

The School District of Lee County

Pace School For Girls



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 School For Girls

3800 EVANS AVE, Ft Myers, FL 33901

<https://www.pacecenter.org/locations/lee>

Demographics

Principal: James Buchanan

Start Date for this Principal: 8/30/2019

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	No
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)	Hispanic Students* White Students* 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 Lee 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, counselling, training and advocacy.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A world where all girls and young women have POWER, in a JUST and EQUITABLE society.

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

Girls at Pace have risk factors including trauma in their lives such as mental, physical and/or sexual abuse, domestic violence or family members with addiction or incarceration histories. These risk factors negatively impact academic performance as they limit a girl's ability to focus, feel safe mentally and physically, and develop positive relationships. Additionally, there is often a lack of parental support to help them be successful in the school setting leading to truancy, failing grades, ungovernable behaviors and a lack of self-confidence in the academic setting.

Pace supports girls by providing a gender-responsive, trauma-informed, and strength-based approach. We offer small class size, supportive staff and counselling services to help them catch up academically and teach the coping skills they need to thrive in the public school system when they transition from Pace.

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
Buchanon, James	Principal	Juvenile Justice Education Manager off-site
Eidem, Marion	Instructional Coach	As a member of the School Leadership Team, the Academic Manager is the Lead Educator/Instructional Supervisor at Pace. This individual supervises instruction, provides training and support to educators, administers all state assessments in accordance with State law, monitors lesson planning and delivery to state standards and district-approved curriculum.
Cellitti , Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Executive Director of the Center provides on-site supervision of all program services including academics, finances, social services and development.
Pugh, Kendra	Other	As a member of the Leadership Team, the Social Services Manager serves as on-site supervision of all aspects of the social services program including day counselors, Reach services (therapy services provided in the public school), intake and transition.

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

Yes

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Pace Center for Girls

Demographic Information**Principal start date**

Friday 8/30/2019, James Buchanon

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

6

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

7

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

50

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

5

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

5

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	0	4	5	10	10	15	6	50	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	9	4	31	
One or more suspensions	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	2	6	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	8	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	6	9	4	31	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	6	7	5	31	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	1	9	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	7	11	5	36

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	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/27/2021

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	2	12	14	12	14	6	5	65	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	10	8	10	4	5	51	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	1	2	0	12	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	5	3	4	1	29	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	5	7	3	4	36	

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	2	7	8	6	4	4	4	35

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	1	1	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	

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					55%	56%		55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains					49%	51%		50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					37%	42%		42%	44%
Math Achievement					50%	51%		54%	51%
Math Learning Gains					45%	48%		43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					43%	45%		43%	45%
Science Achievement					62%	68%		70%	67%
Social Studies Achievement					67%	73%		66%	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					
	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
HSP	18	30									
WHT	8	10									
FRL	14	25					18	18			
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	38	40		13	30			30			
FRL	33	50		12	35		29	21			
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)	

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	15
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	75
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	90%
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	24
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Hispanic Students	
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	9
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	15
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?

Our areas of focus from the 2020-2021 school year were: 1) Math remediation and preparation for the Algebra EOC, particularly in the subgroups of white students and the economically disadvantaged and 2) Reading comprehension and grade level writing in preparation of state FSA ELA assessments particularly in the subgroups of white students and the economically disadvantaged. The progress monitoring that was in place included quarterly star assessments and progress monitoring in our data management system. Results were compared to goals and discussed with students on a bi-weekly basis by each academic advisor. The Accountability Team reviewed results quarterly and adjusted as needed. Results were analyzed by ESSA subgroups.

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

In 2020-2021, 55% of our white and economically disadvantaged students, scored a level 1 on the FSA Math assessment. In 2021-2022, 62% of our white and economically disadvantaged students scored a level 1 on the FSA Math assessment. This is a decline of 7%. In 2020-2021, 45% of our white and economically disadvantaged students, scored a level 1 on the FSA ELA assessment. In 2021-2022, 62% of our white and economically disadvantaged students scored a level 1 on the FSA Math assessment. This is a decline of 17%. Unfortunately, neither area of focus showed an improvement. We introduced small group math instruction and tutoring groups for math. Students received small group instruction in vocabulary, reading comprehension and writing across all content areas.

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?

The area in the greatest need of improvement is the level 1 scores on the FSA ELA statewide assessments for our white students and the economically disadvantaged as well as the level 1 scores for the FSA Math statewide assessments for our white students and the economically disadvantaged. The component that is the most problematic is for grades 9-12 who are white and economically disadvantaged. Our data reflects that 60+% of our high school students in grades 9-12 who are white and economically disadvantaged are scoring at a level 1 on the FSA ELA state assessment and/or the FSA Math state assessment. The basis for this conclusion is drawn from the Early Warning System as outlined in Section D.1.a.

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

Our data also reflects that 66% of our high school students in grades 9-12 are attending at a level below 90%; 61% of our high school students are scoring level 1 on the FSA Math and 63% of our high school students are scoring level 1 on the FSA ELA. 61% of our high school students grade 9-12 are scoring in the intervention and urgent intervention ranges on the Star Reading and 59% of our high school students grades 9-12 are scoring in the intervention and urgent intervention ranges on the Star Math assessments.

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

Students will meet with academic advisors quarterly to review their new Star data. They will graph their own data and set goals based on progress reviewed. Students will lead academic advising meetings on a bi-weekly basis. Advisors will document data, assessment and plan in the program data base system. Prior to quarterly testing, progress and goals will be reviewed.

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 for Read 180, System 44 and Schema-based instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The high number of level 1 scores on the FSA ELA among white and economically disadvantaged students indicates an important area of focus for the school year 2021-2022. For last year, 62% of our students scored a level 1 on the FSA ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2021-2022 school year, we will increase the number of white and economically disadvantaged students who score a level 2 or above on the FSA ELA, by 10% through the use of student graphing data, goal-setting and student-led academic conferences regarding the impact of System 44 and Read 180 has on their learning.

Monitoring:

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

We will continue to use the quarterly Star Reading assessments to monitor student progress in this area of focus. There is a direct correlation between Star success and the FSA ELA assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marion Eidem (marionbe@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The reading classrooms will incorporate a blended learning intervention to address reading comprehension and writing with the technology based System 44 and Read 180. Reading teachers will utilize explicit and systematic instruction that includes whole group learning, student application, small group learning and independent reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The Lee County School District has adopted this program of reading instruction based on years of research into best practices.

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.

Identify teachers with required reading endorsement and professional teaching certificates.

Person Responsible

Marion Eidem (marionbe@leeschools.net)

Purchase and obtain all required resources and software. Schedule training.

Person Responsible

Marion Eidem (marion.eidem@pacecenter.org)

Conduct classroom observations and obtain teacher/student feedback.

Person Responsible

Marion Eidem (marion.eidem@pacecenter.org)

Monitor star assessments for progress.

Person Responsible

Marion Eidem (marionbe@leeschools.net)

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.

N/A

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The high number of level 1 scores on the FSA Math among white and economically disadvantaged students indicates an important area of focus for the school year 2021-2022. For last year, 62% of our students scored a level 1 on the FSA Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2021-2022 school year, we will increase the number of white and economically disadvantaged students who score a level 2 or above on the FSA Math, by 10% through the use of explicit teaching of schema based instruction in word problems after student-led academic conferences.

Monitoring:

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

We will continue to use the quarterly Star Math assessments to monitor student progress in this area of focus. There is a direct correlation between Star success and the FSA Math assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marion Eidem (marion.eidem@pacecenter.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

One of the evidence-based strategies being incorporated into the math classroom for the 2021-2022 school year will be schema based instruction for word problems. This strategy uses explicit instruction to teach students to recognize patterns in word problems and use those patterns to solve the problem.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Based on observation and student/teacher feedback, it was determined that the word problems particularly in the FSA Math present one of the biggest difficulties for our students.

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.

Identify professional development opportunities for the math teacher to learn and practice this strategy in the classroom.

Person Responsible

Marion Eidem (marion.eidem@pacecenter.org)

Conduct classroom observation and coaching/feedback to improve classroom instruction.

Person Responsible

Marion Eidem (marion.eidem@pacecenter.org)

Monitor student performance and improvement through the quarterly Star math scores.

Person Responsible

Marion Eidem (marion.eidem@pacecenter.org)

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.

N/A

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.

Pace is committed to finding the great in every girl. Every Pace team member is part of a collective culture focused on girls and their needs. Our culture plays a significant role on the impact to our girls, shaping their future. Their voice and perspective are always at the forefront. The culture of Pace is one of caring, purpose, learning and results. We offer leadership and growth opportunities to our students through Pace Day at the Capitol, Girls Leadership Council, Face Of Pace, Pathways and volunteer opportunities. Our students are recognized for their efforts through the Growth and Change System and the opportunity to earn points as an incentive.

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

Leadership
Instructional Staff
Social Services Staff including day counselors
Transitional services counselor
Volunteers
Board members
Local community