

Duval County Public Schools

# Pace Center For Girls Jax



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>17</b> |

## Pace Center For Girls Jax

2933 UNIVERSITY BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32211

<http://www.duvalschools.org/>

### Demographics

**Principal: Edward Robinson**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2020

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>6-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Alternative Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 44%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Black/African American Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students*         |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: No Grade<br>2017-18: No Grade<br>2016-17: No Grade<br>2015-16: No Grade |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | CS&I   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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](http://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

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>17</b> |

## Pace Center For Girls Jax

2933 UNIVERSITY BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32211

<http://www.duvalschools.org/>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School<br>6-12                              | No                     | %  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(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 Duval 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name             | Title                  | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|------------------|------------------------|--|
| Reed, Kimberly   | Administrative Support | Director of PACE school for Girls. She is responsible for the daily operation and function of the school and center.   |
| Robinson, Edward | Principal              | Is the instructional support for the district and acts as liaison for PACE and the district. Assists with instructional implementation and academic protocols. |
| Parker, LaTonya  | Assistant Principal    | Is the instructional support for the district and acts as liaison for PACE and the district. Assists with instructional implementation and academic protocols. |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/29/2020, Edward Robinson

**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.*

**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.*

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

#### Demographic Data

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>6-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Alternative Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 44%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Black/African American Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students*         |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: No Grade<br>2017-18: No Grade<br>2016-17: No Grade<br>2015-16: No Grade |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | CS&I   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## 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 | 2 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 1  | 9 | 13    |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 0  | 3 | 5     |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 1     |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1 | 2     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 1     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1 | 2     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 1     |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 1  | 3 |       |

**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 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 3  | 1  | 26 |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 16 | 1  | 4  | 40 |       |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 7/29/2020

**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 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 18 | 13 | 13 | 1  | 60 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 1  | 2  | 1  | 0  | 5  |       |
| 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  | 4  | 5  | 8  | 0  | 17 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 4  | 6  | 8  | 0  | 18 |       |

**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 | 4 | 8 | 18 | 10 | 10 | 0  | 51 |       |

**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 | 6 | 4  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

**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 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 18 | 13 | 13 | 1  | 60    |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 1  | 2  | 1  | 0  | 5     |
| 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  | 4  | 5  | 8  | 0  | 17    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 4  | 6  | 8  | 0  | 18    |

**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 | 4 | 8 | 18 | 10 | 10 | 0  | 51    |

**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 | 6 | 4  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

**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%     | 47%      | 56%   | 0%     | 46%      | 53%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 0%     | 48%      | 51%   | 0%     | 45%      | 49%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 0%     | 42%      | 42%   | 0%     | 39%      | 41%   |
| Math Achievement            | 0%     | 51%      | 51%   | 0%     | 59%      | 49%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 0%     | 52%      | 48%   | 0%     | 52%      | 44%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 0%     | 47%      | 45%   | 0%     | 45%      | 39%   |
| Science Achievement         | 0%     | 65%      | 68%   | 0%     | 64%      | 65%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 0%     | 70%      | 73%   | 0%     | 64%      | 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 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 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 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 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                                       | 27       |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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  | 14   |
| 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                                       | 86   |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 6    |
| Percent Tested  | 83%  |

| 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% | 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 |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

| 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%     | 0   |
| 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   | 14  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 2   |
| 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% | 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.**

The ELA data showed the lowest performance. The contributing factors include but not limited to multiple grade levels behind; attendance; inappropriate behaviors; juvenile delinquency; and foster care.

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

Math showed the greatest decline from the prior year. The contributing factors include but not limited to multiple grade levels behind; attendance; inappropriate behaviors; juvenile delinquency; and foster care.

**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.**

Math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Pace Center for Girls Jacksonville average for 2019-20 school year was 25%. The contributing factors to this achievement gap are students come multiple grade levels behind, have poor attendance, exemplified poor behavior both academically and socially, are involved with juvenile delinquency and are part of the Foster Care System.

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

Reading and grade recovery showed the most improvement in our programs. When students are enrolled they get a credit check within 3 days of enrollment. The student is then enrolled in all classes that will work toward graduation requirements only. (No enrollment in classes that can't assist in meeting graduation requirement)

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

Reading and Math is the major concern for Pace Center for Girls Jacksonville. They are the main contributing factors for meeting promotion and graduation requirements. We have a major focus in these areas and are utilizing the district's academic platforms for remediation, grade recovery and promotion.

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

1. Attendance
2. Reading
3. Math
4. Grade Recovery
5. Promotion rate

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Differentiation of instruction in Math and Reading will be the areas of focus for the upcoming school year. Differentiated classrooms respond to student variety in readiness levels, interests, and learning profiles. If this area improves so will student achievement. It allows all students to be successful.<br>Rationale:<br>Teachers have multiple preparations of subject area content; Example: M/J Math, Algebra 1, Algebra 2, and Geometry are taught simultaneously. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | The measurable outcomes will be shown by improved WIN Assessment scores, Math and ELA gains on district and state EOC assessments, and improved promotion rate.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | LaTonya Parker (parkerl@duvalschools.org)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Teachers will use the District provided curriculum including but not limited to the blended learning platforms to enhance the instructional outcomes of the students. Curriculum mapping, inquiry-based learning, and the PLATO instructional software will also be implemented.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Students vary in culture, socioeconomic status, language, gender, motivation, ability/disability, learning styles, personal interests and more, and teachers must be aware of these varieties as they plan in accordance with the curricula. By considering varied learning needs, teachers can develop lessons and provide instruction so that all students in the classroom can learn effectively.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Professional development to support student engagement and differentiation.
2. Quarterly Professional Development will be provided to assist teachers in cross-curricular lesson plan development.
3. Teachers will incorporate the four (4) pillars of instruction, (Full engagement, rigorous content, student ownership, and demonstration of student learning), with an emphasis on student engagement.
4. Professional Development will be used to development multiple strategies for lesson plan development.
5. In-service days will be used for teacher collaboration and provide the opportunity for teachers to learn differentiation strategies used in various classrooms.

**Person Responsible** LaTonya Parker (parkerl@duvalschools.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Standards based instruction is an area of focus for the 2020-2021 academic year. Standards based alignment will assist students in grade level mastery of the academic standards and improved instructional outcomes. Standards based alignment will ensure that the student academic task will align with the expectation of the standard as the student works toward mastery of the standard.

**Measurable Outcome:** The measurable outcomes will be shown by improved WIN Assessment scores, Math and ELA gains on district and state EOC assessments, and improved promotion rate.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Edward Robinson (robinson2@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will use the District provided curriculum including but not limited to the blended learning platforms to enhance the instructional outcomes of the students. Curriculum mapping, inquiry-based learning, and the PLATO instructional software will also be implemented.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

Title I funds will be used to purchase additional technology such as computers and interactive monitors to promote standards based alignment through the use of digital platforms such as PLATO, Duval Homeroom and other blended learning platform.

**Person Responsible** Edward Robinson (robinson2@duvalschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

NA

**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.

School culture is one of the most impactful contributors to perceptions of a successful school. The culture of a school has far-reaching impacts on every aspect of the organization. Student achievement, teacher effectiveness, parent involvement, community support are all affected by the explicit and implicit cultural attributes of the school. We will create a teacher leadership that utilizes the strengths of your staff members for school improvement. Being intentional about teacher leadership opportunities is fundamental to creating a culture of growth and opportunity. In conjunction with teacher leadership, professional learning opportunities are a powerful way to boost school culture. To generate a culture of learning and growth for all, the teaching and learning of adults must be an integral part of the learning cycle in the school. Parent seminars, teacher training, student teacher partnerships and mentoring will be an integrated part of adult learning, which will model the learning cycle for students. Teacher leadership will be implemented through Professional Learning Community (PLC) to focus on various aspects of teaching and learning. When focusing on school culture, student perceptions of the school can positively and negatively influence everything from student behavior to teacher motivation. To create a student-centered school culture, we will strategically create opportunities for student leadership and seek out unique ways to engage students in non-traditional roles. Community perception is the undercurrent for school marketing, school image and student enrollment, and these all have direct impacts on school culture. From creating a career day that celebrates community members to recruiting classroom volunteers from the community to asking for parent support, are some of the ways we will engage the school community.

#### **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: Differentiation               | \$0.00 |
| 2      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |   | \$0.00 |