

Columbia County School District

Pathways Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 11 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 19 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 20 |

Pathways Academy

1301 NW LABONTE LN, Lake City, FL 32055

<http://pwa.columbiak12.com/>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Pathways Academy is to improve each student's academic performance, attendance, and attitude/discipline. Our goal is to create a positive learning environment in which we teach students to use critical thinking skills for problem-solving, self-monitoring, academic study, and the application of emotional and social skills. We hope to employ restorative justice measures as a way to reflect and atone for undesirable behaviors. Students, staff, and community members work collaboratively to promote effective and efficient life skills for students. Pathway Academy's collaborative efforts are designed to promote positive attitudes that in turn instill hope, produce improved academic performance, and create productive, employable, and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pathways Academy cultivates innovative programs designed to provide each child with a positive, creative, nurturing, and collaborative environment where students demonstrate their abilities to request assistance, persevere in the face of adversity, and resolve problems. Our vision is to improve academic success, modify unacceptable behaviors, and improve school attendance in a fair, firm, and consistent environment.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the 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 |
|-------------------|------------------------|---|
| Christie, Michael | Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Ensuring that academic policies and curriculum are followed *Helping teachers maximize their teaching potential with resources and professional development opportunities. *Meeting and listening to the concerns of students on a regular basis *Encouraging, guiding, and assisting students and teachers *Meeting with parents and administrators on a regular basis for problem resolution. *Enforcing a consistent discipline policy designed to deter unwanted behaviors. *Providing an atmosphere free of any bias in which students can achieve their maximum potential. *Evaluating teachers and learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed. *Make decisions to keep faculty, staff, students, and visitors physically safe on campus. |
| Callum, Nicole | Administrative Support | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Assists the principal in the overall administration of the school and assumes the leadership of the school in the absence of the principal *Responding to disciplinary issues. *Has knowledge of local policies, state, and federal laws relating to minors *Relates to students with mutual respect while carrying out a positive and effective discipline policy. *Assessing data such as state standards and test scores *Evaluating teachers and learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed *Facilitates School Advisory Committee *Facilitates MTSS instruction and other intervention strategies. *Developing and maintaining school safety procedures *Performs other related duties as needed |
| Bradley, Dekela | Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Testing coordinator for state assessments *Attends all district required professional development activities aligned with specific position requirements, and demonstrates active participation and follow-through at the school of assignment. *Provides training and technical assistance in the administration of the F.A.S.T. *Prepares, distributes, and collects the correct completion of state testing for all 6-12 graders to ensure compliance with federal, state, and local requirements. |
| Wright, Shatoria | Behavior Specialist | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Responding to disciplinary issues *Provides Tier 2 & 3 behavioral support services to students *Assists staff with behavioral concerns regarding students. *Aids in identifying potential conflicts with students based on outside influences, and personality conflicts. *Has knowledge of local policies, state, and federal laws relating to minors |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--|----------------|---------------------------------|
| *Relates to students with mutual respect while carrying out a positive and effective discipline policy | | |

Jeffers, Donna Teacher, ESE Provide direct support to students in a classroom by delivering instruction and ensuring learning through a variety of co-teaching models and strategies.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The following stakeholders met to review data and the previous school improvement plan to brainstorm ideas for the 23-24 school year - how to eliminate barriers and support student success: Michael Christie, Nicole Callum, Donna Jeffers, Shatouria Wright, Dekaela Bradley.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap, by engaging in an ongoing data disaggregation process with stakeholders and correlating the achievements or lack of to the action steps outlined on the SIP. This will be done through grade-level meetings, data chats, and faculty meetings. To ensure continuous improvement, the plan will be revised by analyzing what the areas of concern are and developing new implementation steps that will be purposeful in targeting the areas of focus. State and specific curriculum assessments will be analyzed to ensure that progress is made in relationship to SIP goals.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 6-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Alternative Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 52% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |

| | |
|--|--|
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | CSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)* |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | |
| School Improvement Rating History | 2021-22: UNSATISFACTORY 2018-19: UNSATISFACTORY 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: I |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 16 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 11 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 9 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 30 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 26 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 16 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 16 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 15 | 49 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 40 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 27 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 43 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | 8 |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 19 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 25 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 11 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 11 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 15 | 29 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 27 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 16 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | 8 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 30 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | 8 |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 |

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 23 | 42 | 50 | 17 | 47 | 51 | 0 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 21 | | | 7 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |
| Math Achievement* | 13 | 28 | 38 | 6 | 34 | 38 | 21 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 25 | | | | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement* | 0 | 54 | 64 | 6 | 37 | 40 | | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 20 | 62 | 66 | 0 | 39 | 48 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 34 | 44 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 20 | 89 | 89 | | 50 | 61 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 34 | 65 | | 58 | 67 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | | 45 | | | | | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 15 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 76 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 94 |
| Graduation Rate | 20 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 13 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 75 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 81 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 27 | Yes | 4 | 4 |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 45 | | | |
| HSP | | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 7 | Yes | 2 | 2 |
| FRL | 13 | Yes | 4 | 4 |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 18 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 18 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| HSP | | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 15 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| FRL | 14 | Yes | 3 | 3 |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 23 | | | 13 | | | 0 | 20 | | 20 | | |
| SWD | 33 | | | 20 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 45 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 7 | | | 6 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| FRL | 25 | | | 15 | | | 0 | | | | 3 | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 17 | 21 | | 6 | 25 | | 6 | 0 | | | | |
| SWD | 25 | 20 | | 11 | 17 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | | | 8 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 20 | | | 10 | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 23 | 23 | | 9 | 20 | | 10 | 0 | | | | |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 0 | 7 | | 21 | | | | | | | | |
| SWD | 0 | | | 25 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 0 | 8 | | 23 | | | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 10 | 2023 - Spring | 9% | 45% | -36% | 50% | -41% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | * | 57% | * | 54% | * |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 10% | 44% | -34% | 47% | -37% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | * | 45% | * | 47% | * |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | * | 43% | * | 48% | * |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | * | 58% | * | 58% | * |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | * | 53% | * | 47% | * |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | * | 51% | * | 50% | * |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | * | 58% | * | 54% | * |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 10% | 58% | -48% | 48% | -38% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | * | 72% | * | 59% | * |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | * | 66% | * | 61% | * |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 5% | 32% | -27% | 55% | -50% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | * | 60% | * | 55% | * |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 0% | 50% | -50% | 44% | -44% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | * | 50% | * | 51% | * |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 0% | 54% | -54% | 50% | -50% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | * | 33% | * | 48% | * |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | * | 55% | * | 63% | * |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 10% | 61% | -51% | 66% | -56% |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | * | 60% | * | 63% | * |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component with the lowest performance on the 2022 FSA was in Math, with 83% of students tested scoring a level 1. The greatest barrier is the students' lack of foundational math skills. This has been an ongoing trend for several years.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year was ELA Proficiency on the FAST assessment for students with disabilities. The factors that contributed to this decline were that there was a lack of foundational skills, especially as it relates to vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Students also need to have more exposure to making connections to the text and making inferences beyond answers that are "right there" in the text

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap in our data was our 9th grade ELL students on the ELA assessment. We had 0% pass with a level 3 or higher.

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

The data component showing the greatest improvement from the prior year was ELA Proficiency from 6.7% in 2021 to 21.4% in 2022, a 14.7 percentage point increase. The factors that contributed to this increase were the focus on foundational skills, especially as it relates to vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The EWS data shows a need to improve the overall attendance percentage, with a focus on students that have 6-10 absences. The 2022-2023 data indicates that 29% of students were absent 6-10 times throughout the school year. This is a 1 percentage increase from the prior school year 2021-2022 with 28% of students being absent 6-10 times during the school year.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Top priorities for the upcoming year: Improving gains and proficiency in all areas for SWD; Increasing attendance rates for all students. In order to fully reach their potential, students must be in school consistently.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

To maintain a positive school culture and environment our school will focus on positive reinforcement and recognition for good character and academic achievement. Students will be met at the door each morning and greeted by the principal and support staff for a visual check-in. All staff members are trained on school-wide expectations and use the same verbiage with students to reinforce positive behaviors and exhibit consistency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student attendance will improve by 25%.

Monitoring:

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

Frequent, regular attendance checks will be completed through the Focus Portal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Christie (christiem@columbiak12.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Pathways Academy will use a new behavioral resource, 7 Mindsets, to target all students on a tiered system. Research has shown when students attend school regularly, they are more likely to make good grades, graduate, and are less likely to engage in risky and promiscuous behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

7 Mindsets curriculum has shown promise in addressing a variety of problematic behaviors in which students may present. These claims are supported through research.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students with Disabilities have shown to be below their non-disabled peers in both reading and math on state assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD's will show a 10% improvement in both reading and math by the end of the year assessments.

Monitoring:

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

We will periodically review all available data to assist in making decisions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Callum (callumn@columbiak12.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will be using Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) and Do The Math for both reading and math interventions. Additionally, Pathways Academy will be using a new behavioral resource, 7 Mindsets, to target all students on a tiered system.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These academic interventions have been shown to target specific skills in which our students are showing deficiencies. Further, the 7 Mindsets curriculum has shown promise in addressing a variety of problematic behaviors in which students may present. These claims are supported through research.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Pathways Academy stakeholders reviewed academic, behavioral, and attendance data, from 2022-23 as well as taking into consideration ongoing progress monitoring using Edgenuity, Do the Math, and Leveled Literacy Intervention programs. This information is used to determine areas for continued improvement for the current school year as well as trends that have developed over the past three to five years in specific grade levels, content areas, and underperforming subgroups. As the school improvement goals were established, the team of stakeholders determined how Title I dollars should be spent to best support the indicated areas of concern.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|--|-------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|
| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | | | | \$11,700.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |
| | 5100 | 510 | 0221 - Pathways Academy | Other | 0.0 | \$11,700.00 |
| <i>Notes: 7 Mindsets - ESSER 2 Funds</i> | | | | | | |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | | | | \$87,018.43 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |
| | 5100 | 510 | 0221 - Pathways Academy | Other | 0.0 | \$14,343.49 |
| <i>Notes: Do the Math Intervention Program - ESSER 2 Funds</i> | | | | | | |
| | 5100 | 369 | 0221 - Pathways Academy | Other | 0.0 | \$6,409.20 |
| <i>Notes: Study Island & Exact Path Web-based Software Licenses - ESSER 2 Funds</i> | | | | | | |
| | 5100 | 120 | 0221 - Pathways Academy | Other | 1.0 | \$62,069.92 |
| <i>Notes: Reading Teacher - SAI / Reading Allocation</i> | | | | | | |
| | 6400 | 139 | 0221 - Pathways Academy | Other Federal | 1.0 | \$4,195.82 |
| <i>Notes: District-wide Coaching Support Colleague - Math / Title II (70%) & Title V (3%) Funds</i> | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$98,718.43 |

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No