The School District of Lee County

Success Academy

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Success Academy

3650 MICHIGAN AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33916

http://sca.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Tommy Bowens

Start Date for this Principal: 10/25/2017

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)	
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	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Lee 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

Success Academy

3650 MICHIGAN AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33916

http://sca.leeschools.net/

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 Lee 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.

To guide students with the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in our community and our complex world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To prepare every student for success in school and in life.

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
Bowens, Tommy	Principal	Head of School Leadership Team. Invests in the school mission statement while providing guidance and oversight to all employees at the location. Provides the over-reaching school vision in conjunction with the Leadership Team and all school stakeholders such as teachers, employees, parents and families, and business and community partners.
Harris, Michael	Assistant Principal	Assistant to the Head of the School Leadership Team. Invests in the school mission and vision statements while providing guidance and care to all employees at the location. Assists with the management involving aligning all school goals and mission to the District's vision. Monitors and assists with he compliance for engaging, inspiring, and evaluating credible teaching and support staff.
Rios, Francheska	Teacher, K-12	Assists the Leadership Team Head and Assistant to the Head to help promote, inspire, and align the school to its' mission and vision. Assists the faculty to inspire and motivate student success. A school stakeholder who participates in helping involve school stakeholders in making decisions to align with school vision.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 10/25/2017, Tommy Bowens

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

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)	
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	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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	2	4	30	8	23	17	3	87
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	7	17	15	5	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	30	8	23	17	3	87
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	7	6	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	7	6	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	11	9	1	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	12	2	2	29

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	24	7	17	15	3	71

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	10	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	2	0	0	11

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 10/21/2020

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	32	55	88	73	64	47	1	360
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	42	69	51	48	35	0	273
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	43	72	48	39	33	0	263
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	18	12	0	56
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	39	56	41	49	34	0	239

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	28	47	72	58	39	38	0	282

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	14	0	0	0	1	15
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	32	55	88	73	64	47	1	360
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	42	69	51	48	35	0	273
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	43	72	48	39	33	0	263
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	18	12	0	56
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	39	56	41	49	34	0	239

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	28	47	72	58	39	38	0	282

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	14	0	0	0	1	15
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	0%	55%	56%	0%	53%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	49%	51%	0%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	37%	42%	0%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	50%	51%	0%	41%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	45%	48%	0%	34%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	43%	45%	0%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	62%	68%	0%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	67%	73%	0%	63%	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	17%	52%	-35%	54%	-37%
	2018	13%	51%	-38%	52%	-39%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	8%	51%	-43%	52%	-44%
	2018	7%	50%	-43%	51%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	15%	57%	-42%	56%	-41%
	2018	10%	56%	-46%	58%	-48%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
09	2019	15%	51%	-36%	55%	-40%
	2018	13%	51%	-38%	53%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
10	2019	13%	48%	-35%	53%	-40%
	2018	6%	50%	-44%	53%	-47%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	19%	47%	-28%	55%	-36%
	2018	10%	41%	-31%	52%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	8%	57%	-49%	54%	-46%
	2018	8%	65%	-57%	54%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	5%	60%	-55%	46%	-41%
	2018	2%	47%	-45%	45%	-43%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	5%	46%	-41%	48%	-43%
	2018	6%	48%	-42%	50%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	7%	56%	-49%	67%	-60%
2018	4%	61%	-57%	65%	-61%
Compare	3%				

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	4%	67%	-63%	71%	-67%
2018	14%	66%	-52%	71%	-57%
Compare	-10%				

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	23%	64%	-41%	70%	-47%
2018	30%	62%	-32%	68%	-38%
Compare	-7%				

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	11%	59%	-48%	61%	-50%
2018	11%	60%	-49%	62%	-51%
Compare	0%				

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	15%	50%	-35%	57%	-42%
2018	5%	53%	-48%	56%	-51%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		10%			

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
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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	

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.

Due to not having enough reliable data from FY20 and the introduction of remote learning, we will continue with the same schoolwide improvement focus for FY21. Performance on the Civics EOC

(4%) was the lowest for Success Academy. A contributing factor for this was the loss of 1 full teacher unit from our Social Studies team. This places all high school and middle school classes into the schedule of only 2 teachers.

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

Due to not having enough reliable data from FY20 and the introduction of remote learning, we will continue with the same schoolwide improvement focus for FY21. The greatest performance decline for Success Academy was in Civics (-10%). A contributing factor for this was the loss of 1 full teacher unit from our Social Studies team. This places all high school and middle school classes into the schedule of only 2 teachers.

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.

Due to not having enough reliable data from FY20 and the introduction of remote learning, we will continue with the same schoolwide improvement focus for FY21. The component with the greatest gap was in 7th grade math. The main factor contributing to this is the rise in core class size average at Success Academy. Second Semester core class average was 33.

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

Due to not having enough reliable data from FY20 and the introduction of remote learning, we will continue with the same schoolwide improvement focus for FY21. The component with the most improvement for Success Academy was on the Geometry EOC (+10%). New actions taken this past year was to offer more units of high school math through a combined focus on face to face teaching or computer based class (E2020).

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

Due to not having enough reliable data from FY20 and the introduction of remote learning, we will continue with the same schoolwide improvement focus for FY21.
1. Number of students with attendance below 90%
2. Number of students scoring a level 1 on statewide assessments

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

Due to not having enough reliable data from FY20 and the introduction of remote learning, we will continue with the same schoolwide improvement focus for FY21.
1. Student Attendance
2. ESE Suspension Rates
3. Percentage of level 1 on statewide assessment
4. SESIR offenses committed

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to not have enough data from FY20, we will continue with the same schoolwide improvement focus for FY21. Average daily attendance is consistently at 75% during each of the first four years at Success Academy.
Measurable Outcome:	Maintain a yearly average of 80% daily attendance. This would represent an overall 5% attendance increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Harris (michaelkh@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	School wide use of PBIS. This will be the second year with school wide implemented PBIS programs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategy is being selected as it has shown to increase the daily average attendance for a school. Due to the continued drop in attendance levels and the overall trend in capacity for Success Academy, a fully implemented school wide behavior program is needed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Selection of PBIS team.
2. Team training.
3. Selection of school criteria in weekly PLC.
4. Monthly incentive program with attendance goals.

Person Responsible	Michael Harris (michaelkh@leeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to not have enough data from FY20, we will continue with the same schoolwide improvement focus for FY21. Due to an increase in number of ESE students the number of ESE suspensions was increased in the 18/19 school year. The school average for ESE student enrollment was 24% as compared to the district average of 16%.
Measurable Outcome:	A 5% reduction in the number of ESE student suspensions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Francheska Rios (francheskar@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Due to an increase in ESE teaching units the ability to assign a certified teacher for the sole purpose of offering alternatives to the suspension/restorative practices for ESE students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Restorative Practice is a district wide initiative for all students as an alternative to suspension.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Selection of ESE teacher.
2. Training in the use of restorative practices.
3. Selection of students as needed.

Person Responsible	Francheska Rios (francheskar@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Due to not have enough data from FY20, we will continue with the same schoolwide improvement focus for FY21. Continued improvement in school safety. During FY19 we saw a 60% decrease in school violence. With continued hallway monitoring and the addition of a dedicated Dean of Discipline the focus will remain on building a positive school culture and improved supervision of all student areas.

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.

Success Academy holds an Orientation for every student entering the school prior to their enrollment. During that meeting, the student and families meet with the Parent and Family Engagement point of contact, their school counselor, the Leadership Team, and are introduced to the resources available to students and families during their enrollment at Success Academy. Additionally, SAC meetings are held quarterly and all staff, students, parents and families, and community and business stakeholders are invited to participate making key decisions regarding student success. This complex network of internal and external resources for our students supports our key mission of helping students succeed in a school and worldwide setting.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.