Amikids Clay County

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Amikids Clay County

501 LEMON ST, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Maria Przybylski

Start Date for this Principal: 6/16/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
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)	64%
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: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
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 Clay 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

Amikids Clay County

501 LEMON ST, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

[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)
High School 6-12	No	%

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

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

AMIkids Clay County's mission is to protect public safety and positively impact as many youth as possible through the efforts of a diverse and innovative staff. AMIkids works in partnership with youth agencies, local communities, and families.

Provide the school's vision statement.

AMIkids Clay County's vision - Separating a troubled past from a bright future.

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
Przybylski, Maria	Other	Executive Director - Responsible for hiring all support staff as specified within the budget of the school. Responsible for implementing the AMIkids behavior modification and treatment plan.
Thurlow, Sarah	Other	Director of Education

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/16/2020, Maria Przybylski

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
3

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
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)	64%
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: No Grade

2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	2	6	8	10	9	1	0	36
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	1	0	2	6	9	1	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	5	1	0	17

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	1	0	2	3	5	1	0	12

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	10	0	0	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/27/2020

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	1	4	7	11	9	2	0	34
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	1	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	6	1	0	23

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	1	1	0	1	0	0	3

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	4	7	11	9	2	0	34
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	1	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	6	1	0	23

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	1	1	0	1	0	0	3

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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%	60%	56%	0%	54%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	52%	51%	0%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	39%	42%	0%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	55%	51%	0%	60%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	46%	48%	0%	51%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	38%	45%	0%	37%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	73%	68%	0%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	81%	73%	0%	78%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort 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
WHT		23			9						
FRL	16	29		6	17		6	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	13
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	78
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	94%

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	6
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	15
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.

White students and students that are economically disadvantaged are showing the lowest performance. Majority of our population served falls into one if not both of the lowest performing data

component. Contributing factors include lack of resources, low performance on state assessments and reading below grade level.

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

White students and students that are economically disadvantaged are showing decline from previous year. Factors contributing to this decline include a different group of students each year being assessed, low performance scores, and performance below grade level.

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.

We do not have any data to compare to state data. We use WIN testing to assess students when they enter the program and again upon exit. This gives us a baseline assessment for Reading and Math. We also use STAR testing upon arrival and monthly while in the program.

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

We do not have any data to compare to state data. We use WIN testing to assess students when they enter the program and again upon exit. This gives us a baseline assessment for Reading and Math. We also use STAR testing upon arrival and monthly while in the program. Our students are trending up in both Reading and Math but the population changes throughout the school year.

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

Students failing more than one state assessment is our area of biggest concern. Students are arriving to our program already experiencing academic and behavioral struggles.

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

1. Reading gains
2. Math gains
3. Behavioral goals
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to White	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	White students are showing growth below average. It impacts student learning, as majority of the students we serve are in this ESSA sub-group. It is a critical need because by focusing more on the growth of this sub-group, we will improve the academic/behavioral goals of the program.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to see white students grow by one grade level in Reading and Math, using the STAR assessment as our indicator, by the 12 month mark in the program.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Thurlow (sarah.thurlow@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use differentiated instruction and center rotation focused on each student's weakest area in both Reading and Math
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Florida's MTSS (multi-tiered system of supports) provides specific details relating to the resources available and necessary criterion for supporting students in different tiers.

Action Steps to Implement

Collect STAR/WIN data and develop areas needing improvement

Person Responsible	Sarah Thurlow (sarah.thurlow@myoneclay.net)

Work with teachers to develop lesson plans and differentiated instruction to improve specific learning goals for students

Person Responsible	Sarah Thurlow (sarah.thurlow@myoneclay.net)

Follow up with monthly data collection to determine effectiveness of interventions

Person Responsible	Sarah Thurlow (sarah.thurlow@myoneclay.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Work with students on increasing positive decision making and getting away from decisions that led them to the program. IE, truancy, defiance, incomplete work
Measurable Outcome:	Collect attendance data to determine truancy outcomes, track disciplinary concerns and grades
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maria Przybylski (mprzybylski@amikids.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using point cards per class period to track behavioral goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Prevention programs under the Department of Juvenile Justice show strong success in implementing a token economy. Students are able to earn points through desired behaviors and earn incentives each week.

Action Steps to Implement

Set clear expectations for desired behaviors

Person Responsible	Maria Przybylski (mprzybylski@amikids.org)

Monitor behavior goals are being met and assign points accordingly

Person Responsible	Maria Przybylski (mprzybylski@amikids.org)

Arrange incentives weekly for students demonstrating desired behaviors

Person Responsible	Maria Przybylski (mprzybylski@amikids.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will continue to use point cards to monitor and strengthen student's good decision making. We will set and monitor learning goals, both academically and behaviorally. We will monitor daily student decision making and engage in staff wide discussion related to student success and progress towards exiting the program.

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.

We meet with parents/guardians monthly to discuss their student goals and how they are working towards them via Care Meetings. We hold weekly rank meetings and instill positive reinforcements and rewards for students making adequate progress. Stakeholders are invited to participate in this celebration.

We reach out to parents as needed to discuss vision and goals of the program and how they aligh with the individual needs of their student.

We meet with our board of directors monthly to discuss financial needs to assist the program with the necessary costs to best support our economically disadvantaged students.

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: ESSA Subgroup: White	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00