

Citrus County Schools

Academy Of Environmental Science



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

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: 5/31/2019

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 10/8/2019.

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	8
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Academy Of Environmental Science

12695 W FORT ISLAND TRL, Crystal River, FL 34429

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) High School 9-12	2018-19 Title I School No	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) 46%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File) K-12 General Education	Charter School Yes	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) 10%

School Grades History

Year Grade	2018-19	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
	C	B	B	A*

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Citrus County School Board on 10/8/2019.

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.

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 and position title 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	

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	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
	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	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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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
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	7	5	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	9
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	0	4	0	0	4

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%
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	
Number of students enrolled	64 (0)	63 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	127 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	5 (0)	5 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	4 (0)	8 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (0)
	0 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

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				

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
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
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.

Learning gains for the lowest quartile in math were the lowest group of data. This was due to lack of standards based instruction, formative assessment collection and data analysis, as well as lack of effective scaffolding for different levels of learning.

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

ELA learning gains showed the greatest decline due to the fact that we were in a transitional year for our scheduling, we had staffing needs that went unmet due to lack of qualified applicants, and the department's lack of focus.

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.

Learning gains for the lowest quartile in math were the lowest group of data. This was due to lack of standards based instruction, formative assessment collection and data analysis, as well as lack of effective scaffolding for different levels of learning.

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

Biology showed a five point growth in raw data from 85% to 90% I believe this was due to effective use of standards based instruction, implementing a new curriculum with fidelity, and consistent and continual use of formative assessment and data to drive instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

We have to do a better job with our lowest quartile especially those who are ESE and have behavioral issues. I believe and research would support that a lack of engagement and appropriate scaffolding will cause students to disconnect with the class, the teacher, and therefore seek avoidance through whatever means necessary. If we can engage our students and provide instruction to the appropriate level of each student I believe we will see significant gains.

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

1. Learning Gains across ELA and Math with the BQ
2. Learning gains across ELA and Math with the entire population
3. School wide literacy and writing focus to spread the responsibility from one department to all
4. Highly correlated formative assessment that is used to drive instruction
5. Structured professional collaboration time for teachers to share best practices and align how to best address student needs across the content area.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Improvement; Learning Gains, and Achievement
Rationale	Overall achievement of 61% is higher than state and district, however learning gains and our BQ learning gains need to consistently improve year to year.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Improve the ELA achievement of our student population by 3 to 5 percentage points
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Zac Leonard (leonardz1@citruschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>School-wide reading and writing focus. Ensuring that students are interacting with text utilizing a system of effective strategies on a consistent basis across the content area. Utilizing close reading strategies on rigors, standards based text that align between classes will provide a system where students can use the lens of Close Reading and its benefits in different areas.</p> <p>Research suggests that simply integrating more rigorous levels of text is not enough to ensure student growth in the area of reading and how they interpret that reading into writing. St. John's Ralph C. Williams College of Education conducted significant research that provides evidence that the implementation of close reading strategies and consistent system of writing and reading instruction across the content area leads to significant improvement. Dr. Caitlin Dakin stated in her research that "The findings showed improvement in the students' understanding of a text and provides implications that the teachers should evolve instructional practices to meet the needs of the common core and allow for students to become confident in reading harder texts.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Dakin, Caitlin. "The Effects of Comprehension Through Close Reading." The Effects of Comprehension Through Close Reading, St. John Fisher College Fisher Digital Publications, 9 May 2013, fisherpub.sjfc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1238&context=education_ETD_masters.</p>

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Using research on close reading and analysis of ELA Standard Cluster Requirements create an instructional system on close reading, text analysis, and writing to implement across the content area. Create posters that are bright, engaging, and have the 4 major parts of close reading with explanation and examples. - 1. Number the Paragraphs 2. Chunk the text 3. Purposeful Highlighting, Underlining, and Circling 4. Write marginal notes; left side questions, right side observations. Create posters that are bright, engaging, and have the 4 parts of an effective paragraph including, 1. Thesis/ Primary Claim 2. Topic Sentence/ Supporting Claim 3. Concrete evidence 4. Analysis and Elaboration Provide professional development to introduce the process, the research behind it, and why it is the correct focus for our school. Schedule progress
--------------------	--

monitoring sessions quarterly to check on implementation
 5. Provide support through PLCs and one on one teacher conversations.

Person Responsible Zac Leonard (leonardz1@citrusschools.org)

#2

Title Math Proficiency, learning gains, and BQ learning gains

Rationale Math scores were low in overall achievement at 61% but our learning gains and BQ learning gains were particularly low at 31% and 28% respectively.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve Math Proficiency improvement of 3%, Learning gains improvement of 5% and BQ learning gains improvement of 5%.

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

Evidence-based Strategy Utilizing formative assessment to ensure achievement of benchmarks throughout the school year is imperative to ensure success. Teachers will work in PLCs sharing the data collected from formative assessments to design lessons that ensure content mastery. The administrative team will attend these meetings and discuss with the team how they are utilizing the data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Understanding the material students have mastered is essential. The data is even more powerful when it comes in before the final assessment. Black and Wiliam (1998b) found that student gains impacted by formative assessment practices were “among the largest ever reported for educational interventions”. Additionally, district created formative assessments have consistently shown correlation data at or above 96% compared to the FSA.

Connecting Formative Assessment Research To Practice: An Introductory Guide For Educators.
 Nick|Brandt-W. Christopher - <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED509943>

Action Step

Description

1. Schedule formative assessments in the instructional calendar
2. Establish PLC meeting criteria and monitoring their meetings by observation and completion of PLC accountability form.
3. Teachers will administer assessments, analyze data and share out during PLCs. Admin team will analyze data as well and observe how they are using that data for lesson creation.
4. Admin team will meet with teachers to reflect together how data is informing their lesson creation.
5. Admin team will meet with BQ students and analyze their individual data and provide strategies and encouragement for growth.

Person Responsible Zac Leonard (leonardz1@citrusschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Decrease the number of students who miss 10% or more of the school year. We will do this by instituting rewards for high attendance such as lunch time celebrations, field trips, and field days.

Increase overall culture of community and family by conducting team building activity days, team research projects, and service projects in the community. We believe these activities will improve the behavior and the experience students have at AES.

Increase the number of students who are on the honor roll, by implementing a 4.0 breakfast every 4.5 weeks.

Part V: Budget						
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Improvement; Learning Gains, and Achievement				\$73,124.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	2110	100-Salaries	0215 - Academy Of Environmental Science	General Fund	17.0	\$72,624.00
			<i>Notes: We have 3 staff members who will be working on ELA/Reading. Our full time ELA teacher who is reading endorsed and has over 20 years of success reading/ELA instruction experience. A teacher's aide that will be working with our BQ specifically to address areas of concern identified by progress monitoring. Administrator is Reading Endorsed and will work in small groups multiple times weekly to provide targeted instruction.</i>			
			0215 - Academy Of Environmental Science	Other		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: iXL program donated through the company to provide a pilot for addressing reading and math improvement.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency, learning gains, and BQ learning gains				\$46,734.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	2110	100-Salaries	0215 - Academy Of Environmental Science	General Fund		\$45,234.00
			<i>Notes: We hired a teacher who is fully certified in mathematics, has experience teaching all levels and is very excited. Additionally, we hired a teacher's aide to provided targeted support from progress monitoring data to our BQ students.</i>			
			0215 - Academy Of Environmental Science	Other		\$1,500.00
			<i>Notes: iXL donated their program to all students at AES to provide support for identified gaps in understanding from progress monitoring data.</i>			
					Total:	\$119,858.00