

Escambia County School District

Success Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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
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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Success Academy

7045 WYMART RD, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	Yes	%
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.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Dawn Gibbs B

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

17

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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
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 .	

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	5	14	15	24	31	23	3	115	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	10	15	21	7	2	67	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	8	5	6	1	27	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	3	6	1	15	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	1	9	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	14	17	19	4	70	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	13	7	2	0	39	

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	2	4	8	8	12	3	37

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	3	9	6	8	15	20	2	63

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/14/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**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		
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

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		
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	

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	
	(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.

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%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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
SWD		22			53						
BLK	4	35		10	23					20	
WHT	14	32		15	44					43	
FRL	9	24		11	39		13	8		33	
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		22			53						
BLK	4	35		10	23					20	
WHT	14	32		15	44					43	
FRL	9	24		11	39		13	8		33	

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

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	2
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	1
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%	2

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 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 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.

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

Math overall learning gains went from 34% to 44%. The greatest growth took place for our students with disabilities. Those students went from 26.9% to 53.3% in learning gains. We have been providing math remediation daily in every classroom with specific intense instruction for students preparing for the Algebra I EOC. There has also been a paraprofessional added to work specifically with our ESE population.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

32% of our students currently have 2 or more indicators. With the number of students we have that struggle academically the amount of time they have been away from instruction is a grave concern.

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

1. Provide support for students to feel emotionally secure in their environment in order to reach level where we can focus on academic success.
2. Provide a climate where reading instruction is intense and consistent.
3. Provide additional math remedial instruction for all students
4. Provide more opportunities for career exploration
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This became our area of focus based on the 30% of learning gains for students in their last ELA testing.

Measurable Outcome: Student gains in reading will improve by 5% to move students from 30% to at least 35% gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dawn Gibbs (dgibbs@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Provide explicit vocabulary instruction
2. Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction
3. Make available intensive and individualized interventions for struggling readers that can be provided by trained specialists.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices found on What Works Clearinghouse; explicit vocabulary instruction, providing direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction and making intensive and individualized interventions for struggling readers are all strategies that have a strong positive effect on student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All staff will be trained in the use of specific vocabulary instruction within their content area and during remedial reading instruction time. During the bi-weekly meetings that follow staff will also receive training in direct and explicit comprehension strategies in content area.

Person Responsible Dawn Gibbs (dgibbs@ecsdfi.us)

2. Classroom walkthroughs and evidence of student work will determine if teachers are providing vocabulary instruction and instruction in the use of comprehension strategies.

Person Responsible Dawn Gibbs (dgibbs@ecsdfi.us)

3. The STAR 360 test given quarterly will provide monitoring of student progress to determine successfulness of strategies.

Person Responsible Allison Roberts (aroberts@escambia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Leadership team will also work to assure that the strategies provided through the Emotional Poverty workshop are being implemented to insure that students are improving in their ability to remain in class being ready to receive instruction.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

All students who enter our school go through an orientation that includes the parent/guardian, principal or designee, and the student. Expectations are clearly documented, academic history is reviewed for both parent/guardian and student to assure that nothing has been missed and that students have a clear understanding of what they must do to become successful. Teachers and administrators provide parents with clear avenues of communication so that information can be readily passed between home and school. Teachers have been trained in the use of Capturing Kids Hearts, Emotional Poverty, and Response to Trauma in order to be able to properly understand how best to react to students and parents/guardians.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00