# Donna J. Beasley Technical Academy School



**2023-24**
**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

# Donna J. Beasley Technical Academy

60 BELL BLVD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33936

http://beasleytec.org/wordpress1/

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 10/18/2023.

## 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:<br><br>1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;<br>2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;<br>3. Have a school grade of D or F; or<br>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.**

To support students in achieving their high school diploma and to prepare them for college and career success through an individually paced, technology based, flexibly scheduled program.

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

Donna J. Beasley Technical Academy provides students that have fallen behind their graduation requirements to obtain their diplomas. With the help of partners, businesses, and industry, we provide the academic and technical skills necessary to be successful in today's economy. We provide students with "their best second chance!"

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Torregrasso, Joseph | Principal | Budget, day to day management/leadership of school |

**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.

Our school is categorized as a credit recovery/at-risk high school, and students only attend it because their traditional district high school identified them as being too far behind the pace of graduating with their cohort. They come behind in credits, GPA, and/or not satisfying the ELA and/or Algebra I requirements for graduation. Meeting with students, their parents/guardians, collaborating with our team, and reviewing students' academic histories, it was clear that the number one concern/hurdle for all the stakeholders listed was the ELA and Algebra I state assessments.

**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))

DJB will incorporate a reading program called Reading Plus. At the beginning of the year, the team will be trained to utilize the program's features and better understand its positive impact on student achievement. Educators will also receive additional training during the school year to enhance their abilities with the reading program. A the start of the year, all students will take an initial assessment

through the Reading Plus program. Once a reading level has been identified, the Reading Plus program will prescribe specialized instruction to meet the learner's specific needs. Teachers will create weekly reports through the Reading Plus program to monitor student progress. Once a month, the leadership team will meet with the teachers to review and discuss the data.

| **Demographic Data**<br>Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024 | |
|---|---|
| **2023-24 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | High School<br>9-12 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | Alternative Education |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | No |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 80% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 54% |
| **Charter School** | Yes |
| **RAISE School** | No |
| **ESSA Identification**<br>*updated as of 3/11/2024 | CSI |
| **Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)** | No |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)*<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)*<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)*<br>White Students (WHT)*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)* |
| **School Grades History**<br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | |
| **School Improvement Rating History** | 2021-22: I<br><br>2018-19: COMMENDABLE<br><br>2017-18: MAINTAINING<br><br>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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | |

**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 | 0 | |

**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 | 0 | |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |
| 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 | 96 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |

**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 | 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 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 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* | 0 | 47 | 50 | 5 | 49 | 51 | | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | | | | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |
| Math Achievement* | 0 | 34 | 38 | 1 | 33 | 38 | 0 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | | | | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |
| Science Achievement* | | 54 | 64 | 4 | 35 | 40 | | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 22 | 58 | 66 | 6 | 40 | 48 | 17 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 38 | 44 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 13 | 84 | 89 | 23 | 49 | 61 | 35 | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 8 | 65 | 65 | 17 | 60 | 67 | 4 | | |
| ELP Progress | 0 | 36 | 45 | 0 | | | 27 | | |

*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 | 7 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 43 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 82 |
| Graduation Rate | 13 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 8 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 56 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 42 |
| Graduation Rate | 23 |

## 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 | 18 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| ELL | 3 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 7 | Yes | 4 | 4 |
| HSP | 10 | Yes | 4 | 4 |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 22 | Yes | 4 | 4 |
| FRL | 6 | 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 | 23 | Yes | 2 | 2 |
| ELL | 22 | Yes | 2 | 2 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 17 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| HSP | 14 | Yes | 3 | 3 |

| 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 | 12 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| FRL | 19 | 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 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 22 | | 13 | 8 | 0 |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 0 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | 20 | | | 3 | 0 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 0 |

| 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 | 5 | | | 1 | | | 4 | 6 | | 23 | 17 | 0 |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | 23 | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | 44 | | 0 |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | 17 | | |
| HSP | | | | 0 | | | 7 | 19 | | 30 | 27 | 0 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | 9 | | | | | | 15 | | |
| FRL | | | | 8 | | | 18 | 31 | | 22 | 18 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **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 | | | | 17 | | 35 | 4 | 27 |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | 27 | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | 54 | | 27 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | 42 | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | 20 | | 29 | 0 | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | 40 | 10 | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | 20 | | |

**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 | 0% | 45% | -45% | 50% | -50% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | 13% | 46% | -33% | 48% | -35% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 1% | 39% | -38% | 50% | -49% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 4% | 43% | -39% | 48% | -44% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 17% | 50% | -33% | 63% | -46% |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 16% | 54% | -38% | 63% | -47% |

# 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.**

Data shows that approximately 88% of our students are at level 1 in mathematics and 58% at level 1 in ELA. We want to include both because of the significance of reading across the curriculum. That being considered, word problems are becoming more prevalent in mathematics. Upon enrollment, many at-risk 11/12th grade students are found to have not passed the Algebra I course or not have sat for it all. Some students who failed the Algebra I course were still asked to sit for the state exam. Many lack the basic skills to understand some Algebra I concepts. This trend has been consistent since our school's inception in 2013.

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

Just as in Algebra I, upon enrollment, many at-risk 11/12th grade students are found to have not passed the ELA state assessment. There are two main contributors to this occurrence. First is the high percentage of ESOL students, many of whom have just arrived in the United States. Second, the reading levels from the reading assessments through the Reading Plus program showed many 11/12th grade students are reading on an elementary level.

**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.**

Both ELA and Algebra I scores are significantly lower when compared to the state averages. Factors: poor foundation in basic reading/comprehension and basic mathematical skills. This trend has been prevalent since 8/2013 when our school opened. Credit Recovery/At-Risk schools were created to focus on this particular population. As an at-risk/credit recovery high school, it is anticipated this always occur.

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

DJB's due diligence in reviewing many math programs found that Chalk Talk would provide our students the best opportunity to be better prepared for the ACT/SAT concordant assessments. This was reinforced by identifying school districts such as Miami-Dade, Hillsborough, Pasco, and Lee counties currently using Chalk Talk and have expressed positive feedback regarding student achievement levels. The data shows inadequate progress was made in ELA and Algebra I components, and both must be addressed. After investigating and speaking with several individuals, DJB has instituted an accredited reading program called Reading Plus. A program being utilized by other schools here in Lee County. It was chosen because after speaking with school leadership from those schools, it was determined that it would positively affect student achievement levels.

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

8N/A, EWS pertains to grade levels K - 8

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

1. To ensure all students have taken the initial reading assessment with the Reading Plus program. By doing so, the program will customize a plan for all students' particular needs.
2. To monitor all student Reading Plus progress weekly and daily.
3. To introduce the Chalk Talk mathematics program that will offer struggling DJB students a different approach to learning the desired skills needed for the ACT/SAT concordant mathematics assessments.
4. Have the school leadership team meet with the teachers monthly to review the reading/math data to identify what is working and what needs to be modified.
5. To ensure students are better prepared to satisfy the state assessments and concordant assessments in ELA and Algebra I, as these assessments are the number one reason our students do not receive the standard diploma.

**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 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.

Many of our students have witnessed or were personally engaged in an incident from their prior school. Many commented that they felt unsafe. Before any school can consider academics, safety must be the priority. Considering how diverse our student population is, DJB has and will continue to create a culture that is safe, warm, and welcoming to all students, regardless of whom they are or their background. DJB has experienced a decline in referral incidents due to the positive culture created at the school. The DJB team understands culture does not happen overnight and must always continue to grow to provide a safe learning space.

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, DJB will have less than 20 referrals entered into the district's SESIR system.

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

This will be monitored by accessing the Lee County School District's FOCUS database. This will allow us to identify any trends or gaps better.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joseph Torregrasso (josephto@leeschools.net)

### 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.)

The evidenced-based intervention utilized will be Larry Thompson's company Accutrain and its "Roadmap to Responsibility." He has 30 years of experience as an educator, coach, and superintendent. His company has been invited to speak at national conferences, and their system adopted by schools all over The United States. Although schools have plans, initiate different interventions, and add resources and faculty, many educators have expressed identifying an effective system for school discipline can feel like a dream rather than a reality. The company provides several speakers and resources for consistent and continual
support.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

DJB is located in the East region of the district, which has been identified as having a higher rate of violence when compared to other areas of the Lee County School District. Knowing this, a different approach must be considered toward students arriving with sometimes severe behavioral concerns. Larry Thompson's Accutrain has worked with thousands of educators in America and abroad. Feedback from many of those institutions was overwhelmingly positive. Referrals were significantly lowered, allowing for more significant learning gains. Many educators find that the training learned in the university setting may not always work. Many individuals suggested that Thompson's RCD approach worked better than any strategy learned in the university setting.

### 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. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

**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.

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

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

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**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.)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

**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).

The process to review the SIP funding:

1. Identify line items in the budget to reflect resources to include curriculum programs and team additions that address ELA and Mathematics intervention.

2. The academic needs for DJB students have been the same since 8/2013, reading and mathematics. DJB will institute Reading Plus to allow students to learn to control their reading speed better, increase their comprehension, and possess the needed skills to satisfy the state ELA assessment. All teachers will participate in the daily monitoring of student participation and growth and prepare reports as required.

3. Create a new math teaching position. Allow for a more traditional learning setting where students and educators actively engage in the same lesson. One that will allow students to participate digitally with Edgenuity and provide a more hands-on approach using Chalk Talk. Unlike other curriculum, mathematics is not a spectator sport. It requires more of a paper-and-pencil process. Multiple small groups of 10-12 students will work with a teacher daily for an hour to increase more significant understanding of numerous concepts to better prepare them for the ACT/SAT. By doing so, students will be better prepared to satisfy the state Algebra I requirement.

4. DJB's curriculum Edgenuity and the Reading Plus program for intervention are entirely digitally based, while the Chalk Talk mathematics program will be more traditional in its setting. All teachers will prepare various student progress reports from all sources and communicate them with school leadership, students, and their parents/guardians.

5. Monthly meetings among the school leadership and educators will allow for the review of data collaboratively and identify if any modifications are needed.

6. During the 2023-2024 school year, besides reviewing the monthly Reading Plus reports, teachers from all content areas will offer their findings on how well students address their reading and writing assignments in other content areas.

7. DJB will compare state Reading and Algebra I scores from students that tested in 2022-2023 who were unsuccessful in ELA and Algebra I state assessments and compare them with their scores from 2023-2024 to identify the learning gains in the reading and math interventions. Reviewing and comparing both school year's data can begin in late Fall 2023, as state testing occurs many times throughout the academic year.

## Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

**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**

N/A

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

N/A

**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 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 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

## Monitoring

### 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 impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

## Evidence-based Practices/Programs

### Description:
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. §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?

N/A

**Rationale:**
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

**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 |
|---|---|

N/A

# Title I Requirements

**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))**
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

DJB is not a Title I school. However, all stakeholders will know of the SIP. The SIP will not be considered satisfied and complete until the Lee County School District is satisfied with its composition and, once achieved, approved by DJB's Board of Directors. The school leadership will then share it with the entire Team at the school. We will discuss it with all parents and community members attending the Open House functions. A hard copy will be available at the school for any stakeholder to acquire and meet with a school leader to help the stakeholder to disseminate the data better.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.**
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

One advantage DJB provides students and their families is that we are a minimal school setting and even offer two sessions for greater flexibility for better attendance. We have invited families, school district personnel, and other community members to come and visit us while school is in session to see our students. What we found when speaking with many students upon enrollment, they, along with their families, did not know where they were in their pursuit of the diploma. All students' academic histories are generated, reviewed, and a Graduation Plan is created. The DJB counselor will meet and review these Graduation Plans with students. The student will sign off on the process that did occur, and a copy will be sent home to the parents. Weekly emails and other needed correspondences will be sent home weekly by all educators, and if required, parent/teacher conferences will be conducted to review student progress or intervention. All announcements about DJB's educational programs, intervention programs, school resources, staffing, and any information regarding state testing will be posted on the school website, school Facebook as well as discussed at all school community functions.

**Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))**

From the start of the new school year, students will be required to work on their reading intervention through Reading Plus in their first hour of attending school before having any access to other curricula. Small groups of students will work with a different math teacher to focus on specific foundational concepts needed to enhance their Algebra I scores. Consistent routines are important for our at-risk population. Scheduling meetings with Team members will allow us to identify what's working and what needs to be modified. Communicating directly with the students to get their feedback and their families ensures our perception of effectiveness is also shared with those stakeholders.

**If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))**

DJB is a public charter high school. We ensure the school complies with all Federal, State, and district mandates. All students regardless of their background, are eligible to enroll and have access to all the resources at the school.

**Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan**
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

**Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))**

Again, DJB is not a Title I school. However, DJB understands that many of our students face enormous hurdles that prevent them from succeeding. Unfortunately, many students' mental health is compromised because of their daily concerns about where they will sleep or eat, among other worries. We cannot expect students to learn when their mental health needs help. DJB provides a Florida State licensed mental health provider that visits the school

**Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))**

DJB was a vision of a night school called Tri-County Apprenticeship Academy (TCAA) that specializes in offering national certification in various trades. Their vision became a reality in 8/2013 when DJB opened. Regardless of which of the five trades adult night students select, students must take a CORE prerequisite course. DJB offers that course along with Electrical I. When a student completes just the CORE course with us, upon graduation, they will be given a list of employers they will have an excellent chance to work with. The employers have also agreed to pay all future tuition and book costs affiliated with completing the national certification program. Students are also in contact with all military branches here. DJB invites all the branches to visit the school and speak with interested students. Finally, we invite local colleges to visit our site to speak with students interested in pursuing post-secondary education.

**Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).**

As mentioned, DJB implemented Larry Thompson's model of Roadmap to Responsibility. This model accomplishes two factors. First, it allows a structure and pathway for students to process their thoughts and actions differently, eventually allowing them to hold themselves more accountable. Second, it provides educators with a paradigm proven to be highly effective in numerous educational settings similar to DJB throughout America. This model does not discriminate against any student and has been proven to work well with students diagnosed with emotional and behavioral disorders.

**Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))**

Regarding professional learning, all educators are aware they must continue to participate in professional education to keep their state certification active. Teachers are strongly encouraged to participate in as many professional learning opportunities as possible by visiting the Lee County School District Peoplesoft site for a listing of all available training. School leadership attends at-risk charter school conferences to identify curriculum and other resources to enhance safety and student achievement. The beginning of the year and semi-annual training in Edgenuity and Reading Plus will allow the teachers to maximize their skills. There will be scheduled meetings with teachers to discuss how the intervention(s) work and the gaps that must be re-examined. School counselor attends conferences to keep current on existing state and proposed legislation that will impact graduation requirements for students. DJB utilizes various sources to recruit educators. Unfortunately, recruiting educators has become a monumental task as many are leaving the profession, and the enrollment of those entering college-led teacher programs has seen a decline in registration. DJB understands the importance of retaining good educators and other vital team members. Although DJB may be considered one of the smallest high schools in Florida, we ensure we budget so all our Team members are provided 100% health, vision, and dental insurance. Our educators have a voice in building upon the school's culture. They all feel a sense of ownership, which drives them to be the best educator they can be.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))**

N/A

# 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: Other | | | | $891.00 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |
| | 7300 | 311 | 4302 - Donna J. Beasley Technical Academy | General Fund | | $891.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Accutrain: Discipline program.* | | | |
| | | | 4302 - Donna J. Beasley Technical Academy | | | $0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: -- Select below --: | | | | $178,343.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |
| | 5100 | 160 | 4302 - Donna J. Beasley Technical Academy | General Fund | 2.0 | $160,000.00 |
| | | | *Notes: One reading and one math tutor: Salary plus benefits package comes to $160,000.00* | | | |
| | 5100 | 649 | 4302 - Donna J. Beasley Technical Academy | General Fund | | $18,343.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Reading plus: $10,633 and Math program: $7,710. Programs to enhance our Math and English programs.* | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | $179,234.00 |

## Budget Approval

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

No