast Track.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Amy Anderson (andersona1@okaloosaschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** School will purchase a subscription to Sum Dog for math support and Common Lit for ELA support. Teachers will teach a small class of specifically identified students an hour at the beginning and end of the day in their area of struggle. Progress will be measured through programs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Struggling students have consistently displayed a lack of fundamental skills in their area of struggle. Utilizing Sum Dog gives students the opportunity to practice fluency in math facts at home while applying their knowledge at school in a small group setting. Common Lit is research-based and provides at school and a home component as well.

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**A school-wide PBIS system is being implemented at the companion school, Richbourg. Although not eligible for participation through the state PBIS system, components of PBIS will be implemented at Fast Track in order to reward positive traits such as attendance, effort, and cooperation.**

**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.

In cooperation with the adjoining school's leadership, Fast Track teachers will begin implementing a PBIS-style system in order to encourage and reward positive character traits. Stakeholders are the students, parents/guardians, school teachers and leaders, and community members. The effort will be introduced to the SAC committee and further guidance received from this organization.

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

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