



---

## 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>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>17</b>

# Carter Parramore Academy

631 S STEWART ST, Quincy, FL 32351

www.gadsschools.org

## Demographics

Principal: Willie Jackson

Start Date for this Principal: 9/27/2022

<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>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 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.**

NA

### 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	
Gunn, Jeanne	School Counselor	
Harrell, Frances	Administrative Support	
Simpkins, Alzonetta	Teacher, ESE	
	Transition Specialist	NA

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

No

**If yes, name of the contracted education provider.**

NA

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 9/27/2022, Willie Jackson

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

67

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

10

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

10

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

4

**Number of teachers with ESE certification?**

2

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

1

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

1

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**2022-23**

**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	2	8	7	12	7	16	12	8	72
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	5	5	9	4	3	34
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	3	1	4	5	3	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4	5	6	6	37
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	7	4	7	7	4	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4	5	7	6	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	4	5	6	4	5	6	5	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	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Tuesday 9/27/2022

**2021-22 - 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	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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	14	15	18	15	5	77
Level 1 on 2019 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

**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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement		33%	55%					50%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								52%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								55%	54%
Math Achievement		39%	42%					57%	62%
Math Learning Gains								52%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								46%	52%
Science Achievement		33%	54%					47%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		43%	59%					72%	78%

**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.**

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
05	2022					
	2019	9%	40%	-31%	56%	-47%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	33%	-33%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
07	2022					
	2019	12%	40%	-28%	52%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	33%	-33%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
05	2022					
	2019	0%	49%	-49%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	48%	-48%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	6%	52%	-46%	54%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	5%	39%	-34%	46%	-41%
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2022					
	2019	9%	30%	-21%	53%	-44%



SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	5%	-5%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	10%	57%	-47%	67%	-57%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	17%	60%	-43%	71%	-54%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	6%	70%	-64%	70%	-64%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	34%	-34%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	14%	-14%	57%	-57%

### Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
BLK	6	35			18		6	13		59	8
FRL	6	33			16		5	13		64	6
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	

### ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	16
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	129
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	79%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	18
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	3
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	18
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	3

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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 related to the Areas of Focus?**

The area of focus was to improve reading and math learning gains.  
Bi-weekly standard-based assessments  
i-Ready baseline, midyear, and spring assessment

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

ELA Learning Gains  
Added 50 minutes of i-Ready per week.

#### **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?**

Math Learning gains  
Focus Standards: The essential standards required to progress to the next grade.  
Bi-weekly standard-based assessments and i-Ready progress monitoring

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

Students understand recall and comprehension questions but struggle with analysis and knowledge use questions.

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

Focus delivering instruction that addresses analysis of information so students do not struggle with analysis questions (Webb or Marzano DOK).

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

Bi-weekly PLCs to address analysis and knowledge use questions.  
Test items development  
Instructional delivery

### 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 33% to 50% learning gains.

**Monitoring:**

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

Bi-weekly assessment  
Baseline Diagnostic (PM 1)  
Midyear Diagnostic (PM 2)  
Spring Diagnostic (PM 3)

**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 and Vocabulary Explosion

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Tier III 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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**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.

Focus area is related to ESSA subgroups.

**#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 18% to 30% learning gains.

**Monitoring:**

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

Bi-weekly assessment  
Baseline Diagnostic (PM 1)  
Midyear Diagnostic (PM 2)  
Spring Diagnostic (PM 3)

**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

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Tier III 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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**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.

The area of focus is related to one or more ESSA subgroups.

**RAISE**

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

NA

**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

NA

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

NA

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

NA

**Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NA

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Frazier-Lee, LaRonda, frazier-leel@gcpsmail.com

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Progress monitor 1, 2, and 3

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

1. Conduct Professional Learning Community to improve instructional practices
2. Develop Aligned Standard-based Assessments that address Marzano analysis and information generation requirements

Jackson, Willie,  
jacksonwi@gcpsmail.com



## Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

**Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.**

Parent Engagement

**Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.**

Different levels of parental Involvement (DLOPI) data will be collect and analyzed three time during the year.

**Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.**

Parent EXPOs (three), school and district website, school flyers, and displayed on the marquee

**Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.**

The implementation process will be progress monitored during the same time frame as the academics. During Progress Monitor 1 (September), Progress Monitor 2, (December), and Progress Monitor 3 (May).

**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.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Training of staff and parent on DLOPI	
Establishment of Data tracking Matrix	
Collection and Analysis of Data	Harrell, Frances, harrellf@gcpsmail.com
Communicating results to staff and parents	