

Okaloosa County School District

Emerald Coast Career Institute N



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 4-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: I (%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

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

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

Emerald Coast Career Institute N

500 ALABAMA ST, Crestview, FL 32536

[no web address on file]

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)
Combination School 4-12	Yes	%
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	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

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 4-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: I (%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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
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	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.