

Citrus County Schools

Academy Of Environmental Science



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	14
Budget to Support Goals	0

Academy Of Environmental Science

12695 W FORT ISLAND TRL, Crystal River, FL 34429

<https://aes.citruschools.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Zachary Leonard

Start Date for this Principal: 3/21/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	46%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
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

This plan was approved by the Citrus County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Academy of Environmental Science exists to provide a rigorous, hands on learning environmental that engages students in the work of protecting the nature coast and the wildlife that call it home.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Academy of Environmental Science exists to provide a rigorous, hands on learning environmental that engages students in the work of protecting the nature coast and the wildlife that call it home.

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
Leonard, Zac	Principal	Set vision and expectations for stakeholders. Oversee overall running of school and school related activities.
Fletcher, Donna	Guidance Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 3/21/2017, Zachary Leonard

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

6

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	46%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
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	0	0	0	73	55	0	0	128
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	5

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/21/2020

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	0	0	0	64	63	0	0	127
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	12

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	2	3	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	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

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	0	0	0	64	63	0	0	127
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	5	5	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	12

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	2	3	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	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

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	61%	57%	56%	0%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	53%	51%	0%	48%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	41%	42%	0%	38%	44%
Math Achievement	61%	56%	51%	0%	53%	51%
Math Learning Gains	31%	39%	48%	0%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	40%	45%	0%	42%	45%
Science Achievement	88%	80%	68%	0%	65%	67%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	0%	79%	73%	0%	73%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	65%	54%	11%	55%	10%
	2018	67%	52%	15%	53%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	59%	54%	5%	53%	6%
	2018	62%	49%	13%	53%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	72%	18%	67%	23%
2018	87%	61%	26%	65%	22%
Compare		3%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	71%	-71%	68%	-68%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	70%	-21%	61%	-12%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	62%	-62%
Compare		49%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	76%	57%	19%	57%	19%
2018	0%	52%	-52%	56%	-56%
Compare		76%			

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
WHT	62	50	44	62	34	31	88				
FRL	50	44	35	65	34		88				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	364
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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
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	53
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	53
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.

The lowest growth we saw was in math learning gains, and learning gains of the lowest quartile. We believe we have addressed and are continuing to address this area by instituting AVID strategies in the math classroom and also embedding mathematical vocabulary connections across the content area.

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

The greatest decline was in math learning gains and the learning gains of our lowest quartile. Due to COVID-19 we were unable to see officially if what strategies we put in place made a measurable difference in student performance. We are continuing with standards based instruction and implementing AVID strategies to assist.

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.

From the 2018-2019 data the largest gap was with our lowest quartile in math. We believe this was due to a number of issues including staff problems, that have been corrected.

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

We continually see high levels of proficiency with our Biology students, we are very proud of our high success and attribute that to our team mentality with providing instruction and intervention to support this subject. We are working to move that model to ELA and math as well.

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

The highest area of concern for this coming year is COVID-19 and how it will impact the instructional success of our teachers and students. In addition we have a number of tenth grade students who showed significant absenteeism and we will be placing them on a watch list to ensure we know when they are absent.

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

1. Learning gains and learning gains of the bottom quartile
2. ELA Proficiency
3. Math Proficiency
4. COVID-19 and distance learning support
5. Biology proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The data shows a decrease in proficiency in both ELA and Math. This leads the team to believe a return to standards-based instruction is needed to ensure students are receiving the correct information in the most effective way for long term success.

Measureable Outcome: Through this we would like to see an increase in all reporting categories of at least 3%-5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Zac Leonard (leonardz1@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing WICOR strategies to take the focus off of which instructional strategy to use and back on the standard or standards being taught.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: After reviewing survey data, and talking with teachers there was a struggle on "what we were doing wrong" this lead us to analyze what we were teaching and how to ensure we were meeting the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Construct walkthrough tool aligned to WICOR and key findings from NCEE research. To utilize in walkthroughs with teachers throughout year.

Person Responsible Zac Leonard (leonardz1@citruschools.org)

Conduct monthly walkthrough checks and debriefing meetings with teachers about what they are planning and executing with their lessons and what we are seeing.

Person Responsible Zac Leonard (leonardz1@citruschools.org)

With available time conduct small professional development sessions on the NCEE key findings to strengthen teacher understanding on the learning process from a scientific standpoint and how that can be utilized in instruction.

Person Responsible Zac Leonard (leonardz1@citruschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Additionally we will be looking at research out of the National Center for Education and the Economy regarding the nature of learning. Implementing aspects of their key findings including addressing preconceptions and misconceptions, aligning new information with prior knowledge, and then developing effective meta-cognitive strategies.

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.

After reviewing survey data and discipline data, it was clear there needed to be more interventions for students who struggling controlling their behavior from time to time. We will be instituting additional instructional steps for students who are making small behavioral infractions and need to be redirected but a suspension would be too much.

Additionally, we will be focusing on being Safe, Respectful, and Responsible in our dealings with all stakeholders. This includes behavioral and COVID issues.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.