The Phoenix Program Naples

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

The Phoenix Program Naples

3706 ESTEY AVE, Naples, FL 34104

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brent Klein
Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 4-12
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)	Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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

The Phoenix Program Naples

3706 ESTEY AVE, Naples, FL 34104

[no web address on file]

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)
Combination School 4-12	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 Collier 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.

The goal of Phoenix Naples is to provide an alternative route for students that have not been successful in the traditional school setting due to disciplinary reasons. They also may be behind cohort, have failed state assessments, have low GPAs, or have chronic absenteeism. Students are encouraged to reclaim responsibility and become active participants in their educational experience.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will complete school prepared for ongoing learning, as well as community and global responsibilities.

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
Janssen, Cynthia	Principal	Dr. Janssen monitors the Assistant Principals and handles all staff hiring for Phoenix. She delegates the leadership team's duties and manages the finances. She reports to the district and ensures that Phoenix is in compliance with all state and district requirements. She does an evaluation on each staff member. Dr. Janssen ensures that her three assistant principals are up to date with program and district information by holding weekly debriefs, along with leadership team meetings bi-weekly with all of the lead teachers and key people in leadership roles.
Bryant, Stanley	Assistant Principal	Mr. Bryant serves at the on site leader for Phoenix Naples. He completes the evaluations, and monitors the data for this program. He serves in both the curriculum and instruction role and attendance and discipline role. He is responsible for the textbook distribution, instructional supplies and laptops, and the facilities. He is implementing the SEL program and training the teachers and staff. He is supervising the site based testing coordinator for Phoenix Naples.
Campins, Kyle	Teacher, K-12	Lead Teacher.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/12/2012, Brent Klein

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
14

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 4-12
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)	Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	19	33	54	8	136
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	13	27	46	4	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	17	28	35	5	104
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	7	15	27	4	64
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	9	16	22	6	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	13	17	4	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	14	17	0	43
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	17	16	30	40	6	112

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	2	4	0	0	20	5	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	2	1	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/23/2020

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	6	30	31	40	35	20	163
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	8	13	10	5	50
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	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	6

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	6	30	31	40	35	20	163
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	8	13	10	5	50
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	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	6

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%	59%	61%	0%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	61%	59%	0%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	63%	54%	0%	54%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	66%	62%	0%	63%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	61%	59%	0%	65%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	58%	52%	0%	58%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	46%	56%	0%	68%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	83%	78%	0%	79%	75%

			EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**									**Total**
	4	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(0)	(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**
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	56%	-56%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	8%	55%	-47%	52%	-44%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	8%	58%	-50%	56%	-48%
	2018	18%	63%	-45%	58%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
09	2019	15%	56%	-41%	55%	-40%
	2018	15%	56%	-41%	53%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
10	2019	8%	53%	-45%	53%	-45%
	2018	16%	59%	-43%	53%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
04	2019					
	2018					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Cohort Comparison						
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	61%	-61%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	25%	66%	-41%	54%	-29%
	2018	0%	67%	-67%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				
08	2019	5%	36%	-31%	46%	-41%
	2018	13%	43%	-30%	45%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	8%	52%	-44%	48%	-40%
	2018	18%	56%	-38%	50%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	33%	68%	-35%	67%	-34%
2018	21%	72%	-51%	65%	-44%
Compare		12%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	72%	-72%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	70%	-70%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	72%	-3%	70%	-1%
2018	0%	72%	-72%	68%	-68%
Compare		69%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	67%	-67%	61%	-61%
2018	26%	67%	-41%	62%	-36%
Compare		-26%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	59%	-59%	57%	-57%
2018	26%	67%	-41%	56%	-30%
Compare		-26%			

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	0
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	0
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
Percent Tested	
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	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Due to Covid-19 related school closure, we did not take state tests. Therefore, there is no applicable data to reference.

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

Due to Covid-19 related school closure, we did not take state tests. Therefore, there is no applicable data to reference.

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 Covid-19 related school closure, we did not take state tests. Therefore, there is no applicable data to reference.

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

Due to Covid-19 related school closure, we did not take state tests. Our attendance data did however see great substantial gains. Our overall attendance rate improved.

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

Two areas of concern are number of students who scored a level 1 on the 2019 statewide ELA & Math assessments.

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

1. Decrease the percentage of students scoring level 1 on state ELA & Math assessments.
2. Continue to improve overall attendance rates.
3. Social Emotional Learning Initiatives.
4. Decrease suspension rates.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Increase the End of Course Assessment Pass RATES

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our goal is to increase the rates at which students take and successfully complete (level 3 or higher) End of Course and FSA Exams (Civics, Biology, Algebra 1, History, & Geometry EOC's/FSA ELA, Math, & Science). We aim to improve our testing rate by at least 10%. This has an impact on students staying on track to graduate. Improving our graduation rate is our main focus but improving student's overall GPA's, and increasing the number of students who pass the required tests for graduation will enable them to graduate and have the opportunities to pursue post-secondary education. This area was identified as a critical area of need based on the ESSA data and the district data comparing our student performance on EOC's to the other schools across the district and state.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase student EOC/FSA pass rates by 10% for the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stanley Bryant (bryantst@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will have teachers supplement the online learning platform with direct instruction, we are scheduling intensive reading and math support for state mandated tests, we are planning multi-tiered support for students based on their specific needs, including test prep and small group intensive support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our rationale for selecting these strategies is based on Learning Sciences International's research on effective instructional strategies. We chose these specific strategies based on our school needs and capabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Intentional Master Scheduling
2. Create collaborative planning teams for curriculum creation
3. Planning student groups
4. Progress Monitoring (Periodic) & Feedback

Person Responsible	Stanley Bryant (bryantst@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will have teachers supplement the online learning platform with direct instruction, we are scheduling intensive reading and math support for state mandated tests, we are planning multi-tiered support for students based on their specific needs, including test prep and small group intensive support.

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.

The school includes all stakeholders to help increase input, involvement, and sense of ownership. Our practices our ingrained into our daily practices. Specific details are outlined in our Parent Family and Engagement Plan.

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: Other: Increase the End of Course Assessment Pass RATES				$50,438.40
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	9015 - The Phoenix Program Naples	Title, I Part A	0.75	$48,905.83
		Notes: Resource Teacher				
	6150	510-Supplies	9015 - The Phoenix Program Naples	Title, I Part A		$471.30
		Notes: Parental Involvement Supplies: fliers, brochures, communications to help parents support their child at home. Parent InfoGuide Display Package.				
	5100	510-Supplies	9015 - The Phoenix Program Naples	Title, I Part A		$1,061.27
		Notes: Miscellaneous classroom supplies: paper, pencils, notebooks, markers, and chart paper.				
					Total:	$50,438.40