

The School District of Palm Beach County

# South Tech Preparatory Academy



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

## South Tech Preparatory Academy

1325 GATEWAY BLVD, Boynton Beach, FL 33426

<http://southtechprep.org/>

### Demographics

**Principal: Nicole Handy**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/23/2021

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: C (53%)<br>2016-17: C (52%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## South Tech Preparatory Academy

1325 GATEWAY BLVD, Boynton Beach, FL 33426

<http://southtechprep.org/>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | Yes                    | 94%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | Yes                    | 95%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade |         | C       | C       | C       |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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.**

South Tech Preparatory Academy's core mission is to graduate students prepared to matriculate into a career academy program of study which will prepare them for work, higher education, and productive citizenship.

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

SouthTech Preparatory Academy has set high standards for student achievement as both a Title I and a choice school. As a feeder program to SouthTech Academy, SouthTech Preparatory Academy (STP) will provide students with a strong academic curriculum instilling the desire to pursue continuing education. Additionally, as of SY21, STP is the only CTE (career technical education) Middle School in Palm Beach County; students have the opportunity to explore career pathways which lead to a successful livelihood and produce the tenets of productive citizenship. STP will serve a racially, culturally, socio-economically, and academically diverse population with: the support of state and district resources, a career-centered, academic curriculum aligned to state standards and the involvement of parents/guardians in the adolescent development of the whole child.

SouthTech Preparatory Academy promotes academic success and financial efficiency-aligning responsibility with accountability-via the following: state standards, the School Improvement Plan (SIP), Title I monitoring, the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM), THE Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), the Governing Board and the National Career Academy Coalition. All require rigorous accounting with regard to: student academic achievement, career academy success, quality and integrated instruction aligned with benchmarks and standards, allocation of human and material resources, policies and procedures, and administrative monitoring.

Data-driven instruction will be implemented; strategic formative assessments will be used to monitor learning gains over the students' middle school careers, with students taking diagnostic/progress monitoring assessments in the key subjects of reading, writing, and mathematics. The results of these assessments will drive instruction and curriculum planning. STP will also plan parent conferences around quarterly updates (report cards), ensure all IEPs (individual education plans) and 504s are met, and hold conferences with ELLs (English language learners), ensuring the most at-risk students have the support needed to be successful.

SouthTech Preparatory Academy will keep parents informed regarding school-wide progress via annual FSA results, progress reports, report cards, Chalk reporting software, Parent Link, Title I meetings/parent trainings, and mailings. This stream of communication will encourage parents to take on a more active role in helping to shape the lives of their children at this critical juncture in their personal and academic development.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

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

| Name                | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Beattie, Denise     | Assistant Principal | As assistant principal, Denise Beattie observes and evaluates instructional staff and analyzes student performance data to drive overall instructional program development and to determine staff development activities. She monitors the master schedule to ensure appropriate placement of all students, and assists in the recruitment and placement of staff. In addition, she provides data for and assists in the implementation of the school improvement plan.  |
| Handy, Nicole       | Principal           | As principal, Nicole Handy oversees all of the operations of SouthTech Preparatory Academy. She recruits highly qualified staff and actively pursues professional development to keep abreast of current educational trends and methodology. She mentors and supports the guidance and administrative staff, and supervises instructors in the classroom. She participates in program evaluation, design and modification of both the academic and CTE programs. She uses student performance data to drive curriculum development and the development of the School Improvement plan. In addition, she communicates effectively with parents and the community. |
| velasquez, elias    | Dean                | Elias Velasquez tracks student disciplinary referrals, develops monthly meeting agendas and implements the school wide positive behavior program. In addition, he is responsible for coordinating and communicating information regarding the Response to Intervention.  |
| caffrey, amanda     | Teacher, ESE        | As the ESE coordinator, Amanda Caffrey is responsible for tracking support for all students with IEPs and/or 504s to ensure all accommodations are met. She ensures IEPs & 504s are up-to-date.  |
| day, sharhoda       | Instructional Coach | Sharhoda Day serves as the testing coordinator and as an instructional leader, spearheading on-campus tutorial efforts and data-driven, diverse instructional initiatives.   |
| Markevich, Kristen  | Other               | As the Compliance Specialist, Kristen Markevich acts as the testing manager, grant administrator, and ensures compliance with all district, state, and national policies.  |
| Wigelsworth, Joshua | Other               | Joshua Wigelsworth is the head of all career academies at SouthTech. He works with community partners to offer on-the-job career exploration for our students and works with SouthTech instructors towards the goal of every student graduating with an industry certification.  |
| Lovett, Carla       | Other               | Carla Lovett administers the budget, creates a positive culture for students, employees and families, improves school leadership, and creates the long-term plans for the success of SouthTech students and the school itself. She strives to create positive relationships between SouthTech and the  |



| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|------|----------------|---|
|      |                | community it supports, working with business and community leaders to bring the best opportunities to SouthTech students. |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Thursday 9/23/2021, Nicole Handy

**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.*

6

**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.*

18

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

29

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

**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.**

8

### 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  | 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 | 37 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 79  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 102 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   |       |
| FY21 ELA Diag Lvl 1 & 2                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   |       |
| FY21 Math Diag Lvl 1 & 2                                 | 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     |    |

**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**

Thursday 9/23/2021

**2020-21 - 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 | 183 | 176 | 178 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 537 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8   | 12  | 7   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27  |       |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11  | 14  | 9   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9   | 20  | 19  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15  | 10  | 8   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37  | 42  | 37  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 116 |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48  | 54  | 43  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 145 |       |
| Level 1 on Statewide Assessment Civics    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 13  | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13  |       |
| Level 1 on Statewide Assessment Science   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 39  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 39  |       |

**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 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 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 | 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  |       |

**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 | 183 | 176 | 178 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 537   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8   | 12  | 7   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11  | 14  | 9   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9   | 20  | 19  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15  | 10  | 8   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37  | 42  | 37  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 116   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48  | 54  | 43  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 145   |
| Level 1 on Statewide Assessment Civics    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 13  | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Level 1 on Statewide Assessment Science   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 39  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 39    |

**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 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 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 | 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  |       |

**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             |        |          |       | 46%    | 58%      | 54%   | 46%    | 56%      | 53%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 51%    | 56%      | 54%   | 52%    | 57%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 44%    | 49%      | 47%   | 50%    | 49%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 45%    | 62%      | 58%   | 43%    | 61%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 53%    | 60%      | 57%   | 48%    | 61%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 47%    | 53%      | 51%   | 47%    | 54%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 34%    | 52%      | 51%   | 31%    | 55%      | 52%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       | 73%    | 75%      | 72%   | 81%    | 75%      | 72%   |

**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 | 45%    | 58%      | -13%                       | 54%   | -9%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 43%    | 53%      | -10%                       | 52%   | -9%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -45%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 50%    | 58%      | -8%                        | 56%   | -6%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -43%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 36%    | 60%      | -24%                       | 55%   | -19%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 25%    | 35%      | -10%                       | 54%   | -29%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -36%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 57%    | 64%      | -7%                        | 46%   | 11%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -25%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 34%    | 51%      | -17%                       | 48%   | -14%                    |
| 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         | 73%    | 72%      | 1%                    | 71%   | 2%                 |
| 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         | 89%    | 64%      | 25%                   | 61%   | 28%                |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 0%     | 60%      | -60%                  | 57%   | -57%               |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

Progress monitoring also allows teachers and administrators to track students' academic progress or growth across the entire school year. Teachers use student performance data to continually evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching and make more informed instructional decisions. If the rate at which a particular student is learning seems insufficient, the teacher can adjust instruction. Various reports will be used to monitor and support student learning:

Grades K-2 we will use iReady for Fall, Winter & Spring

In grades 3-5 we will use XXX in the Fall, XXXX in the Winter, and XXX in the Spring.

- iReady: Provides user-friendly dashboards and clear reports with actionable data that give teachers a foundational understanding of students' strengths and areas of need.
- Unit Standardized Assessments USAs gives teachers data on how well the students have mastered the standard. Supports the monitoring of student learning and provides ongoing feedback that instructors can use to make adjustments to instruction to improve student learning.
- SuccessMaker is an adaptive learning program that continuously personalizes math instruction for student growth and differentiation.

| Grade 6               |   |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged<br>Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners |      |        |        |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged<br>Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners |      |        |        |

| Grade 7               |   |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students  |      |        |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |      |        |        |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students  |      |        |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |      |        |        |
| Civics                | Number/% Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students  |      |        |        |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |      |        |        |

| Grade 8                  |  |      |        |        |
|--------------------------|--|------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students   |      |        |        |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students With<br>Disabilities<br>English Language<br>Learners |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students   |      |        |        |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students With<br>Disabilities<br>English Language<br>Learners |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science                  | All Students   |      |        |        |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students With<br>Disabilities<br>English Language<br>Learners |      |        |        |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 25          | 38        | 39                | 13           | 20         | 21                 | 13          | 37         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL                                       | 34          | 40        | 46                | 25           | 20         | 33                 | 10          | 57         | 58           |                         |                           |
| BLK                                       | 45          | 40        | 32                | 24           | 21         | 24                 | 19          | 63         | 58           |                         |                           |
| HSP                                       | 51          | 49        | 53                | 27           | 16         | 23                 | 29          | 60         | 55           |                         |                           |
| WHT                                       | 57          | 59        |                   | 38           | 36         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL                                       | 48          | 44        | 41                | 26           | 19         | 24                 | 26          | 60         | 56           |                         |                           |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 14          | 37        | 39                | 21           | 38         | 33                 | 3           | 48         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL                                       | 31          | 45        | 41                | 30           | 43         | 52                 | 19          | 59         | 60           |                         |                           |
| BLK                                       | 46          | 48        | 40                | 45           | 54         | 47                 | 39          | 79         | 70           |                         |                           |
| HSP                                       | 45          | 53        | 46                | 44           | 53         | 48                 | 26          | 67         | 64           |                         |                           |



| 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                                       | 46       | 49     |             | 50        | 47      |              | 42       | 80      |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 44       | 51     | 45          | 44        | 53      | 48           | 33       | 73      | 68        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 19       | 43     | 40          | 19        | 33      | 32           | 16       | 54      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 19       | 37     | 36          | 19        | 29      | 33           |          | 77      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 50       | 55     | 57          | 42        | 50      | 49           | 28       | 84      | 85        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 40       | 47     | 43          | 43        | 45      | 45           | 29       | 82      | 71        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 53       | 56     |             | 42        | 50      |              | 50       | 57      | 80        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 45       | 51     | 51          | 43        | 47      | 47           | 29       | 81      | 79        |                   |                     |

### 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  | 43  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 3   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 77  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 429 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10  |
| Percent Tested  | 97% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 31  |
| 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                                       | 40  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | YES |
| 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                                    | 40  |
| 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  | 45  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| 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   | 48  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 42  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| 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.

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

Comparison of FY21 vs FY19

Trends

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Section 2C, Diagnostics, FY19

#### What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Student engagement

Attendance

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Section 2C, Diagnostics FY20 vs FY21 , FY19

#### What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

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

1. Professional Learning Communities support....

#### 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.

1. Standards-based instruction

#### Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

1. PLCs
2. Research-based strategies for example:
- 3.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

add analysis rom section 2F-a

**Measurable Outcome:****Monitoring:**

New, list the PM you will do and who is supporting and how.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Enroll students in extended learning opportunities (after-school tutoring programs)
2. Determine students' needs based on data
3. Plan a curriculum focusing on areas of need
4. Provide professional development in data analysis & reading strategies in the content areas
5. Meet with department chairs to determine needs of teachers
6. Purchase supplemental software programs and provide professional development on programs

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Explain how they will support student learning.

**Action Steps to Implement**

After-school tutoring programs

a. Analyze student data to determine needs for improvement

b.

c.

**Person Responsible**

[no one identified]

*No description entered***Person Responsible**

[no one identified]

*No description entered***Person Responsible**

[no one identified]

*No description entered***Person Responsible**

[no one identified]

*No description entered***Person Responsible**

[no one identified]

*No description entered***Person Responsible**

[no one identified]

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

### 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.

Parental Involvement. Parents are often hindered in helping their children to do well in school due to barriers such as the complexity of course content, lack of time and availability to meet with their child's teachers, language barriers to effectively communicate with school staff and families, and lack of familiarity with the school culture. We will work to eliminate these barriers so that families can assist their children in being successful in school. We will employ and retain a Parent Liaison/Language Facilitator School Counselor to coordinate parent/teacher conferences, Family Academic Training Nights, and Parent/Family recruitment for SISC and PTO.

Parent/teacher conferences - ensures there is consistency in the collaboration between teacher and parent. Family Academic Training Nights - ensures parents become familiar with the content as a means to support their child at home. Parent/Family recruitment for SISC and PTO ensures there is an ample amount of parent representation during each meeting.

Integrate ELA/Reading Strategies throughout the content area: Students are immersed in rigorous task encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 with a focus on reading and writing across all content areas. Our students focus on content and curriculum related to:

- The History of the Holocaust
- The History of Black and African Americans
- The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics
- The Contributions of Women
- The Sacrifices of Veterans and Medal of Honor recipients within US History.

Our school integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols, and monitoring SwPBS through data. In alignment with Florida State statute 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, art expos of different cultures; in music our students study music of different eras and countries. Our instructional staff are provided extensive and continuous professional development to ensure seamless integration. Administration reviews lesson plans to ensure compliance with F.S. 1003.42.

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

Stakeholders & roles:

Instructional

Non-instructional