

Nassau County School District

Callahan Intermediate School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Callahan Intermediate School

34586 BALL PARK RD, Callahan, FL 32011

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kerri Boatright

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School 3-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (78%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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

This plan is pending approval by the Nassau 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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Callahan Intermediate School

34586 BALL PARK RD, Callahan, FL 32011

[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)
Elementary School 3-5	Yes	47%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	10%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Nassau 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.

Callahan Intermediate is committed to working with the community to create a variety of high quality educational experiences designed to provide each student with the opportunity to develop his or her talents in every area of the curriculum. Students will develop positive learning habits that will enable them to become dependable contributors to a diverse society through challenging programs in a safe, caring environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Callahan Intermediate visualizes the complex world that our students live in and the many demands that will be placed upon them in a multicultural society and swiftly changing environment. Our vision is for students to develop positive learning habits that will enable them to become dependable contributors to a diverse society.

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
Cason, Monica	Principal	
Bryant, Terri	School Counselor	
Simmons, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
Palmer, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Drury, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Whitaker, Alisha	Teacher, K-12	Teacher
Pavey, Cynthia	Teacher, ESE	
Thompson, Desiree	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Kerri Boatright

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.*

12

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School 3-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (78%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	207	190	177	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	13	23	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/6/2020

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	217	208	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	607
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	23	26	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	4	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	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	217	208	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	607
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	23	26	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	4	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	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	72%	76%	57%	74%	73%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	65%	58%	66%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	54%	53%	53%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	87%	85%	63%	88%	82%	61%
Math Learning Gains	84%	77%	62%	81%	71%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	76%	67%	51%	81%	64%	51%
Science Achievement	80%	75%	53%	79%	73%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	3	4	5	
	(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
03	2019	68%	75%	-7%	58%	10%
	2018	81%	76%	5%	57%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	68%	-5%	58%	5%
	2018	70%	69%	1%	56%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
05	2019	83%	75%	8%	56%	27%
	2018	85%	71%	14%	55%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	84%	83%	1%	62%	22%
	2018	85%	80%	5%	62%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	81%	4%	64%	21%
	2018	84%	83%	1%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	93%	86%	7%	60%	33%
	2018	95%	79%	16%	61%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	80%	73%	7%	53%	27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	85%	72%	13%	55%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

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
SWD	48	58	59	75	72	66	58				
BLK	64			79							
HSP	90	77		100	77						
MUL	67	64		89	64						
WHT	71	67	56	87	85	76	80				
FRL	65	63	57	82	79	72	73				
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
SWD	52	54	49	69	73	70	56				
BLK	75	90		81	90						
HSP	89	83		94	67						
WHT	79	69	57	89	82	76	86				
FRL	74	69	61	84	81	74	81				
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
SWD	39	47	47	66	77	72	48				
BLK	54			85							
HSP	84	100		95	85						
MUL	71	60		86	80						
WHT	74	65	53	88	82	81	79				
FRL	65	59	51	84	79	79	76				

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	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	522
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	62
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	72
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	86
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	71
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	75
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	70
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.

At Callahan Intermediate 68% of the students in 3rd grade, 62% in 4th grade are proficient on the ELA Florida State Assessment. These percents show a deficit of 5-7% compared to the district.

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

Third grade ELA showed the greatest deficit for Callahan Intermediate School by 13% compared to the prior year

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The 2018-2019 data was above the state average. For grade 3, CIS was 10% above the state, fourth grade was 5 % above the state, and 5th grade was 27% above the state average.

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

For state assessments, the 5th grade ELA showed the most improvement by 33% and in math by 27%. Small group differentiated instruction as well as whole group instruction along with paraprofessional assistance helped with both ELA and Math for 5th grade. Consistent spiral teaching and review also help students maintain and practice skills throughout the school year.

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

After reflecting on the EWS data we will continue to monitor and implement strategies to reduce excessive absences.

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

1. School-wide ELA achievement while focusing on the learning gains for our lower quartile in ELA
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Callahan Intermediate scored 72% achievement proficiency school-wide for ELA in 2019. Our District's expectation is 80%, so we chose to increase proficiency in ELA by utilizing several strategies and action steps below especially focusing on our lower quartile students. Our iReady BOY data for Fall 2020 supports this decision, as we are 47% proficient with end of the year grade level standards.
Measurable Outcome:	Proficiency will increase from 72% in 2019 to 80% in 2021 school-wide as indicated on the FSA ELA Achievement Component and 47% to 80% as indicated on the iReady ELA Tier 1 Proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Cason (casonmo@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence-based strategy used is intentional differentiated ELA instruction based on data from diagnostic assessments to progress monitor individual student achievement and growth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on previous FSA and various assessments using iReady, STAR and Benchmarks, our data reveals the need for continued adjustments in differentiating small group instruction and providing targeted additional instruction through intervention blocks such as intensive reading (In-school support time for intervention).
Action Steps to Implement	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Differentiated small group instruction 2. Targeted in school interventions 3. Tiered support as indicated in MTSS 4. Tutoring 5. Collaborative planning and professional development 	
Person Responsible	Monica Cason (casonmo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2019 attendance data, 12% of CIS students did not maintain a 90% attendance rate. According to the 1st quarter attendance data for 2020, CIS is demonstrating that 10% of the students are not maintaining a 90% attendance rate. It appears that our attendance is improving however the 2020 enrollment for CIS has decreased by 33 students.

Measurable Outcome: At the end of the 20-21 school year, the goal of CIS is to decrease the percentage of students absent for more than 10% of the school year by 2%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Monica Cason (casonmo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Parent communication will be used to bring awareness of the attendance policy and to implement student, classroom, and schoolwide positive reinforcers regarding attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: It is evident that parent/student communication and reinforcement is needed to express the importance of attendance and the correlation to student academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Positive Reinforcements
2. Parent Phone Calls
3. Tiered System of Support (letters, phone calls, relationships)
4. Attendance policy clarified at parent conferences

Person Responsible: Desiree Thompson (thompsonde@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

CIS identified ELA as the focus this year, but will continue to monitor Math Achievement data based on diagnostic assessments from iReady.

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.

School staff, faculty, and administrators strive to strengthen parent involvement in the school. The school will coordinate and integrate parental involvement strategies including community involvement opportunities and business partnerships.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00