

Pasco County Schools

East Pasco Education Academy



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

East Pasco Education Academy

35830 STATE ROAD 52, Dade City, FL 33525

<https://epea.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Shelley Carrino

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* 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 Pasco 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	6
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

East Pasco Education Academy

35830 STATE ROAD 52, Dade City, FL 33525

<https://epea.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.

JIEC will prepare students to be positive, contributing members of the community by committing to social, academic and emotional excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students achieve success in college, career and life.

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
Miller, Morgan	Teacher, K-12	
Olmo, Jose	Other	
Long, Brian	Teacher, K-12	
Lail, Greg	Teacher, K-12	
Davis, Cloty	Principal	

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	8	26	26	11	6	4	81	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	23	19	7	5	2	63	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	24	21	11	6	4	74	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	25	18	9	5	3	65	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	13	6	3	2	38	

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	8	26	23	11	5	4	77

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	9	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	8

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

16

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/25/2019

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	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	

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	0%	57%	56%	0%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	53%	51%	0%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	41%	42%	0%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	56%	51%	0%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	49%	48%	0%	45%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	45%	0%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	70%	68%	0%	65%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	73%	73%	0%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	8 (0)	26 (0)	26 (0)	11 (0)	6 (0)	4 (0)	81 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	7 ()	23 ()	19 ()	7 ()	5 ()	2 ()	63 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	8 ()	24 ()	21 ()	11 ()	6 ()	4 ()	74 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	5 ()	25 ()	18 ()	9 ()	5 ()	3 ()	65 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	3 ()	11 ()	13 ()	6 ()	3 ()	2 ()	38 (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
06	2019	0%	56%	-56%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	15%	58%	-43%	56%	-41%
	2018	6%	58%	-52%	58%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
09	2019	15%	57%	-42%	55%	-40%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	59%	-59%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	42%	-42%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	17%	68%	-51%	46%	-29%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	20%	54%	-34%	48%	-28%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	10%	70%	-60%	71%	-61%
2018	0%	71%	-71%	71%	-71%
Compare		10%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	69%	-69%	70%	-70%
2018	36%	70%	-34%	68%	-32%
Compare		-36%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	60%	-60%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	63%	-63%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	62%	-62%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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
HSP											
WHT											
FRL	10										
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	3
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	14
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	59%
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%	
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	0
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	5
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

ELA - 15% pass rate. Student population is transient.

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

History EOC - 34% Only 7 students were tested.

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.

History EOC -70% No enough students tested due to low class enrollment

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

Science 20% - Higher % of students tested due to new adjustments in testing schedule.

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

Behavior

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

1. Attendance
2. Behavior
3. Subgroup performance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Data Driven Decisions

Rationale Increase systems to support students

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

JIEC will decrease level 2 referrals by 50% from the previous year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jose Olmo (jolmo@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

MyStudent referral data will be reviewed weekly during student services team meetings as well as teacher PLC meeting for teachers. Groups will also be conducted to address the various behavioral needs of the students. These meetings will be held weekly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

By having teachers review data weekly, instructional staff will be able to more effectively make decisions concerning student interventions prior to referrals

Action Step

Description

1. Ongoing PLC and SIT meetings
2. Run student groups centering around the highest needs for behavioral needs for the students
3. SEL training for staff will be conducted once a month

Person Responsible

Cloty Davis (cadavis@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Collaborative Culture
Rationale	Improve campus culture through staff interaction
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Enrollment will increase in ADULT ED from previous year by 25%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cloty Davis (cadavis@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Tracking data through sign-in sheets and phone logs to implement new directives concerning improvements through adult education registration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Feedback from student and potential students warranted an examination of our customer service practices.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rearrange enrollment office to make more inviting 2. meet with staff to ensure customer service is being implemented daily 3. Track student enrollment and return calls for students who have not yet registered on sign-in sheet
Person Responsible	Cloty Davis (cadavis@pasco.k12.fl.us)
#3	
Title	High Impact Instruction
Rationale	All students' learning experiences match the rigor of the state standards.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>STAR testing data will reflect an increase of 5% with students who have attended all year</p> <p>Subgroups (all, white, Hispanic, and ED) that scored below 41% on the Federal Index will improve to 41% or greater.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cloty Davis (cadavis@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Meet with reading and math instructors to review initial STAR testing data results and strategize in increasing student scores for the post-test.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students at JIEC are very transient and therefore we will focus on students who attend for the entire year to retrieve data.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reading teacher to implement new reading program in conjunction with IRLA 2. PLC meetings will review STAR data to improve scores and incorporate into lessons
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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).

NA