

Hernando County School District

Endeavor Academy



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	7
Planning for Improvement	11
R.A.I.S.E	0
Positive Culture & Environment	0

Endeavor Academy

14063 KEN AUSTIN PKWY, Brooksville, FL 34613

www.edline.net/pages/hcsb_star

Demographics

Principal: Laura Burgess

Start Date for this Principal: 9/30/2021

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	Alternative
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Unsatisfactory
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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 create a safe, caring and structured environment for at-risk students. Students are empowered to take responsibility for their social, behavioral and academic goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To develop a “new” beginning for at-risk students aimed at success. “Vita Nova”

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

Students are referred to Endeavor Academy in lieu of expulsion. Our alternative school provides a structure for students to catch up on credits with a high level of monitoring so that early interventions can be put in place for student success. Class sizes are small which allows academic and behavior supports to be implemented with fidelity. Students are then prepared to return to their zoned school on a path to high school graduation.

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
------	----------------	---------------------------------

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 9/30/2021, Laura Burgess

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

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

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

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	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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/30/2021

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	
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	
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					49%	56%		48%	56%
ELA Learning Gains					45%	51%		48%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					36%	42%		39%	44%
Math Achievement					51%	51%		47%	51%
Math Learning Gains					45%	48%		43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					38%	45%		40%	45%
Science Achievement					68%	68%		58%	67%
Social Studies Achievement					71%	73%		68%	71%

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
06	2021					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	9%	53%	-44%	52%	-43%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	10%	53%	-43%	56%	-46%
Cohort Comparison						
09	2021	-9%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	23%	51%	-28%	55%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
10	2021					
	2019	18%	49%	-31%	53%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	25%	62%	-37%	54%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	12%	50%	-38%	46%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	5%	54%	-49%	48%	-43%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	53%	67%	-14%	67%	-14%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	36%	75%	-39%	71%	-35%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	43%	70%	-27%	70%	-27%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	16%	59%	-43%	61%	-45%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	27%	55%	-28%	57%	-30%

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	13	36		11	19		17				
HSP											
WHT		25			20						
FRL	4	33		4	13		6				

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	7			20	20						
WHT	10	18		13	32						
FRL	8	10		8	40			18			

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	13
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	91
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	86%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	0
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	8
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	12
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?

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

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?

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

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

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.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Based on the 2020-2021 School Improvement Rating, the percent of total points dropped from 39% to 29%. This was due to a drop in Math Learning Gains from 47% to 22%. ELA Learning Gains increased from 30-35%, but is still a drop from 2018 when it was 43%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Math Learning Gains will increase from 22% to 50% which is in the Commendable range.
 ELA Learning Gains will increase from 35% to 44% which bring the school 1 point higher than 2018.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will conduct bi-weekly walkthroughs. Leadership team will meet weekly to review prior week's grades/behavior.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Steve Crognale (crognale_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teachers will work in Professional Learning Communities to review data and create action plans.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

PLCS will allow teachers to collaborate to problem solve student progress on lessons completed and pass rate. Formative data will also be analyzed to differentiate instruction. Both course completion and differentiation will lead to increased learning gains.

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.

Walkthrough Schedule will be made to ensure monitoring and drive PLC discussions.
 PLC schedule will be made so that meeting are done with consistency.

Person Responsible

Steve Crognale (crognale_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Student data tracker will be made and posted in classroom so that teachers and students can track progress towards goals.

Person Responsible

Kimberly Webster (webster_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will be trained on best practices for classroom management including teacher proximity, high expectations, and building relationships. PD for best practices for instruction will include focusing on data driven outcomes, differentiation, and acceleration. A focus for SWD will be on scaffolding grade level instruction.

Person Responsible

Steve Crognale (crognale_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will analyze student performance on lessons and formatives to guide instruction for the following week. Progress Monitoring Data will be reviewed using i-Ready and Achieve3000 data. This will include looking at SWD data compared to Non-SWD students.

Person Responsible

Steve Crognale (crognale_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Parents will be contacted at the 4.5 week mark on student progress and conferences will be held as needed.

Person Responsible

Steve Crognale (crognale_s@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

Based on 2018-2019 data, Endeavor has three underperforming subgroups: White 15%, SWD 12%,

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.

and ED 12%.

SWD make up 31% of the population and their data on course completions, grades, and assessments will be disaggregated.

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.

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