
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pace Center For Girls

728 GEAR LAKE AVE, Orlando, FL 32803

<http://www.pacecenter.org/>

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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success. Pace provides girls and young women an opportunity for a better future through education, counseling, training and advocacy.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pace envisions a world where all girls and young women have power, in a just and equitable society. Our three pillars lay the foundation for our approach to supporting and equipping girls throughout their journeys. We are gender-responsive, strength-based, and trauma informed.

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
Tovine, William	Principal	Principal for alternative education programs with Orange County Public School.
Holmes, Jada	Other	Oversight and management of daily academic programs and operations for Pace Orange/ Creates the master schedule, ensures all students have accurate schedules, oversees testing, and works closely with teachers to ensure rigorous education. As well as provide teachers with coaching and support with a focus on engaging standard based instruction.

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.

Here at Pace we have a open door policy with all stakeholders and uphold a continuous feedback loop during monthly meeting, parent engagement sessions, board meeting, open houses, and any Pace Center for girls events or pubic meetings

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))

After implementation of the above practices. A quarterly feedback survey will given to students, parents, and staff to determine the success of the communication and engagement initiatives. It will be the duty of the Academic Manager to monitor and ensure the program is consistently making efforts to improve/ move our data forward. The Academic Manager will give time during monthly one-on-one meetings, team meetings, and staff trainings to ensure relative data is being used and reviewed regularly. The Academic Manager will gather information and present it to the leadership team to ensure that all parties are aware. We will revise the plan as needed to ensure continuous improvement.

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	75%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
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)	Black/African American Students (BLK)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	2022-23: Commendable 2021-22: Acceptable 2020-21: Commendable

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	2	3	5
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	9
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	11
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	4	6	10

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	0	6	6

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	1	1
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	0	1	3	3	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	13
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	1	0	0	3

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

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	0	1	3	3	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Course failure in ELA	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
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
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	1	0	0	1

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	3	3	7

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

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*	14	49	50	16	49	51			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	0	34	38	6	36	38	0		
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		66	64	33	31	40	10		
Social Studies Achievement*	10	66	66		43	48			
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate		87	89		62	61			
College and Career Acceleration		65	65		70	67			
ELP Progress		45	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	8
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	24
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	88
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	18

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	55
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	83
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				
FRL	7	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	10	Yes	1	1
HSP				

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%
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	14			0				10				
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	13			0							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	16			6			33					
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	10											
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				0			10					
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.

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 noted areas of greatest improvement include FSA Reading ELA assessments and reading deficiencies amongst students. Based on RENAISSANCE Star Reading assessment, FSA 2023 ELA Reading assessments, and the FAST PMA3 assessment our students are in need of reading fundamentals, vocabulary, and enrichment. Based on the data review above, the specific component that is most problematic is language acquisition and understanding fundamental literature components.

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 the prior year is the reading and math comprehension skills of our students. Students are struggling with meeting proficiency on State testing and making averages comparable to those of their cohort.

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 trends that have emerged across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas is the need for reading strategies and enrichment.

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

The area of focus for the previous school year, was to increase student attendance in an effort to improve graduation rates. Monitoring for this area of focus included weekly reports from our Pace Impacts system along with correlation from the Skyward attendance system. We also monitored this area of focus via classroom attendance and highlight intervention for the girls tardy and/or absent to their first class periods to ensure greater daily attendance. We ensure that we are reaching out to families daily when a student is not present, and providing incentives and plans for students that require extra motivation.

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

n/a

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

1. Continue to increase student engagement and attendance
2. Continue to train and certify teachers and staff on educational best practices
3. Continue to implement opportunities for instructional support and enrichment for all students
4. Update textbooks and classroom curriculum

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

Based on the data reviewed, student enrolled in our program at entry scored on average less than the district baseline in ELA. 85% of our students scored a level 1 on the of the FAST Ela Reading

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of students making learning gains in ELA/Reading on the 2023-24 FAST PM3 in order to improve student postsecondary readiness will increase by 3%.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through quarterly Renaissance STAR Reading Assessments to identify student needs and growth areas. Test results will be reviewed with teachers in monthly team meetings, with students in biweekly advising, and with parents in monthly parent contact meetings to ensure that all stakeholders are working towards the same goal of literacy improvement

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jada Holmes (jada.holmes@pacecenter.org)

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.)

With in the classroom, these strategies will include individualized instruction, project-based learning opportunities to increase student engagement, and multi-tiered learning approaches to support sensory learning needs of students and social emotional regulation. In addition, Pace will continue to provide a small group environment to focus on individual needs more readily and consistently. As well as creating an opportunity for small group intervention and intensive reading services. This model is the core of Pace Programming based on Prochaska and DiClemente

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Specifically this model reinforces working with each individual student to address barriers and opportunities to behavior modification, including increasing school attendance, academic engagement, and reading fundamentals. Our counseling staff use this model as the basis for social emotional goal plans for each girl that address barriers in these domains. Similarly each girl is assigned an academic advisor whom is responsible for developing academic goals for each girl. Goals are designed to create focus and identify girl academic goals and needs. These academic goals will include goals for attendance that will support further academic progress

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 2 - Moderate 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. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

Pace Center for Girls has developed a Parent and Family Engagement Plan to promote parent involvement. Data will be collected from parent meetings/events sign-in sheets as well as feedback forms. The feedback forms will be analyzed to determine what parents need and how Pace Center for Girls Jax can support parents with supporting their student(s) at home; and the sign-in sheets will be analyzed to guide decision making on when, where, and what times are more convenient for parents to attend meetings/events.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, we will improve our parent involvement attendance rate from 60% to 63%.

Monitoring:

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

Pace Center for Girls will develop a Parent Engagement Events timeline to ensure implementation of annual parent meetings/events will take place along with collecting evidence of effectiveness to know what parents learned and what is desired for them to learn.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jada Holmes (jada.holmes@pacecenter.org)

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.)

Have adequate welcoming space to engage families while in the building.
Conducting monthly parent meetings to ensure parents are updated and involved with day to day of the center
Establishing polices and procedures throughout our center based on family engagement.
Provide support and help families with their basic needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We believe that engaging parents will support in the engagement of the students.

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