Pioneer Career Academy School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pioneer Career Academy

200 S FLORIDA AVE, Wauchula, FL 33873

www.hardee.k12.fl.us/pioneer_career

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Hardee County School Board on 10/26/2023.

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.

"Provide all students a high-quality education in a nurturing and creative environment to develop responsible citizens".

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Empower and inspire all students for success".

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
Gustinger, Karen	Director	The Pioneer Career Academy (PCA) Principal/Associate Director of plays a leadership role in enhancing and developing the instructional team members' comprehension and appreciation of individual student needs, interventions to support student success and cultivation of a safe school environment and positive culture. Instructional team members require guidance on their roles and responsibilities to develop the individual capacity to support the students they serve, to understand the change(s) we are seeking in individual students, and the overall impact they have on the learning environment. The Principal/Assoc. Director oversees the task of developing strategies to improve instruction and meet students' overall needs and has the responsibility of monitoring implementation by instructional team members. The instructional team shares responsibility for the implementation and monitoring of a cycle of continuous improvement and academic growth in students, modeling the school's climate and culture, and recognizing barriers, corrective actions, and accommodations specific to each individual student. Administrative leadership and instructional team members collaboratively collect progress-monitoring data through student performance indicators, observations, and teaching artifacts to mutually participate in action steps and modifications in developing and maintaining a healthy school culture, safe and positive environment, and school-wide improvement based on stakeholder input, trust, respect, and high expectations for all.

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 process for involving stakeholders begins with the identification of School Advisory Council (SAC) members. Members include school leadership and instructional personnel in addition to parents and student and community leaders when possible. The School Advisory Council demographics are reflective of the school demographics. Members of the SAC are invited to provide feedback on elements used to target school improvement. These include policies and procedures related to attendance, resiliency referrals such as substance abuse programs and mental health counseling, identified barriers to student progress and success, progress monitoring, and instructional strategies used to support student academic achievement. In addition, to input from the SAC membership, information, and perspectives are gathered from stakeholders outside of the SAC such as parents, students, district administration and support services, progress monitoring data, and community resources. All forms of data are considered in the SIP developmental process to target supports and strategies to benefit our specific population and stakeholders' needs in driving school improvement.

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 monitored regularly for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of all students and especially those with the greatest achievement gap. Students will be monitored monthly for academic engagement and academic progress by administrative and instructional team members and will participate in monthly data discussions to review their progress. A parent-student meeting will be scheduled for students who continue to struggle to meet expected academic gains and a targeted plan will be crafted to target the student's individually identified needs. A quarterly review and revision, if necessary, of the SIP will occur based on input from student data and academic progress and identified trends, barriers, and/or deficits in student achievement. Quarterly reviews will include input from a variety of stakeholders including students, parents, administration, and instructional staff.

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	71%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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)	
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	

School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING
	2018-19: MAINTAINING
	2017-18: MAINTAINING
	2016-17: MAINTAINING
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	1	0	3	6	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	8
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	3	5	8

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	5	8

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	1	0	1	1	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	1	1	3	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	19

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	0	0	0	1	2	3	19

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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3

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	0	0	0	1	1	3	5
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	6
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	6

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	0	0	0	1	2	3	6

The number of students identified retained:

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

(Grade Level header spans columns K–8)

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*	13	41	50		44	51			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	15	35	38		34	38			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		61	64		30	40			
Social Studies Achievement*		67	66		31	48			
Middle School Acceleration					37	44			
Graduation Rate		85	89		63	61			
College and Career Acceleration		43	65		68	67			
ELP Progress		32	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	14
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	28
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	77
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

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%
FRL	19	Yes	1	1

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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	13			15								
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	18			20							2	

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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	*	46%	*	50%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	36%	*	47%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	39%	*	47%	*
09	2023 - Spring	6%	36%	-30%	48%	-42%
04	2023 - Spring	*	51%	*	58%	*
06	2023 - Spring	*	42%	*	47%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	43%	*	48%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	61%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	55%	*

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	*	35%	*	44%	*

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	39%	*	50%	*

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	36%	*	48%	*

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	58%	*	63%	*

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	67%	*	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 3-10 data component showing the lowest performance as compared to the State was ELA. While the performance in PM1 was 27% as compared to the State 11% and PM2 performance increased to 31 % as compared to the State at 25%, PM3 performance was 43% compared to the State performance at 53%. The PM3 difference in 3-8 ELA is -10 percentage points or a difference of 23%.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from 2022 to 2023 was ELA 3-10. In 2022, students scoring proficient in ELA 3-10 was 46% and while a different assessment was implemented in 2023, students scoring at Level 3 or above decreased to 43%. This is a decrease of 3 percentage points or 7 percent. Contributing factors include students' challenges in student engagement and remediation, academic and organizational skills, time management, and understanding of regular attendance while working in the virtual setting.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the State average was ELA 3-10. The State improved 42 data points from PM1 to PM3 while the district improved 16 data points from PM1 to PM3.

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

The data component that showed the greatest improvement was Math 3-8 which improved from 11 data points in PM1 to 53 in PM3. This represents a change of 42 data points. School actions to target improvement in Math proficiency include targeted face-to-face remediation, ongoing progress monitoring with students, and implementation of adaptive remediation in math skills for students scoring below proficient.

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

Potential areas of concern include students with retentions, students missing more than 10% of days, and students with one or more suspensions.

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

1. Improving targeted remediation in ELA
2. Reducing student suspensions
3. Improving student engagement
4. Improving attendance
5. Reducing student retention

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**

Budget Approval

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

No