

Gadsden County Schools

# Carter Parramore Academy



## 2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>R.A.I.S.E</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>

## Carter Parramore Academy

631 S STEWART ST, Quincy, FL 32351

www.gadsdenschools.org

### Demographics

**Principal: Willie Jackson**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2009

<b>2021-22 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Function</b> (per accountability file)	Alternative
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School 4-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: No Rating 2016-17: No Rating
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating</b>	2023-24: No Rating

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Gadsden 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.

Carter-Parramore will provide a learning environment that is safe and conducive for learning to prepare students for college and/or careers.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Carter-Parramore Academy will provide a safe and conducive learning environment by customizing processes for advancement through guidance, compassion, and academic.

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

96% of the students scored level 1 on the 2021 reading and ELA assessments.

### 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
Jackson, Willie	Principal	
Combs, Eugenia	Reading Coach	
Gunn, Jeanne	School Counselor	
Harrell, Frances	Administrative Support	
Henderson, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	
Simpkins, Alzonetta	Teacher, ESE	

#### Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2009, Willie Jackson

#### Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

6

#### Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

4

#### Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

11

**Total number of students enrolled at the school.**

86

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

2

**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	1	1	4	6	16	16	20	16	6	86
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	11	14	11	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	6	11	10	6	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	1	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	6
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	14	15	18	15	5	77
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	14	17	15	4	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	16	16	17	12	4	75

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	6	2	16

**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	1	1	2	3	6	2	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	6

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 10/13/2021

**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					50%	61%		47%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					52%	59%	19%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					55%	54%	36%	51%	52%
Math Achievement					57%	62%		57%	61%
Math Learning Gains					52%	59%	21%	50%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					46%	52%	50%	47%	52%
Science Achievement					47%	56%		43%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					72%	78%		70%	77%

**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
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
05	2021					
	2019	9%	40%	-31%	56%	-47%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	0%	33%	-33%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
07	2021					
	2019	12%	40%	-28%	52%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	33%	-33%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
09	2021					
	2019	18%	34%	-16%	55%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2021					
	2019	0%	25%	-25%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
05	2021					
	2019	0%	49%	-49%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	0%	48%	-48%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	6%	52%	-46%	54%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	5%	39%	-34%	46%	-41%
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					



SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	9%	30%	-21%	53%	-44%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	0%	5%	-5%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	10%	57%	-47%	67%	-57%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	17%	60%	-43%	71%	-54%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	6%	70%	-64%	70%	-64%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	34%	-34%	61%	-61%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	14%	-14%	57%	-57%

**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
SWD											
BLK	3	16			12			5		29	
FRL	3	13			9			5		25	

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
SWD	6	21			25						
BLK	1	19	43		14	31	3	5		36	
HSP	10	50									
FRL	3	22	33	1	17	43	5	13		40	
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
SWD		27			25						
BLK		20	36		21	50				12	
FRL		18			21					9	

### 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	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	63
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	79%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	0
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
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	9
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	8
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?**

Not enough data to compare.

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

Biology and ELA

**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?**

A lack of quality instruction that focus on standards, vocabulary, and learning charts.

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

Math and History

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

A continuation of quality instruction that focuses on standards, vocabulary, and learning charts.

**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.**

Bi-weekly PLCs that focus on the use of the vocabulary rubric and the data analysis using the school-wide assessment rubric. Classroom visits to monitor instructional delivery. Use educational paraprofessionals to assist students with vocabulary development and comprehension.

## 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.

ELA Learning Gains  
CPA is an alternative school and receives a rating based on the two areas of ELA and Math learning gains.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Improve from 20% to 32% learning gains in ELA.

**Monitoring:**

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

District baseline, midyear, and spring assessment  
i-Ready Reading Fall, Winter, and Spring diagnostics  
Weekly assessment by classroom teachers  
School-wide monthly assessments

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Willie Jackson  
(jacksonwi@gcpsmail.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

One hundred minutes of i-Ready per week  
Vocabulary and comprehension using a vocabulary rubric  
Practice through homework (two day per week)  
Bi-weekly PLCs to improve instruction

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Ninety six percent of the student scored level 1 on the FSA. Therefore, i-Ready will provide the Tier I intervention.

**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.

i-Ready implementation for Tier I  
PLCs for instructional practices  
Weekly data analysis evaluate progress

**Person Responsible**

Willie Jackson  
(jacksonwi@gcpsmail.com)

**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. 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.

Math Learning Gains  
CPA is an alternative school and receives a rating based on the two areas of ELA and Math learning gains.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Improve from 14% to 30% learning gains in math.

**Monitoring:**

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

District baseline, midyear, and spring assessment  
i-Ready Math Fall, Winter, and Spring diagnostics  
Weekly assessment by classroom teachers  
School-wide monthly assessments

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Willie Jackson  
(jacksonwi@gcpsmail.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

One hundred minutes of i-Ready per week  
Practice through homework (two day per week)  
Bi-weekly PLCs to improve instruction

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Ninety-two percent of students scored level 1 on the spring math assessment.

**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.

i-Ready implementation for Tier I  
PLCs to improve instructional practices  
Weekly data analysis to monitor progress

**Person Responsible**

Willie Jackson  
(jacksonwi@gcpsmail.com)

**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.

The Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) outlines how the school will build positive relationships with all stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students. A copy of the plan is available on the school's website and in the family and community resource room. The plan satisfies the parent engagement section of the SIP.

The PFEP targets include flexible parent meetings and training held at opportune times of the day to engage more parents, build capacity to ensure effective engagement of parents and to support a partnership among all stakeholders to improve student academic achievement.

CPA has built a sustainable business partner program with a local business partner liaison for the purpose of securing partners and developing activities that benefit the students and their achievements. This has allowed local businesses and community partners to connect with the students and school.

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

The school advisory Council (SAC) is the driving force behind identifying stakeholders to help promote a positive culture and environment at Carter-Parramore Academy. The SAC consists of representative from five stakeholder groups.

- School Leadership
- Teachers
- Students
- Parents
- Community partners