

Seminole County Public Schools

Endeavor School



2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| R.A.I.S.E | 0 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |

Endeavor School

3010 OLD LAKE MARY RD, Lake Mary, FL 32746

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0311>

Demographics

Principal: Paul Harshman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

| | |
|--|---|
| 2021-22 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Function (per accountability file) | ESE |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School KG-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Special Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 72% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Improvement Rating History | 2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Unsatisfactory 2017-18: Unsatisfactory 2016-17: Unsatisfactory |
| DJJ Accountability Rating | 2023-24: No Rating |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Seminole County School Board.

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be successful in the educational, career, and community mainstream.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Endeavor School and Hopper Center aligns with Seminole County Public Schools vision to be a premier school district in the State of Florida and to be recognized nationally for high standards, academic performance and offering students customized educational pathways 24/7/365.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

Endeavor School and Hopper Center serve students with significant emotional and behavioral challenges. Every student at Endeavor has an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) that is written to address their unique needs. Endeavor school provides a very small student to staff ratio and numerous other supports to address the unique needs of the students. In addition to teachers and paraprofessionals in every class, we also have a full-time psychologist, as well as a full-time social worker and student support services facilitator. Our goal is to provide our students with the resources and support needed to make the academic, social, and emotional growth necessary to be successful in the school and community mainstream.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Harshman, Paul | Principal | Principal |
| Benjamin, Kawanya | Assistant Principal | Administrator |
| Curran, Carissa | Assistant Principal | Administrator |
| Whyte, Regina | Other | Mental Health and Guidance Counseling, Individual Education Plans, Behavior Intervention Plans, Evaluations |
| Williamson, Hanna | Teacher, ESE | Teacher Leader |
| Merthie, Tamicka | Teacher, ESE | Teacher Leader |
| Tomaszewski, Matthew | Teacher, ESE | Teacher Leader |

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Paul Harshman

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

4

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

6

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

35

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

0

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems**2021-22****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 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 8 | 35 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 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 | 1 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |
| 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

Tuesday 8/24/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 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 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 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 | 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 | 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 Review**

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | | 77% | 61% | | 78% | 60% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | 65% | 59% | | 62% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 62% | 54% | | 52% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | | | | | 81% | 62% | | 79% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | 69% | 59% | | 70% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 67% | 52% | | 58% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | | | | | 76% | 56% | | 72% | 57% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | | 86% | 78% | | 94% | 77% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 58% | -58% | 52% | -52% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 61% | -61% | 56% | -56% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 61% | -61% | 55% | -55% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 61% | -61% | 53% | -53% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 61% | -61% | 54% | -54% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 32% | -32% | 46% | -46% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 57% | -57% | 48% | -48% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 71% | -71% | 67% | -67% |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 74% | -74% | 71% | -71% |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 75% | -75% | 70% | -70% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 61% | -61% | 61% | -61% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 64% | -64% | 57% | -57% |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 4 | 26 | | 10 | 39 | | 8 | 7 | | | |
| WHT | 8 | 25 | | 20 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 5 | 32 | | 6 | 36 | | 9 | | | | |

| 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 | 6 | 30 | | | 27 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 16 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 94 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 87% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 16 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |

| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 18 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

Endeavor and Hopper Center are "separate day schools" where every student in attendance has an Individual Education Plan (IEP). Our students come to Endeavor and Hopper Center because of significant emotional and behavioral challenges. Progress monitoring efforts utilized the SCPS Early Warning systems for data monitoring and monitoring support for students utilizing resources from Student Support Services team.

Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

N/A - no prior year data is available for Endeavor/Hopper Center.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

N/A - no prior year data is available for Endeavor/Hopper Center.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Endeavor School and Hopper Center are co-located ESE centers who serve students with emotional/behavior disabilities many of whom are also economically disadvantaged. Endeavor School and Hopper Center's Federal Percent of Points Index reflects deficiencies in achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students.

What strategies need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

1. Student owned progress monitoring
2. Provide teachers with ongoing instructional feedback resulting from regular classroom observations.
3. Provide ongoing professional development for all staff that focuses on the Art and Science of Teaching, Project based and high engagement learning, and instructional best practices.
4. Provide ongoing professional development that focuses on best practices for behavioral intervention and classroom management.
5. Facilitate Professional Learning Communities that focus on trauma informed care, restorative practices, and the effectiveness of intervention plans.
6. Explore, develop, and implement new technology to enhance instruction, engage students in academics, gather information, and communicate knowledge.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development for teachers and school leaders will focus on resources available to support students and families and professional learning communities focused on social emotional needs, relationship building and restorative practices.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Endeavor School and Hopper Center are co-located ESE centers who serve students with emotional/behavior disabilities. Endeavor School's Federal Percent of Points Index reflects deficiencies in achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities most of whom are economically disadvantaged.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities, reduction in behavioral incidents and crisis situations, evidence of school social worker support provided to students and families.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

SCPS Early Warning Systems will be used to monitor student academic progress and discipline incidents. Student Support Services updates will provide evidence of school social worker support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Harshman (paul_harshman@scps.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Lessons aligned to Florida Standards at the appropriate level of complexity with ongoing feedback loop between leadership and teacher, students and teachers and student with students and PLC focused on relationship building data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Endeavor School strives to provide every student with the support and resources needed to be successful. Endeavor staff will monitor and evaluate the needs of our students on a daily basis and support and provide every resource possible to address those needs. Monitoring will take place through tracking the school social worker support and resources provided to students and families.

Person Responsible

Paul Harshman (paul_harshman@scps.k12.fl.us)

Ongoing professional development and professional learning communities have been established to provide a continual focus on building relationships and trust, as well as provide academic and behavioral interventions and best practices. Evidence of success will be a reduction of behavioral incidents and crisis situations and academic growth.

Person Responsible

Paul Harshman (paul_harshman@scps.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

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.

Endeavor School serves students with significant emotional and behavioral challenges. The foundation of everything we do is built by building relationships and trust with students and the staff that serve them. There is a consistent and constant focus in this area. Endeavor provides a very small staff to student ratio, and thus, we have the opportunity to work very closely with our students and families to provide the unconditional support and interventions needed to build the academic and emotional skills our students need to be successful and happy. Many of our students never experienced school success prior to coming to us. Through this extensive support system our students learn to trust and begin having school success academically and behaviorally. The result of this success are students that enjoy coming to school, possibly for the first time. This positive attitude and trust is infectious and results in a positive school culture and environment.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Staff: Endeavor School serves students with significant emotional and behavioral challenges. All of the staff (administration, teachers, support personnel, office, custodial, etc.) at Endeavor fully understand this challenge and provide the support, trust building, interventions, and relationships needed to foster the academic and behavioral success of our students.

Students: Over the course of time our students learn how to have positive relationships and trust the adults at the school who support them. Students often become leaders on the campus once this has been established and support and promote a positive culture and environment for newer students still becoming acclimated with the school and staff.

Families: Building trust and relationships with families is just as important as it is with students. Staff at Endeavor provide daily communication with families and are constantly encouraging and coaching family members on how we can work together as a team to provide consistency of expectations, rewards, and consequences between school and home. These relationships result in great support from most of our parents and lead to student success that positively impacts the school culture and environment.