

Escambia County School District

Achieve Academy At McMillian



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Achieve Academy At Mcmillian

3000 OWEN BELL LANE, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Wooten

Start Date for this Principal: 6/18/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
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	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Escambia 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	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Achieve Academy At Mcmillian

3000 OWEN BELL LANE, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

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)
Combination School KG-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	2011-12
Grade	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

Camelot & KAPS Academy of Escambia Mission Statement

Camelot Education is deeply committed to the academic and social success of its students. Through partnerships with school districts across the country, we focus on re engaging, graduating, and preparing students for success in K-12 and beyond.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Camelot & KAPS Academy of Escambia Vision Statement

Camelot & KAPS Academy of Escambia County's vision is to provide students with a learning environment that integrates research-based instructional strategies and a normative school culture model that challenges students to achieve success, both academically and socially, by encompassing high expectations and accountability standards for all stakeholders.

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
Travis, Leslie	Principal	The Principal is the overall academic leader of the campus and responsible for promoting growth in students' learning by setting clear goals for the academic program, allocating resources to instruction, managing the curriculum, monitoring lesson plans and evaluating Teachers. The Principal supervises all Teachers and other instruction staff. The principal ensures compliance with all contract standards which specifically describe deliverables for student academic growth as outlined in the service agreement with the District by developing and monitoring campus improvement planning activities. The Principal is a member of the Leadership Team and works collaboratively with other resource team members to ensure a high-quality program.

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	3	4	13	7	12	11	33	44	27	16	11	2	183	
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	
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	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/18/2019

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%	64%	61%	0%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	51%	59%	0%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	41%	54%	0%	9%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	65%	62%	0%	59%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	47%	59%	0%	35%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	0%	52%	0%	0%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	71%	56%	0%	70%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	69%	78%	0%	84%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	13 (0)	7 (0)	12 (0)	11 (0)	33 (0)	44 (0)	27 (0)	16 (0)	11 (0)	2 (0)	183 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	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 (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)	0 (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)	0 (0)	0 (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
03	2019	0%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	6%	52%	-46%	58%	-52%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	0%	51%	-51%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	10%	42%	-32%	54%	-44%
	2018	0%	40%	-40%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
07	2019	0%	43%	-43%	52%	-52%
	2018	9%	41%	-32%	51%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	20%	50%	-30%	56%	-36%
	2018	12%	51%	-39%	58%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
09	2019	0%	48%	-48%	55%	-55%
	2018	6%	49%	-43%	53%	-47%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
10	2019	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	55%	-55%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	62%	-62%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	58%	-58%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	55%	-55%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	4%	36%	-32%	55%	-51%
	2018	3%	36%	-33%	52%	-49%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
07	2019	17%	50%	-33%	54%	-37%
	2018	8%	45%	-37%	54%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	3%	21%	-18%	46%	-43%
	2018	0%	24%	-24%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
	2018	10%	55%	-45%	55%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	10%	42%	-32%	48%	-38%
	2018	11%	45%	-34%	50%	-39%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	58%	-58%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	3%	54%	-51%	71%	-68%
2018	9%	51%	-42%	71%	-62%
Compare		-6%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	62%	-62%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	5%	52%	-47%	61%	-56%
2018	5%	51%	-46%	62%	-57%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	47%	-47%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	48%	-48%	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
SWD	5	19		4	35					8	
BLK	10	14	18	7	24	47				22	
FRL	12	18	18	9	26	47				22	
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	16
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	148
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	90%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	10
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	16
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	17
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.

Overall we believe it is hard to determine if outlined subgroups are correct. Our students are assigned to Camelot on a weekly basis and we lose student throughout the year to DJJ, DJJ Programs, Home School, returning back to the regular school.

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

Overall we believe it is hard to determine if outlined subgroups are correct. Our students are assigned to Camelot on a weekly basis and we lose student throughout the year to DJJ, DJJ Programs, Home School, returning back to the regular school.

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.

Overall we believe it is hard to determine if outlined subgroups are correct. Our students are assigned to Camelot on a weekly basis and we lose student throughout the year to DJJ, DJJ Programs, Home School, returning back to the regular school.

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

Overall we believe it is hard to determine if outlined subgroups are correct. Our students are assigned to Camelot on a weekly basis and we lose student throughout the year to DJJ, DJJ Programs, Home School, returning back to the regular school. Even though our third grade, black male and low socioeconomic group made huge impacts in learning gains for the 2018-2019 school year.

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

Overall we see all areas are a concern. With our fluctuating population it is hard to maintain students and to ensure they make learning gains when they are not in our school for the entire year.

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

1. Monitor students that need credit recovery and are over age in their current grade.
2. Ensuring ESE students are receiving more individualized and small group instruction.
- 3.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Promotions/Credit Deficiencies
Rationale	Monitor and evaluate every student sent to Camelot to see where they are lacking credits. Allow as many students as possible to participate in credit recovery or virtual classes to ensure they are able to catch up or recover credit.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Goal will be measured by the number of students that recover a credit or course.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Leslie Travis (ltravis@ecsdfi.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	FOCUS - use of the ALS software as well as EVA (virtual school)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Most students referred to Camelot are over-age (having been retained in one or more grades) and are missing credits.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Audit each student's grades/credits earned 2. Determine how students will recover credit and through which program 3. Monitor students work and turn in grade recovery forms 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Leslie Travis (ltravis@ecsdfi.us)

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).

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.

We have several events throughout the school year where parents are invited to participate. We also require parent contact weekly for students and communicate with parents as often as possible.

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.

We offer on site counseling for all students as well as have girls and boys social emotional groups.

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

Meetings are held between our school and the transitioning school. We communicate clearly how the student has met goals for transition.

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.

Teachers participate in weekly PD to ensure understanding of standards. PD is also provided for our teachers in the area of ESE and IEP accommodations; specifically how to provide accommodations and what it looks like. Teachers also attend training in the school district and with their direct departments within the district.

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

Mentors visit our school often, promoting college and success. We talk about next steps with each of our high school students and bring in guest speakers to share and provide options for all high school students (military, technical school, college).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Promotions/Credit Deficiencies	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00