State College Of Florida Collegiate School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
mission
family and community involvement
school improvement
ambitious
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
areas of focus
resources
instruction
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
growth

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

State College Of Florida Collegiate School

5840 26TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34207

https://scfcs.scf.edu/bradenton/

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Monod

Start Date for this Principal: 11/29/2010

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)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (78%) 2016-17: A (76%) 2015-16: A (74%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

N/A

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

State College Of Florida Collegiate School

5840 26TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34207

https://scfcs.scf.edu/bradenton/

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	36%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	49%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

State College of Florida Collegiate School's mission is to guide and mentor student achievement by equipping them to attain a high school diploma and an Associate in Arts Degree concurrently upon graduation. Beginning in 6th grade, SCFCS students' progress in a rigorous academic environment, supported with 1:1 technology. The program utilizes demanding and innovative initiatives to establish a system that encourages independent learning, preparing students for success in a full-time college schedule beginning their junior year.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The following tenets guide the operation of the SCF Collegiate School:

-Pursue innovation in teaching and learning.
-Engage in continuous assessment to measure success for positive change.
-Partner with other schools and institutions locally, nationally and internationally.
-Infuse curriculum with characteristics necessary to build student awareness of the international community, and their role as global citizens.
-Instill a 'going to college' culture at an early age, specifically for students who are first generation college students.
-Educate families and the community about the benefits of a college education, and the importance of early preparation.
-Eliminate transitions in education with a continuum from sixth grade to college, while providing academic advising for college at SCF and beyond.
-Using technology to increase interest, and to teach and learn with relevant tools needed for today's "digital natives".
-Increase rigor and curricular relevance, with enrichment utilizing college resources.
-Create a home base for accelerated college students enrolled in SCFCS.

Innovative teaching and creative leadership will accomplish this mission. Each student is encouraged to learn to work independently, with other students, and with instructors to meet their goals.

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
Monod, Kelly	Principal	The School Leadership Team is comprised of the following members: SCFCS Senior Head of Collegiate Schools SCFCS Assistant Head of School SCFCS Certified School Counselor SCFCS College Advisor SCFCS School Resource Officer SCFCS ESE Specialist SCF Executive Vice President and Provost

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 11/29/2010, Kelly Monod

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.*

2

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

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)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (78%) 2016-17: A (76%) 2015-16: A (74%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	

SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	67	67	74	71	83	79	508
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	3	1	5	6	2	1	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	2	2	7	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	2	15	1	6	2	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	5	4	2	1	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	10

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	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	4

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

Sunday 5/31/2020

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	68	68	70	77	66	91	82	522
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	7	2	2	2	2	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	10	2	7	5	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	5	5	0	0	0	26

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	5	1	1	1	0	0	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	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	68	68	70	77	66	91	82	522
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	7	2	2	2	2	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	10	2	7	5	36
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	5	5	0	0	0	26

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	5	1	1	1	0	0	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	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	78%	49%	56%	85%	48%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	47%	51%	69%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	37%	42%	61%	35%	41%
Math Achievement	92%	51%	51%	86%	52%	49%
Math Learning Gains	71%	47%	48%	72%	46%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	45%	45%	59%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	75%	67%	68%	83%	73%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	96%	69%	73%	82%	63%	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	64%	52%	12%	54%	10%
	2018	73%	47%	26%	52%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	79%	48%	31%	52%	27%
	2018	81%	48%	33%	51%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	77%	54%	23%	56%	21%
	2018	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
09	2019	84%	53%	31%	55%	29%
	2018	90%	52%	38%	53%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
10	2019	88%	49%	39%	53%	35%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	91%	52%	39%	53%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	77%	57%	20%	55%	22%
	2018	79%	52%	27%	52%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	94%	57%	37%	54%	40%
	2018	83%	54%	29%	54%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
08	2019	96%	41%	55%	46%	50%
	2018	84%	41%	43%	45%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	79%	45%	34%	48%	31%
	2018	80%	45%	35%	50%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	69%	1%	67%	3%
2018	100%	72%	28%	65%	35%
Compare		-30%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	77%	19%	71%	25%
2018	93%	78%	15%	71%	22%
Compare		3%			

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	98%	65%	33%	61%	37%
2018	97%	65%	32%	62%	35%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	61%	32%	57%	36%
2018	96%	56%	40%	56%	40%
Compare		-3%			

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
ELL	35	41	42	74	59	61	36	83			
ASN	84	65		100	87						
BLK	73	63	64	90	68	60	42				
HSP	65	63	55	88	67	64	67	90	38	100	100
MUL	91	64									
WHT	87	64	33	93	72	65	87	97	50	98	100
FRL	69	66	60	89	68	65	74	95	39	100	100

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
ELL	25	45	38	58	50	38					
ASN	95	71		100	82		100				
BLK	70	63	45	77	77		85				
HSP	70	60	50	85	71	58	80	85	46	100	100
MUL	91	50		100							
WHT	92	78	77	92	77	63	95	97	41	98	100
FRL	72	61	50	84	70	61	81	89	35	93	100

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
ELL	36	50	45	64	75						
ASN	96	74		100	90		100				

| 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
BLK	65	72	40	81	72		80				
HSP	77	65	65	79	66	58	78	68	18		
WHT	90	71	63	90	73	60	83	91	39	100	100
FRL	74	65	54	79	66	58	74	70	18	100	100

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	94
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	932
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	100%
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	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	84

Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	66
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	74
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	78
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	77
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	76
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Student performance in English Language Arts (ELA) was down slightly from the previous year, with the lowest 25% of ELA as the lowest score. This score represents the lowest reading students, with 54% passing the FSA in 2019. Most of the academically lowest students are in 6th grade and were not testing on level when enrolled in the school. Overall, 6th and 9th grade saw a decline in performance in ELA from the same grade level as last year. However 9th grade did show learning gains as a cohort.

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

The Biology EOC showed the lowest performance with a 30% decline. The science classes did have some adjustment in the past two years. The school added an additional science course, physical science, to the course offerings, which skewed the 2018 scores. The 2019 scores are a readjustment to this course offering. This class was determined to be less effective to prepare for students to prepare for the rigor of the college campus and was removed from the course offerings. The school leadership expected the EOC scores to reflect previous outcomes in 2020, and continues to assume percentages will fall back to previous levels.

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.

There is not an area where the school is below the state or district averages.

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

The greatest improvements were in 7th and 8th grade math. The teacher schedule was such that the courses were taught as a team. The math teachers worked together to identify, plan and meet specific course and student learning goals.

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

The highest area of concern is incoming 6th graders regarding academics and behavior.
Outside of the data from 2019, the highest area of concern is with a learning gap from spring school closures.

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

1. Focus on progress monitoring for students in a virtual, hybrid and on campus learning environment.
2. Focus on meeting student learning goals and development targets.
3. Focus on social/emotional development of students during the return to school.
4. Meeting CDC requirements for a physical environment that is healthy, to the greatest extent possible. Meeting legislative requirements for safety, mental health education, drugs/alcohol prevention and an anti-bullying campaign.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers are working this year to synthesize collaborative planning time at SCFCS. Teacher leads are focused on mentoring new teachers, refreshing all teachers regarding school programing and charter tenets, collaboration with curriculum and skills maps to create a continuum in the curriculum between grades 6-10 and preparation to college coursework.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcomes will be the completion of the curriculum and skills maps and the minutes from mentor and curriculum meetings. Not measurable will be the overall teacher morale and feelings of support and inclusion, as revealed during individual sessions following the four classroom observations over the course of the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Monod (monodk@scf.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Hoyle, English, and Steffy (1994, p. 84) offer four reasons a systematic approach to curriculum development is essential: To ensure continuity of instruction within a school and among schools. To ensure progressive skill development among schools through continuity of instruction. To maximize the use of student time, avoid unnecessary instructional overlaps, prevents gaps, and thereby minimize boredom and ensure mastery of curriculum. To provide a strong barrier against the problem of concentrating on one school or level of schools at the expense of the total system. Resource from: Curriculum Mapping, by Rebecca Crawford Burns, http://www.ascd.org/publications/curriculum-handbook/421/chapters/Overview.aspx
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Review and restructure of curriculum maps and skills are necessary when teachers are writing their own curriculum. This ensures elements are not missed, teacher lessons are working with other lessons and goals in parallel coursework and preparing for the next grades. It also avoids duplication and focuses on whole school learning priorities.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The SCFCS reopening plan approved by the district and state, includes three learning scenarios for students as schools reopen during the pandemic. Parents may choose virtual, hybrid or an on campus learning plan for students. SCFCS must focus specifically on the progression of students through progress monitoring. This is especially true for more vulnerable students, including special education students and English Language Learners.
Measurable Outcome:	The outcomes are specific in the reopening plan. A brief version of the plan includes the following: SCFCS will progress monitor all students, with additional supports for those in a more vulnerable subgroup and/or showing signs of academic and/or social/emotional regression. Academic monitoring will be with the school reading software, Achieve 3000. It will also be through overall grades/GPA using the student information data base (FOCUS) and completion of requirements using the online Learning Management System (CANVAS). Engagement of virtual students is part of the outcome goals, measured by attendance and responsiveness in the classrooms, as well as in hybrid social actives that include virtual students during the school day. Students will also be monitored by the level of participation with specific supports, including assigned mentors and advocates to work with specific students who may struggle in an unfamiliar school setting.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Monod (monodk@scf.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies are part of the SCFCS reopening plan as outlined by the state.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategy is designed to allow every student to have an individual learning plan if they are unable to successfully follow the majority of students in the dual learning environment. The supports and resources are part of the SCFCS programming already, but the school has hired additional personnel to help with individual student goals.

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.

1. Focus on progress monitoring for students in a virtual, hybrid and on campus learning environment.
2. Focus on meeting student learning goals and development targets.
3. Focus on social/emotional development of students during the return to school.
4. Meeting CDC requirements for a physical environment that is healthy, to the greatest extent possible. Meeting legislative requirements for safety, mental health education, drugs/alcohol prevention and an anti-bullying campaign.

All five focus areas are part of the conversations with the administrative leadership and lead teacher teams. The areas have internal action plans developed as a group and monitored for effectiveness and surveyed for helpful changes. The tasks ahead of teachers this year are extreme and require retooling of all curriculum and its presentation and assessments. Teachers must have time to reflect on their effectiveness in the classroom and monitor and respond to student progress. Resources have been brought in to support students and teachers, including additional personnel and TAs to assist teachers in the classrooms.

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.

[SCFCS is not a Title I school]
All school initiative:
-Parents are included in student conferences at least two times per year, and communication with coaches is ongoing. Students may lead conferences and discuss goal setting and achievements or coaches may address grade levels at one time for common questions.
-Instructors are also academic coaches, assigned 22-25 students, so parents can have a go-to person for increased communication .
-Students email parents academic updates weekly.
-Administration emails parents newsletter every week.
-In a normal environment, volunteer opportunities at school and field trips.
-Academic events sponsored by student clubs. Clubs have virtual opportunities this year.
-PTO and SAC every month.
-Efforts to welcome Spanish speaking parents with translator available for conferences and Diversity Club events. SCFCS offers an information session presented in Spanish. Spanish speaking volunteers and staff are available, and important documents are often translated.
-Guidance office is working with academic coaches and students to bring in a culture of kindness, using

Sandy Hook Promise as a curriculum guide.
-The SRO works with D-FY Manatee to host a club that promotes anti-drug culture and team building. The clubs hosts Stomp Out Bullying Day in the fall.

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: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00