Professional Academy Magnet At Loften High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Professional Academy Magnet At Loften High School

3000 E UNIVERSITY AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

https://www.sbac.edu/loften

Demographics

Principal: Kristopher Bracewell

Start Date for this Principal: 9/9/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Professional Academy Magnet At Loften High School

3000 E UNIVERSITY AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

https://www.sbac.edu/loften

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	54%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McElroy, William	Principal	Master schedule, data analysis, student supervision, all others
Allen, Cheryl	Assistant Principal	Testing, schedules, parents, IEP and 504 meetings, all others duties as assigned
MIddleton, Dedra	Administrative Support	As assigned
Pearl, Chris	Teacher, K-12	Teaching, SAC Chair
Smith, Mark	Teacher, K-12	Fure EMS Director

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 9/9/2020, Kristopher Bracewell

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.*
19

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

19

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	65	66	54	279
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	9	25
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	1	2	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	16	9	2	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	11	8	6	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	9	9	2	42

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	

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	41	26	24	15	106
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

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

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	9	3	26

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	9	3	26

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	65%	59%	56%	57%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	52%	51%	47%	54%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	39%	42%	41%	42%	41%
Math Achievement	63%	54%	51%	42%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	57%	54%	48%	32%	41%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	48%	45%	25%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	80%	68%	68%	63%	65%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	75%	73%	74%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	68%	60%	8%	55%	13%
	2018	68%	58%	10%	53%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	63%	55%	8%	53%	10%
	2018	60%	60%	0%	53%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	66%	15%	67%	14%
2018	87%	68%	19%	65%	22%
Compare		-6%			

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

HISTORY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	71%	71%	0%	70%	1%
2018	69%	71%	-2%	68%	1%
Compare		2%			

ALGEBRA EOC

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

GEOMETRY EOC

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

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	37	36	35	50			30			
BLK	41	46	18	41	62		47	56		95	16
HSP	76	71		55							
MUL	50			80							
WHT	72	59	50	70	57	56	94	93		100	74
FRL	55	48	47	59	56	58	75	59		92	48

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	37	29				60				
BLK	38	49	35	40	27		67	36		88	47
HSP	67	67									
WHT	77	59		76	44		87	96		100	78
FRL	54	54	40	60	38	25	65	60		96	50

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	26	15	12	13					67	
BLK	34	41	43	18	17	6	35	53		68	35
HSP	46	46		43	21						
MUL				20							

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
WHT	76	52	36	58	43	44	79	82		94	75
FRL	43	43	43	32	27	14	55	66		69	39

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	663
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	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	73
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Career Acceleration, ELA-white, SWD ELA, F/R-ELA gains. We did not implement our school-wide literacy plan with as much fidelity as in years past

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

Math scores among white students. We are not sure what caused this decline

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.

SWD ELA scores.

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

ELA and math of the lowest 25% both had significant jumps. Year-long math and ELA for these students on the block schedule

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

The achievement gaps for students with disabilities and between white and black students

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

1. ELA achievement for SWD
2. Black math achievement
3. Career Acceleration, all students
4. F/R ELA gains
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The one subgroup that did not meet the Baseline Federal Percent of Points Index (BFPPI) were Students with Disabilities (SWD).
Measurable Outcome:	10% increase in both ELA and mathematics
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheryl Allen (allencs@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SWD will be scheduled in year-long ELA and/or year-long math for an 80 minute period for both fall and spring term. They will also be schedule in a Learning Strategies resource class during the term they take English
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These students should not experience a gap in instruction that may occur on a block schedule.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will be scheduled in all all year academic courses. Formative assessments will be conducted in the fall term class to establish a baseline for all students. Teachers will be trained on the RTI process for interventions.

Person Responsible	Cheryl Allen (allencs@gm.sbac.edu)

Students instructional plans will be individualized based on results and intervnetions

Person Responsible	Cheryl Allen (allencs@gm.sbac.edu)

Students will be monitored and retested as necessary.

Person Responsible	Cheryl Allen (allencs@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The achievement gap among white and black students has increased in math for a second consecutive year.
Measurable Outcome:	We want to see a 20% decrease this gap.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	These students will be scheduled on smaller classes in year-long mathematics and we will also utilize a pull out model for one-on one or small group tutoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These students should not experience a gap in instruction our block schedule. We will use additional teaching units.

Action Steps to Implement

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase the number of African American students in advanced courses.
Measurable Outcome:	African American enrollment in advanced courses will increase by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increasing the achievement of African American students by placing them in higher level courses.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Studies are clear that with the right tools and assistance, ALL students can successful in higher level courses.

Action Steps to Implement

African American students will be identified by teachers and administration and scheduled into higher level courses.

Person Responsible	William McElroy (mcelroywc@gm.sbac.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The other two ares of focus are to increase the ELA gain scores of our students on free and reduced lunch and increase attendance in our DA sections. We will identify FRL students and schedule them for year long interventions in Intensive Reading and Language Arts. We will use baseline assessment data to develop an individual plan for each student. We will also develop a better system for reaching out to DA students who are not not participating in their classes as scheduled.

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.

We are proud of the positive and inclusive culture that exists on PAM@LHS campus. We start by establishing high expectations for culture and behavior from the time a student arrives on our campus. All Loften students are associated with a Career Academy which becomes their small learning community for four years. Within this community, students establish strong relationships with each other and with their teachers. All students are expected to treat each other with respect and dignity and we have assemblies and presentations that stress these concepts. We also have various social and mental service professionals on campus at various times for students.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**