Professional Academy Magnet At Loften High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Professional Academy Magnet At Loften High School

3000 E UNIVERSITY AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

https://www.sbac.edu/loften

Demographics

Principal: Kristopher Bracewell

Start Date for this Principal: 8/27/2013

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)	50%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (60%) 2014-15: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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 Alachua 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

Professional Academy Magnet At Loften High School

3000 E UNIVERSITY AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

https://www.sbac.edu/loften

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 9-12	No	62%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	B	C	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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.

Every student, every day .... engaged and experiencing success!

Provide the school's vision statement.

A vital community united as the premier provider of career and technical education.

We believe that the Professional Academies Magnet at Loften High School is a place where every student:
* is known by name
* can belong to a group and be part of something special
* wants to come to school because he or she is involved in doing important things
* is motivated to achieve at high levels in all program clusters
* has his/her needs met by a staff that works as a united team
* experiences the connection between community and school

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
McElroy, William	Principal	Master schedule, data analysis, student supervision, all others
Allen, Cheryl	Assistant Principal	Testing, schedules, parents, IEP and 504 meetings, all others duties as assigned
Boria, Rikki	Teacher, K-12	Literacy Chairperson
MIddleton, Dedra	Administrative Support	As assigned

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	81	74	61	57	273
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	11	10	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	4	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	9	7	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	13	9	7	56

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	8	6	9	3	26

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	

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

16

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/27/2019

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	65%	59%	56%	57%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	52%	51%	47%	54%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	39%	42%	41%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	63%	54%	51%	42%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	57%	54%	48%	32%	41%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	48%	45%	25%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	80%	68%	68%	63%	65%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	75%	73%	74%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	81 (0)	74 (0)	61 (0)	57 (0)	273 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 ()	4 ()	11 ()	10 ()	30 (0)
One or more suspensions	3 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	13 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	8 (0)	6 (0)	9 (0)	7 (0)	30 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	27 (0)	13 (0)	9 (0)	7 (0)	56 (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	68%	60%	8%	55%	13%	
	2018	68%	58%	10%	53%	15%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison							
10	2019	63%	55%	8%	53%	10%	
	2018	60%	60%	0%	53%	7%	
Same Grade Comparison		3%					
Cohort Comparison		-5%					

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	81%	66%	15%	67%	14%
2018	87%	68%	19%	65%	22%
Compare		-6%			

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	71%	71%	0%	70%	1%
2018	69%	71%	-2%	68%	1%
Compare		2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	56%	-6%	61%	-11%
2018	55%	60%	-5%	62%	-7%
Compare		-5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	48%	48%	57%	39%
2018	52%	63%	-11%	56%	-4%
Compare		44%			

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
SWD	16	37	36	35	50			30			
BLK	41	46	18	41	62		47	56		95	16
HSP	76	71		55							
MUL	50			80							
WHT	72	59	50	70	57	56	94	93		100	74
FRL	55	48	47	59	56	58	75	59		92	48
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
SWD	21	37	29				60				
BLK	38	49	35	40	27		67	36		88	47
HSP	67	67									
WHT	77	59		76	44		87	96		100	78
FRL	54	54	40	60	38	25	65	60		96	50
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
SWD	21	26	15	12	13					67	
BLK	34	41	43	18	17	6	35	53		68	35
HSP	46	46		43	21						
MUL				20							
WHT	76	52	36	58	43	44	79	82		94	75
FRL	43	43	43	32	27	14	55	66		69	39

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	663
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	73
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

SWD students in ELA showed the lowest performance. The biggest contributing factor was attendance for these students.

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

Math scores for white students showed the largest drop of all data points. Again, we found that attendance was the biggest issue along with a gap in instruction on our block schedule.

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.

The Algebra EOC scores showed the largest gap. This was not the case in previous years. The difference was that we increased the class size in 19-19 but have now split those students in two sections, year long for 19-20.

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

The geometry scores saw the biggest jump as we offered it in the fall term as opposed to the spring term. There was not a large gap in instruction.

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

Attendance and level 1 students.

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

1. Students with disabilities, ELA and math
2. Students with level 1 on ELA and/or math
3. Attendance for all students
4. Students who fail one or more ELA or math course
5. Gain scores in ELA and math for lowest 25%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Students with disabilities ELA
Rationale	This number of SWD students who passed the FSA ELA assessment decreased by 5 percentage points.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the passing rate on the FSA ELA assessment for students with disabilities by 3%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Schedule all level 1 and 2 SWD students in year-long language arts and reading instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our SWD students showed the largest drop in the FSA ELA passing rate. There were also the only subgroup that did not meet the baseline federal percent of points index.
Action Step	
Description	1. Identify SWD students who did not make a passing score on most recent FSA ELA assessment 2. Place identified students in year-long ELA and reading instruction, both fall and spring term on the block schedule 3. Schedule and IEP permitting, place identified students in a section of Learning Strategies for additional academic support in either the fall or spring term, or both. 4. Use FSA and AIMS data to identify specific areas to target for remediation.
Person Responsible	William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)

#2	
Title	Student on FRL ELA gain scores
Rationale	ELA gain scores for FRL students fell by 6 percentage points.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA gain scores for FRL students will increase by 5 percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Identified students will be placed in year-long ELA and reading instruction to avoid a gap in instruction. Students will also attend after-school tutoring or be pulled out of an elective period for one-on-one remediation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our FRL students were the only subgroup which had a decrease in gain scores.
Action Step	
Description	1. Identify FRL students who did not make a gain on most recent FSA ELA assessment from the previous year 2. Place identified students in year-long ELA and reading instruction, both fall and spring term on the block schedule 3. Use FSA and AIMS data to identify specific areas to target for remediation.
Person Responsible	William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)

#3	
Title	Students with level 1 on ELA or Math
Rationale	Early Warning Sign (EWS) data indicated students with a level 1 on a state-administered assessment was the largest group.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	50 % of these students will increase their achievement level in either math or ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cheryl Allen (allencs@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	All level one ELA and math students will be placed in year-long mathematics and/or ELA-reading instruction on the block schedule
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To avoid any gaps in ELA or math instruction. This was the most pressing EWS data point to address.
Action Step	
Description	1. Identify all level 1 math and ELA students 2. Schedule students for double time, year-long instruction in smaller classes. 3. Utilize FSA and AIMS data to differentiate instruction 4. Monitor subsequent test scores.
Person Responsible	William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)

#4	
Title	Math and ELA Achievement gap
Rationale	Although our math gap decreased by 16 % and ELA gap decreased by 7 %, we want to get both to zero.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Decrease the math and ELA achievement gap by 5%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	All level 1 and 2 students will take an extra math or ELA course during the 19-20 school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The extra math and/0r ELA course will provide a year-long learning experience and double the instructional time for our lowest level minority students.
Action Step	
Description	1. Identify all students of color who are at level 1 in ELA and/or mathematics 2. Schedule students in year-long math and/or ELA. 3. Analyze specific data to identify deficiencies 4. Design instruction based on data analysis. 5. Conduct periodic meetings for updates on performance and re-mediate as necessary
Person Responsible	Cheryl Allen (allencs@gm.sbac.edu)

#5	
Title	Minority enrollment in Career Academies
Rationale	Increase the number of minority students who attend one of the five Career Acadamies

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the diversity in all Academies by 2%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Identify minority students early in their 8th grade year and increase the number who are exposed to the various Career Academies at Loften. Continue to use the lottery system to provide additional opportunities for minority students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The percentage of minority students is less than that of non-minority students in CTE Academy programs at Loften .

Action Step	
Description	1. Collect data on the percentage of minority students in each Career Academy at Loften. 2. Reach out to 8th grade minority students to attend the CTE forum at BHS on November 14, 2019 3. Reach out to 8th grade minority students to attend the CTE forum at PAM@LHS on January 9, 2020. 4. Implement the lottery process with fidelity. 5. Implement strategies to retain minority students in CTE programs.
Person Responsible	William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)

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).

Career and acceleration and graduation rate data decreased from the previous year so we are making that a school focus for the 19-20 school year. Student transcripts and current schedules are being reviewed to determine which students have not received the acceleration credit.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

N/A

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students with disabilities ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student on FRL ELA gain scores	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students with level 1 on ELA or Math	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math and ELA Achievement gap	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Minority enrollment in Career Academies	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00