

Escambia County School District

Pace Program



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pace Program

1028 UNDERWOOD AVE, Pensacola, FL 32504

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Laurie Rodgers

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2019

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	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)	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	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Pace Program

1028 UNDERWOOD AVE, Pensacola, FL 32504

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)
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 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.

Pace provides girls and young women an opportunity for a better future through education, counseling, training and advocacy.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pace values all girls and young women, believing each one deserves an opportunity to find her voice, achieve her potential and celebrate a life defined by responsibility, dignity, serenity and grace.

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
Gentry, Brandi	Other	Program Director: Oversees the academic and social services departments of the program. Conducts professional development for staff and oversees the intake and transition departments of the program to ensure girls are being served adequately.
Rodgers, Laurie	Other	Regional Executive Director: Oversees the funding and functionalities of the program. Provides trainings per DJJ and DCF requirements. Oversees managers of the program and leads fundraising.

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	2	5	15	16	14	3	0	55	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	7	4	5	0	31	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	2	2	0	13	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	6	2	0	26	

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	1	3	7	6	4	3	0	24

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	2	4	7	10	4	3	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	8	2	3	0	20

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

6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/12/2019

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%	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	2 (0)	5 (0)	15 (0)	16 (0)	14 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	55 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 ()	6 ()	8 ()	7 ()	4 ()	5 ()	0 ()	31 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	13 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	10 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	9 (0)	6 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	26 (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					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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
WHT	8										
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	12
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	47
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	86%

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	
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	
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	8
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	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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.

Our white population showed the lowest on the federal index at 8%; however, our FSA data shows less than 30% for math learning gains 6-10 and less than 30% for ELA learning gains for 9-10. Over 80% of our girls come to us with academic deficiencies and as Level 1 or 2 in both Math and ELA. Our girls also have risk factors in mental health, poverty, physical/emotional abuse, attendance, and substance abuse. We are not guaranteed to have our girls any length of time, since this is a voluntary program. We only serve 55-60 girls at a time and had a total of 130 served in 2018-2019.

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

We had a decline in our white population performance. This is due to our fluid enrollment, risk factors the girls were facing and attendance.

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.

75% of our white population was a Level 1. We have less numbers than the average school and 85% or more of our population is in the lowest quartile of an average school. Our girls enrollment is constantly shifting, due to being a voluntary program.

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

Our ELA Learning Gains improved. We rearranged how we grouped the girls (middle and high school) to rotate to their classes and we shifted from solely teacher lead instruction to using FuelEd (Peak) and ALS (A+) platforms for our middle and high school core courses.

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

We have frequent turnover due to being year-round, military area, and the high risk population we serve.

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

1. Academic Improvement
2. Attendance Improvement
3. Teacher Retention

4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title White Population Academic Performance

Rationale Our white population was 8% on the Federal Index.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Improve the white population on the Federal Index to 32% or higher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

We will incorporate small groups that are standard-based in our ELA and Reading classes, as well as Math classes.

"Provide faculty and staff with professional development in the following areas, and monitor implementation through classroom visits and walkthroughs.

Assessment and Determining Next Steps

Content Area Literacy Strategies

Unpacking Standards and Sequencing Instruction

Reading Interventions for Substantial Reading Difficulties

Math:

Provide professional development through the mathematics department focused on standard based planning with the aspect of rigor linked. Teachers have had the opportunity to unpack standards, so the next step would be to repack the standards. The follow up would include classroom walks in collaboration with the administrative team to calibrate the lens for math expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

The girls will be identified based on the FSA and STAR reports for standards they are not proficient in. This will allow for a 1:3 teacher/student ratio. We will monitor this by STAR testing every 12 weeks and participating in the school district's progress monitoring testing through SchoolNet. We will monitor implementation through walk-throughs and teacher 1:1's.

Action Step

Description

1. Examine current girl's FSA/STAR Reports in ELA and Math.
2. Professional Development on small groups for teachers, deconstructing standards, lesson planning for small groups.
3. Monitor girl's data throughout the year: STAR, SchoolNet, Classroom Assessments.
4. Adjust small groups lessons based on girl/s data.
- 5.

Person Responsible

Brandi Gentry (bgentry@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).

All girls will participate in the small groups during ELA, Reading and Math. We will also monitor attendance through our counselors and continue to work through our PBIS incentive process.