

Escambia County School District

Success Academy



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 | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 16 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

Success Academy

7045 WYMART RD, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Dawn Gibbs B

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 | 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* Multiracial Students* White 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 | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 16 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

Success Academy

7045 WYMART RD, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 6-12</p> | <p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Alternative Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">%</p> |

School Grades History

Year
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.

At Success Academy we believe that all students can be successful and that the first step in achieving success is believing that you are capable of success. Our purpose is to create an environment where students can work at their own pace in rigorous and relevant coursework to develop a sense of ownership over their own learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Success Academy believes that we have the responsibility to our students to accept them as individuals, to assess their needs and interests, and to provide a varied well-organized curriculum which will promote positive academic, social, physical, and emotional growth. We strive to create a safe environment with meaningful educational opportunities that motivate students at all levels to achieve at their highest potential. We recognize that adolescents are experiencing a transition marked by rapid changes in physical growth, relationships with peers and adults, perception of themselves, and formation of values. In conjunction with the family and community, the ultimate goal of Success Academy is to help students to become responsible and empowered citizens.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Gibbs, Dawn | Principal | Responsible for overseeing the planning process and the implementation of the School Improvement Plan through responsible management of school resources. |
| Joiner, David | Assistant Principal | Assist Principal in development and implementation of the SIP. |
| Carter, Pam | Teacher, K-12 | Assist is the data collection and planning for implementation of SIP |
| Roberts, Allison | Teacher, K-12 | ELA teacher to assist with data and planning for ELA instructional changes. |

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 | 7 | 18 | 25 | 29 | 69 | 23 | 10 | 181 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 18 | 59 | 16 | 8 | 126 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 30 | 14 | 7 | 68 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 40 | 13 | 5 | 71 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 22 | 17 | 65 | 20 | 6 | 151 |

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 | 6 | 17 | 25 | 26 | 68 | 23 | 9 | 174 |

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 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 24 | 2 | 1 | 44 |

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

16

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/22/2019

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 | 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 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 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 | 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% | 49% | 56% | 0% | 48% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 0% | 47% | 51% | 0% | 45% | 49% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 0% | 33% | 42% | 0% | 33% | 41% |
| Math Achievement | 0% | 42% | 51% | 0% | 43% | 49% |
| Math Learning Gains | 0% | 48% | 48% | 0% | 41% | 44% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 0% | 41% | 45% | 0% | 33% | 39% |
| Science Achievement | 0% | 59% | 68% | 0% | 60% | 65% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 0% | 62% | 73% | 0% | 62% | 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 | 7 (0) | 18 (0) | 25 (0) | 29 (0) | 69 (0) | 23 (0) | 10 (0) | 181 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 () | 9 () | 11 () | 18 () | 59 () | 16 () | 8 () | 126 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 8 (0) | 9 (0) | 30 (0) | 14 (0) | 7 (0) | 68 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 13 (0) | 40 (0) | 13 (0) | 5 (0) | 71 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 5 (0) | 16 (0) | 22 (0) | 17 (0) | 65 (0) | 20 (0) | 6 (0) | 151 (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% | 42% | -42% | 54% | -54% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 40% | -40% | 52% | -52% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 6% | 43% | -37% | 52% | -46% |
| | 2018 | 8% | 41% | -33% | 51% | -43% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 12% | 50% | -38% | 56% | -44% |
| | 2018 | 23% | 51% | -28% | 58% | -35% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 09 | 2019 | 14% | 48% | -34% | 55% | -41% |
| | 2018 | 9% | 49% | -40% | 53% | -44% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 18% | 48% | -30% | 53% | -35% |
| | 2018 | 14% | 49% | -35% | 53% | -39% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 0% | 36% | -36% | 55% | -55% |
| | 2018 | 0% | 36% | -36% | 52% | -52% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 6% | 50% | -44% | 54% | -48% |
| | 2018 | 17% | 45% | -28% | 54% | -37% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 11% | 21% | -10% | 46% | -35% |
| | 2018 | 4% | 24% | -20% | 45% | -41% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 0% | 42% | -42% | 48% | -48% |
| | 2018 | 17% | 45% | -28% | 50% | -33% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -17% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 24% | 58% | -34% | 67% | -43% |
| 2018 | 37% | 57% | -20% | 65% | -28% |
| Compare | | -13% | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 11% | 54% | -43% | 71% | -60% |
| 2018 | 14% | 51% | -37% | 71% | -57% |
| Compare | | -3% | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 9% | 62% | -53% | 70% | -61% |
| 2018 | 42% | 65% | -23% | 68% | -26% |
| Compare | | -33% | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 14% | 52% | -38% | 61% | -47% |
| 2018 | 30% | 51% | -21% | 62% | -32% |
| Compare | | -16% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 21% | 47% | -26% | 57% | -36% |
| 2018 | 33% | 48% | -15% | 56% | -23% |
| Compare | | -12% | | | |

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 | | 22 | | | 53 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 4 | 35 | | 10 | 23 | | | | | 20 | |
| WHT | 14 | 32 | | 15 | 44 | | | | | 43 | |
| FRL | 9 | 24 | | 11 | 39 | | 13 | 8 | | 33 | |

| 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 | 21 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 166 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 85% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 19 |
| 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 | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 18 |
| 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 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 | 30 |
| 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 | 20 |
| 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 data was only at 32% learning gains, which was a 4% increase from 17-18, but still much too low. The greatest contributing factor was the fact that we had purchased Language Live last year to use with students and the company was never able to get our information straight so we could enroll our students. Therefore we didn't have a specific reading curriculum.

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

Within the ELA learning gains there was an overall gain of 3% for total students but a 7% drop for economically disadvantaged students and a 18.6% drop for female students. Part of this can be attributed to our low numbers and the large impact that only 3 students can make, but again the issues with not having a systematic reading program in place was seen as the greatest contributing factor to the decline across the board.

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 greatest gap between our learning gains and the state average was with ELA, which for the state was 51% and for us was 32%. Again those issues are being linked to the lack of systematic ELA reading instruction due to lack of proper curriculum.

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

Math overall learning gains went from 34% in 2018 to 44% in 2019. The greatest growth took place for our students with disabilities. Those students went from 26.9% learning gains in 2018 to 53.3% learning gains in 2019. During the last year we worked on math remediation daily in every classroom with specific intense instruction for those students preparing for the Algebra EOC. There was also the addition of an ESE paraprofessional who worked with students individually, particularly on math concepts.

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

Of the greatest concern from our EWS data is the fact that 96% of our students have 2 or more indicators which means there are multiple areas of concern, including the fact that 24% have been retained 2 or more times and that 83% are a level 1 on statewide assessments in either math or ELA.

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

1. Create a climate where reading instruction is intense and consistent
2. Provide support for students to feel emotionally secure in their environment in order to reach a level where we can focus on academic success.
3. Continue building on strategies in math instruction that helps students to grow in their knowledge and develop deeper understanding.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| #1 | |
|---|--|
| Title | ELA Learning Gains |
| Rationale | Greatest area of need from the previous year and always a concern for school wide growth in all curriculum areas. From 17-18 to 18-19 our students' learning gains in ELA overall went from 29.3% to 30.2%, with the lowest quartile going from 33.3% in 17-18 to 40% in 18-19. But for the Economically Disadvantaged students there was a decline from 30% to 23.7% and Students with Disabilities went from 25% to only 21.7%. African American students learning gains went from 30% to 34.8% while white students only went from 30.4% to 31.8%. Male students went from 25.6% to 33.3% but female students went from 40% to only 21.4% learning gains from 17-18 to 18-19. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | 50% of all students should achieve learning gains in ELA. We would prefer to see an overall rise across all of the categories of students consistently. Economically Disadvantaged students need to have at least 40% gains, while Students with Disabilities should be 40-45%. There should also be a more even distribution between males and females with an expected gain of 50% across both categories. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Dawn Gibbs (dgibbs@ecsdfi.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Identify teachers whose STAR AP1 reading data reflect that less than 41% of their students are proficient in the area of ELA. Collaborate with the ELA Department to provide coaching support. "Provide faculty and staff with professional development in the following areas and monitor implementation through classroom visits and walkthroughs. Writing Instruction Reading Interventions for Substantial Reading Difficulties Training on Snap&Read " STAR 360 interval testing provides teachers with data on student's ELA performance and needs and will assist us in providing appropriate supports to meet student needs. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Based on STAR 360 data we will work with the district ELA department to provide professional development for teachers and monitor implementation in the areas of student need. For students with disabilities that require "read to" instruction we will obtain training for teachers on implementing this strategy through Snap & Read training through the district ESE department. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. STAR 360 calendar for testing and data review 2. Collaborate with ELA department to determine calendar for PD 3. 2. Committee meetings to review data from monitoring and develop plan of action 4. Implementation of strategies with students. 5. Monitor progress |
| Person Responsible | Dawn Gibbs (dgibbs@ecsdfi.us) |

| | |
|---|---|
| #2 | |
| Title | Math Learning Gains |
| Rationale | Even with 44% learning gains in math from the previous year that is still below the state average. The Economically Disadvantaged students went from 29.4% in 17-18 to 39.1% in 18-19. Students with Disabilities went from 26.9% learning gains in math to 53.3%. African American students went from 32% to only 23.1% while white students went from 36.4% to 43.8%. The growth was more consistent between male and female students with females going from 30.8% to 36.4% and males going from 31.6% to 34.8%. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | 50% of students will achieve learning gains in math. The goal for the Economically Disadvantaged students will be to reach the 50% mark while continuing to work with the Students with Disabilities to reach the 60% level. There should be a greater consistency between black and white students with the goal for each being 50% learning gains. We would also like to strive for 50% learning gains for the male and female students. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Dawn Gibbs (dgibbs@ecsdfi.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Provide professional development through the mathematics department focused on the shifts of the standards and the implementation of instructional practices to allow students to learn the content of the standard. For example, understanding the aspect of rigor and applying it within the classroom. The professional development will be followed up with classroom walks with the administration and the math department to identify the shifts and implementation with feedback given to the teachers. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | The gains that students achieved in 18-19 were directly correlated between teachers increasing the rigor and regularity of math instruction in the class room. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instruction and testing calendar to monitor student progress. 2. Committee meetings to review data from monitoring and develop plan of action 3. Implementation of strategies with students. 4. Monitor progress 5. |
| Person Responsible | Dawn Gibbs (dgibbs@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).

School Safety- Establish a school safety committee and work with other schools and agencies to better prepare our campus, staff, and students for intruders, fire, weather, or other emergency situations. Using VOLO app by staff to notify others of campus emergencies.

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 schedule an individual orientation with every family prior to enrollment to ensure an understanding of how our school and processes work. During that orientation families are provided with the linked information to our social media pages and given the principal's personal cell phone number. If families indicate that coming to the school is a problem we also contract with a taxi service to ensure that every family can have transportation.

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.

Our guidance department has a process in place that makes counseling request forms available to all students who might have a social, emotional, or academic needs. Students fill out the form, submit it to the guidance office, and the guidance counselor schedules a time to meet with the student. Our students also have access to Suite360, which provides resources on a variety of topics that are beneficial in addressing the social-emotional challenges that many of our students encounter. Proactive steps are also taken by teachers when they encounter students who exhibit behavior that is contrary to school-wide expectations, or considered uncharacteristic for that student. Teachers and staff report to guidance and/or school administrator with an concerns, and contact is made with those students to determine what interventions are needed to improve the child's current state. These interventions may include parent conference, teacher-student conference, referral to our on-site mental health counselor, developing behavior/academic strategies and goals for the student, and connecting child with a mentor or community agencies/resources.

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

During the orientation process the student/family and principal discuss graduation options and develop a plan for implementation. That plan is revisited at the end of each semester with each student. We also meet with each student to develop a plan when they are moving back to another school where we meet with the intaking counselor to discuss the goals and plans already discussed, student progress, and needs for the future.

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.

School staff collaborate weekly to discuss the current academic and behavior deficits that many of our students face. At the mid-nine week mark of each nine week period, teachers submit a list of students who are currently failing or in danger of failing. Our guidance and school administrators take each list

and meet with those students to identify what subjects each student is struggling in, what resources or interventions might be helpful, and discuss a strategy for moving forward to ensure student success.

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

We work with our campus neighbor George Stone Technical College to provide career training opportunities for students by having them dual enroll with the college in career courses while still attending our high school. Each semester we have eligible students participate in interest surveys and take students to visit the college to determine interest in a particular program of study. Students then may enroll for the following semester. Former and current students also visit the school to discuss their experiences within the academies. We have business partners come in to discuss possible training opportunities for students that may be outside of the college, like Gulf Power and Navy Federal Credit Union.

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains | | | | \$10,000.00 |
|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 0866 - Success Academy | Title, I Part A | 181.0 | \$10,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Teachers will attend Kagan training to better support and engage students in all areas of the curriculum including Reading.</i> | | | |
| | | | 0866 - Success Academy | | 181.0 | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains | | | | \$5,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 6400 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 0866 - Success Academy | Title, I Part A | | \$5,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Teachers will continue to provide tutoring to students on a quarterly basis and to meet with parents to provide training in how to assist their students.</i> | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$15,000.00 |