Escambia County School District

Pace Program



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

3
4
6
9
14
46
16
16

Pace Program

1028 UNDERWOOD AVE, Pensacola, FL 32504

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Laurie Rodgers

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2020

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)	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) Infe	ormation*
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. F	or 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:

- 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Noodo Accesment	
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

Last Modified: 4/18/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 4 of 16

Pace Program

1028 UNDERWOOD AVE, Pensacola, FL 32504

www.escambiaschools.org

2019-20 Economically

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	No	%
Drimany Sandaa Tyna		2018-19 Minority Rate

(per MSID File)	Charter School	(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Primary Service Type

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/12/2020, Laurie Rodgers

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.

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

6

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)	Economically Disadvantaged Students*
	2018-19: No Grade
	2017-18: No Grade
School Grades History	2016-17: No Grade
	2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) In	formation*
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 Cod	de. 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												
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	10	9	9	12	4	60	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	5	6	6	8	3	43	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	3	2	4	0	16	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	6	0	11	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator		Grade Level													
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3	5	3	18	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	2	2	14	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/12/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level														
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	16	14	3	0	55	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	7	4	5	0	31	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	2	2	0	13	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	0	10	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	6	2	0	26	

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

Indicator			Grade Level													
mulcator	K 1 2 3 4 5 6	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total							
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	4	3	0	24		

The number of students identified as retainees:

ludiosto r	Grade Level													Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	10	4	3	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	8	2	3	0	20

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator						G	irac	de L	.evel					Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	16	14	3	0	55
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	7	4	5	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	2	2	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	6	2	0	26

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

Indicator		Grade Level												Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators		0	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	4	3	0	24

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	10	4	3	0	30
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	8	2	3	0	20

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).

Sahaal Crada Company		2019		2018				
School Grade Component	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 In	dicators	as Inpu	ıt Earlier	in the S	urvey		
Indicator		Gra	de Level	(prior ye	ar report	ted)		Total
indicator	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
	(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 Con	nparison					
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Com	nparison	0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Con	nparison	0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Com	nparison	0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Con	nparison	0%			•	

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

	SCIENCE												
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison							
80	2019												

			SCIEN	CE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Com	nparison			_		

		BIOLO	GY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
		CIVIC	S EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
		HISTO	RY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
<u> </u>		ALGEE	RA EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
		GEOME	TRY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

	2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18		
WHT	8												
		2018	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS				
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019. ESSA Federal Index			
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I		
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	12		
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES		
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1		
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency			
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	47		
Total Components for the Federal Index	4		
Percent Tested	86%		
Subgroup Data			
Students With Disabilities			
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities			
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?			
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?			
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%			

Black/African American Students				
Federal Index - Black/African American Students				
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?				
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%				
Hispanic Students	<u>'</u>			
Federal Index - Hispanic Students				
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?				
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				
	N/A			
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	N/A 0			
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?				
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%				
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students	0			
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students Federal Index - White Students	8			
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students Federal Index - White Students White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	0 8 YES			
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students Federal Index - White Students White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0 8 YES			
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% White Students Federal Index - White Students White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% Economically Disadvantaged Students	0 8 YES			

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our white population showed the lowest on the federal index at 8%; however, our FSA data shows less than 30% for math learning gains 6-10 and less than 30% for ELA leaning gains for 9-10. Over 80% of our girls come to us with academic deficiencies and

as Level 1 or 2 in both Math and ELA. Our girls also have risk factors in mental health, poverty, physical/emotional abuse, attendance, and substance abuse. We are not guaranteed to have our girls any length of time, since this is a voluntary program. We only serve 55-60 girls at a time and had a total of 130 served in 2018-2019.

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

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

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 1. Academic Improvement
- 2. Attendance Improvement
- 3. Teacher Retention
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically	relating to Small Group Instruction
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	White Population Academic Performance: Our white population was 8% on the Federal Index.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve the white population on the Federal Index to 32% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will incorporate small groups that are standard-based in our ELA and Reading classes, as well as Math classes. "Provide faculty and staff with professional development in the following areas, and monitor implementation through classroom visits and walkthroughs. Assessment and Determining Next Steps Content Area Literacy Strategies Unpacking Standards and Sequencing Instruction Reading Interventions for Substantial Reading Difficulties Math: Provide professional development through the mathematics department focused on standard based planning with the aspect of rigor linked. Teachers have had the opportunity to unpack standards, so the next step would be to repack the standards. The follow up would include classroom walks in collaboration with the administrative team to calibrate the lens for math expectations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The girls will be identified based on the FSA and STAR reports for standards they are not proficient in. This will allow for a 1:3 teacher/student ratio. We will monitor this by STAR testing every 12 weeks and participating in the school district's progress monitoring testing through SchoolNet. We will monitor implementation through walk-throughs and teacher 1:1's.

Action Steps to Implement

Examine current girl's FSA/STAR Reports in ELA and Math.

- 2. Professional Development on small groups for teachers, deconstructing standards, lesson planning for small groups.
- 3. Monitor girl's data throughout the year: STAR, SchoolNet, Classroom Assessments.
- 4. Adjust small groups lessons based on girl/s data.

Person Responsible Bra

Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

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

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.

At Pace center for Girls we work with our staff and girls on our organization wide culture: Caring, Learning, Purpose and Results. We engage staff and girls in decision making and in the creation of what this culture looks like at our center. We have a Stage process for Growth and Change that incorporates this focus as well. We also have bi-annual surveys for both girls and staff. Our families are engaged through monthly parent contact - an in person meeting with the girl, her parents and her counselor to discuss the girls progress - and parent surveys. We have family dinners, breakfasts and Zoom calls to engage the families as well. We have a local board that we have monthly meetings with and engage them in what is happening at Pace and they brainstorm how to assist with assuring our girls have what they need academically and economically. Our Transitions Coordinator works with the local colleges and career and technical programs, as well as Man Power, to coordinate visits, tours and meetings for our girls preparing to transition our center.

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: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
		Total:	\$0.00