

Escambia County School District

Pace Program



2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| R.A.I.S.E | 0 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |

Pace Program

1028 UNDERWOOD AVE, Pensacola, FL 32504

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Laurie Rodgers

Start Date for this Principal: 8/30/2021

| | |
|--|--|
| 2021-22 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Function (per accountability file) | DJJ |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 6-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Alternative Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Improvement Rating History | 2021-22: No Rating 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: No Rating 2017-18: No Rating 2016-17: No Rating |
| DJJ Accountability Rating | 2023-24: Commendable |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

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.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

The girls that attend Pace have 3 or more risk factors and have endured significant trauma. There are girls that are significantly below reading and math grade levels, behind in their academic progression and girls with mental health diagnosis.

At Pace, the girls are provided with a counselor that schedules bi-weekly sessions with her to work on her social services goal, weekly psychoeducational group, an academic advisor who meets with her bi-weekly to discuss her academic progression and needs, 1:12 teacher, student ratio, individualized goals, per day, each week, progress monitor plan with a reading, math and vocational goal that is monitored monthly and updated every 12 weeks, and a transition counselor that continues to work with her during her first year leaving Pace.

The girls participate in our growth and change program to assist them in making the changes they need to be successful. Each girl has a point card for daily recognition and participates in our point spending store as a reward. Girls also participate in events and tours with stakeholders.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------|--------------------|---|
| Rodgers, Laurie | Executive Director | Oversee the program as a whole, events, budget and board. Supervises the Program Director, Reach Manager, and Business Manager. Ensures data is collected and reviewed. |
| Gentry, Brandi | Program Director | Oversee the academic and social services programs. |
| Smith, Walter | Academic Manager | Walter Smith will be our Academic Manager and he will be monitoring girls course work and academic progression, coach teachers, evaluate teachers, provide Professional Development and ensure it is being implemented. |
| Byers, Hillary | Counselor | Hillary Byers will be working with girls one on one and in groups to assist with their social and emotional needs. She will also assist with assigning girls to a psychoeducational group related to their individualized needs, planning for our positive behavior rewards and activities. Hillary will also problem solve attendance concerns for girls, as needed. |

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

Yes

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Escambia County School District

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/30/2021, Laurie Rodgers

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

0

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

6

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

56

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

1

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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 | 1 | 8 | 13 | 18 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 56 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 45 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 14 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 27 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

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 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 24 |

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 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 41 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 20 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 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 | 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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | | 49% | 56% | | 52% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | 47% | 51% | | 51% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 33% | 42% | | 40% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | | 42% | 51% | | 44% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | 48% | 48% | | 51% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 41% | 45% | | 40% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | | 59% | 68% | | 60% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | | 62% | 73% | | 69% | 71% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| FRL | 9 | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 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 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 9 |
| 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 | 18 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 2 |
| Percent Tested | 68% |

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% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |

| 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% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 9 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

This past school year we focused on our white students, since they were below 41%. We implemented Freckle as an intervention for both math and reading and the leadership team monitored it monthly, while teachers monitored it weekly. We monitored their SchoolNet district created assessments quarterly, STAR every 12 weeks, and their classroom assessments.

Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our STAR data showed us that 61% of our white girls made learning gains in math from their first assessment to their last assessment. We did not have a math teacher for half of the year, so we had all of our teachers working with our girls on math. We focused more on one on one than small group.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Our STAR data and FSA data have shown us that reading is our most problematic area, with only 37% of our white girls making a learning gain from her first STAR assessment to her last. Based on STAR and Freckle, we have seen that our girls struggle the most with reading fluency and comprehension.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

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. On average, our girls are with us around 18 months. We only serve 55-60 girls at a time and typically serve around 115 per year. This past year we also had COVID related issues with quarantining and students missing school or falling behind due to lack of engagement working remotely. We had 24 students with a significant reading deficiency. Grades 8 and 9 seemed to have the most and are also the the grades we have more students total and more students that are behind academically.

What strategies need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will need to focus on one on one and small group reading instruction with the use of iLit45, Accelerated Reader, Freckle and STAR as data metrics. Specific, standards based instruction, sentence fluence, phonemic awareness and comprehension will be the focus, along with motivating students to read more frequently.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will be focused on small group standards-based, along with lesson planning, using data effectively for instruction and planning, Accelerated Reader and iLit45 implementation, what it means to be Trauma-informed and Strength-based, how to use Freckle as an intervention strategy.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to White

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Achievement in Reading for our white students (8%) has not met 41% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Reading proficiency will go from 8% on the 2021 SSA to 16% or higher on the 2022 ESSA school wide and for our white students. The overall federal index will improve from 12% to 20% ESSA.

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the this goal will be Chapter tests and quizzes, Freckle, iLit45, AR, STAR and quarterly district assessments on SchoolNet.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide data monthly. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1. Provide explicit vocabulary instruction.
2. Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction.
3. Provide opportunities for extended discussion of text meaning and interpretation.
4. Integrate writing and reading to emphasize key writing features.

1. According to Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices from What Works ClearingHouse, providing explicit vocabulary instruction strengthens students independent skills of constructing the meaning of text.

2. According to Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices from What Works ClearingHouse, providing direct and explicit comprehension strategies, and opportunities for extended discussion shows positive impact on student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

3. According to Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Behavior from What Works Clearinghouse, connecting and integrating abstract and concrete representations shows positive impact on student achievement.

4. According to Teaching Secondary Students to Write Effectively, from What Works ClearingHouse, by integrating reading and writing to emphasize key features, it is found to have positive effects on the overall writing quality, genre elements, and word choice domains.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. The leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss ESSA and prior year data for overall population and specific subgroups. For progress monitoring, the leadership team will analyze data metrics from Schoolnet based on the quarterly district tests once a quarter, analyze data from Freckle and iLit45 bi-weekly, review STAR reading data as students test. The leadership team will meet with teachers for data chats once a month.

Person Responsible Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfi.us)

Professional development will include the following: implementation of the BEST standards, Freckle - how to use it as a data point for writing girl's daily goals and for selecting girls for standard-based small group, and implementation of Accelerated Reader - how to connect it as a data point to STAR and Freckle. Explicit small group PD for lesson planning and instruction.

Person Responsible Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfi.us)

Planning will be conducted with teachers on a monthly basis, or as needed. Coaching will be provided to teachers on an as needed basis and will concentrate on student engagement, small group lesson planning and how to effectively use data.

Person Responsible Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfi.us)

The leadership team will conduct classroom walks on a bi-weekly basis to monitor the implementation of the professional development and planning outcomes. The leadership team will provide feedback to teachers and determine coaching support based on the data metrics and classroom walks. The team will determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities based on the qualitative and quantitative data.

Person Responsible Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfi.us)

In-depth coaching will be provided to teachers based on qualitative and quantitative data points. the BEST standards, how to effectively use data, and small group planning. The coaching will be monitored by the School Leadership Team to determine the on-going coaching cycle. The leadership team will work with the school district specialists to assist in the coaching process.

Person Responsible Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfi.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

NA

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to White

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Achievement in Math for our white students (8%) has not met 41% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Math proficiency will go from 8% on the 2021 SSA to 16% or higher on the 2022 ESSA school wide and for our white students. The overall federal index will improve from 12% to 20% ESSA.

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the this goal will be Chapter tests and quizzes, Freckle, Delta Math, STAR and quarterly district assessments on SchoolNet.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide data monthly. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdf.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1. Use manipulatives and tools
2. Make students mathematics thinking transparent by talking about their solution process, drawing a picture, or making a graph
3. Work with real-life word problems
4. Use the data to make informed instructional decisions

1. According to The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, of the University of Texas in Austin, if teachers help students to solve mathematics problems by using manipulatives and tools to bridge concrete to abstract and symbolic understandings of mathematics, it will improve student performance.

2. According to The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, of the University of Texas in Austin, if Students are asked to make their mathematics thinking transparent by talking about their solution process, drawing a picture, or making a graph and using mathematically correct language , student performance will increase.

3. According to The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, of the University of Texas in Austin, if teachers present “real-life” word problems for students to solve daily, student performance will increase.

4. According to The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, of the University of Texas in Austin, if Teachers collect data regularly to determine whether their students are benefiting from instruction and use the data to make informed instructional decisions for subsequent lessons, student performance will improve.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss ESSA and prior year data for overall population and specific subgroups. For progress monitoring, the leadership team will analyze data metrics from Schoolnet based on the quarterly district tests once a quarter, analyze data from Freckle and Delta Math bi-weekly, and review STAR math data as students test. The leadership team will meet with teachers for data chats once a month.

Person Responsible Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfi.us)

Professional development will include the following: implementation of the BEST standards, Freckle - how to use it as a data point for writing girl's daily goals and for selecting girls for standard-based small group, and implementation of Delta Math. Explicit small group PD for lesson planning and instruction.

Person Responsible Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfi.us)

Planning will be conducted with teachers on a monthly basis, or as needed. Coaching will be provided to teachers on an as needed basis and will concentrate on student engagement, small group lesson planning and how to effectively use data.

Person Responsible Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfi.us)

The leadership team will conduct classroom walks on a bi-weekly basis to monitor the implementation of the professional development and planning outcomes. The leadership team will provide feedback to teachers and determine coaching support based on the data metrics and classroom walks. The team will determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities based on the qualitative and quantitative data.

Person Responsible Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfi.us)

In-depth coaching will be provided to teachers based on qualitative and quantitative data points. the BEST standards, how to effectively use data, and small group planning. The coaching will be monitored by the School Leadership Team to determine the on-going coaching cycle. The leadership team will work with the school district specialists to assist in the coaching process.

Person Responsible Brandi Gentry (bgentry@ecsdfi.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

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.

At Pace we have a growth and change program that assists in guiding our girls to making changes and promoting growth. We use this program by providing point sheets to each girl, weekly, and allowing them to earn points that they can use in our point spending store once a week. Our girls also engage in conflict resolutions when having any conflict with a peer or staff. Our classrooms all have a peace space for girls to use for a 1-5 minute break to help get them re-focused. We use behavior, academic and attendance plans to promote changes and assist the girl in recognizing her growth areas. We use skill cards when working with our girls to assist them in recognizing the problem and what type skill she needs in order to come to a solution. We use Opportunities for Growth and Excellence as a way to identify an area of growth for the girl and then have her go through a reflection process to not only recognize the area she is struggling, but to also identify ways she could have responded to the situation differently. We have a monthly celebration to recognize the girls efforts in academics, attendance, growth and change, following procedures and doing their best. We have a student of the month and we do celebration for birthdays each month.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our stake holders assist in fundraising and providing opportunities for our point spending store, rewards for meeting their goals, activities and celebrations. We have monthly parent contact meetings with the student and family to review academic and social service progress. We have an open School Advisory Committee meeting quarterly and stakeholders are invited.