Palm Acres Charter High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Palm Acres Charter High School

507 SUNSHINE BLVD N, Lehigh Acres, FL 33971

http://www.palmacrescharter.com/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 8/22/2023.

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.

To create an environment that serves leaders by ensuring the attainment of an accredited diploma and relevant vocational skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To empower leaders through inspiration and education.

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
White, Sarah	Principal	* Principal - Sarah White - Compliance, Operations, District-related responsibilities Others on the School Leadership Team include: * Vocational / Student Support Specialist - Markihe Anderson - Data Mgt, Enrollment/Retention * Teacher - Ramon Pedraja - Academics, Attendance, Discipline, Safety and Security * School Counselor - Russell Crawford - Counseling, Mental Health and Guidance

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.

• Comprehensive Needs Assessment – Stakeholders, including students, staff and parents, will be surveyed to better understand students' most pressing needs and their root causes. Survey results will be reviewed together with relevant academic achievement data.

• Comprehensive Schoolwide Plan - The Leadership Team will lead development of a "schoolwide plan" including strategies to be implemented; descriptions of how strategies will strengthen the academic program, increase the amount and quality of learning time, help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum and will include benchmarks for the evaluation of program results. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

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))

• Regular Meetings - The Leadership Team will meet at least once per quarter to discuss areas of concern, to review data relative to student progress and to evaluate overall operations. If warranted or desired, the Team will meet more frequently. Strategies for improvement will be developed and implemented.
* Annually, the SIP will be revised based on student needs 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 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	82%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	63%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: COMMENDABLE 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: MAINTAINING
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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	47	50	0	49	51			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*		34	38	4	33	38			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		54	64		35	40			
Social Studies Achievement*		58	66	17	40	48			
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	14	84	89	12	49	61	34		
College and Career Acceleration	42	65	65	50	60	67	12		
ELP Progress	22	36	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	23
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	91
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Graduation Rate	14

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	17
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	83
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	12

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	29	Yes	4	4
ELL	14	Yes	4	4
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	15	Yes	4	4
HSP	20	Yes	4	4
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	23	Yes	4	4
FRL	20	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	8	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%
ELL	8	Yes	3	3
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	4	Yes	3	3
HSP	16	Yes	3	3
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	12	Yes	3	3
FRL	9	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	13									14	42	22
SWD											1	
ELL											2	22
AMI												
ASN												
BLK											1	
HSP											2	27
MUL												
PAC												
WHT											1	
FRL											2	27

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	0			4				17		12	50	
SWD										8		
ELL										8		
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										4		
HSP										16		
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										12		
FRL										9		

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										34	12	
SWD										50		
ELL										35		
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										20		
HSP										37	7	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										48	25	
FRL										29	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	32%	45%	-13%	50%	-18%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	9%	39%	-30%	50%	-41%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	6%	43%	-37%	48%	-42%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	63%	*

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	25%	54%	-29%	63%	-38%

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.

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated):
The school received a School Improvement Ratings of "MAINTAINING" for FY22 and "COMMENDABLE" for FY19. In order to calculate the gains required to receive a School Improvement Rating, scores from a minimum of 10 qualifying students MUST have been reported. Learning gains were calculated for ELA and for Math for FY19 and FY22. NONE of these gains are reflected in the pre-populated charts.

"Graduation rate" is the data component showing the lowest performance. Please refer to "Graduation Rate Comments" on previous page. Percentages are misleading when they are calculated on such small numbers.

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

"Graduation rate" showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Fiscal years 2020 and 2021 were both years of COVID-19 pandemic accommodations. It was difficult for students to "get back on track" after remote learning for nearly two years.

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.

"Graduation rate" is the data component that showed the most improvement. Please refer to "Graduation Rate Comments" on previous page. Percentages are misleading when they are calculated on such small numbers.

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

"Graduation rate" is the data component that showed the most improvement. Please refer to "Graduation Rate Comments" on previous page. Percentages are misleading when they are calculated on such small numbers.

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

"Graduation Rate" is definitely an area of concern. As an alternative charter high school, improving the "graduation rate" for our program is nearly impossible. The majority of students are "out-of-cohort" either upon enrollment or upon completion of our program. The opportunity to improve the "graduation rate" as calculated for all other schools in the state is possible but the likelihood that it can exceed 67% is not reasonable.

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

- Recruitment / Retention of certified staff
- Student Mentoring Program – impacting attendance, course completion, graduation

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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

- Employment of certified staff that are passionate about our program aimed at helping those students that are disengaged, disadvantaged and/or disinterested is integral to the success of our program. The teacher-student relationship is most important in establishing a path to academic and social-emotional success for our students. Currently, there is a nationwide shortage of qualified teachers.

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

- At least two certified teachers will be hired – at least one Science and one Math or ELA. The appropriate teacher to student ratio of 1 teacher to 50 students will be maintained.
The school operates 2 sessions; during each session the teacher works with 25 students.
- At least 75% of certified staff will sign contract to work FY25 at the end of FY24

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

- CSIMS will reflect the hiring of additional staff.
- Participation in professional development opportunities
- Year-End Letter of "Intent to Return" completed in May 2024.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah White (sarahwh@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.)

- Participation in LCSD "APPLES" mentoring program for new teachers and teachers new to Lee County
- Increased professional development opportunities for staff
- Advertisements for positions placed on Craigslist / Indeed.com / Facebook ads

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

- Training staff in the practices and policies of the LCSD (our sponsor) and with CPCHS, Inc.
- Supporting professional development encourages individual growth and helps to identify staff with leadership potential.
- Looking for persons local to Southwest Florida
- Seeking persons certified in the State of Florida

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.

- Attendance at National Dropout Prevention Conference – Networking opportunities
- Attendance at the Florida Charter School Conference – Networking opportunities
- Participation in LCSD "APPLES" mentoring program
- Reviewing staff professional development interests, certificate status, legal requirements, etc. to enable staff to direct their professional growth. Development of individualized plan.

Person Responsible: Sarah White (sarahwh@leeschools.net)

By When: ASAP

#2. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation

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.

Graduation rate is the most unfair gauge when reviewing an alternative school whose student population is comprised primarily of persons who were "out-of-cohort" upon enrollment in our program. PACHS offers a credit recovery / dropout prevention program affording individuals the opportunity to obtain a state-recognized diploma (not a GED) until the age of 21 (22, if ESE). Students can attend from 9th grade through the age of 21. Students in their 12th grade year upon enrollment arrive when there is insufficient time left in the academic year to complete remaining courses required for them to acquire the 18-24 credits to graduate. Although they may graduate before the age of 21, they are "out-of-cohort" upon completion of the program. Because so many students are "out-of-cohort" while enrolled, our graduation rate will not ever reach 67%. However, this is the calculation that categorizes us as CSI.

Unlike at traditional high schools, all our students do not necessarily remain continuously enrolled. Many of our students enroll and drop out repeatedly over the course of months or years. The actual number of students enrolled during any given year is often double the number of students indicated for the Florida Educational Funding Program (FEFP) which averages students enrolled during specific dates in October and February. "Graduation rate", as calculated above, holds little meaning for us. A better way to calculate a "graduation rate" for our program would be to calculate the number of graduates vs the number of students enrolled that could have graduated…..

- Palm Acres' FY22 graduation rate as calculated by "in cohort" graduates was 12%. While the graduation rate of 67% to exit CSI is unattainable for our program, increasing the number of students who graduate "in cohort" is a priority.

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

- Palm Acres' graduation rate, as calculated by "in cohort" graduates, will increase by 5% by the end of FY24.

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

- Review of FY24 graduation rate in June 2024

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah White (sarahwh@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.)

- Palm Acres CHS has instituted a school-based mentoring program affording students one-on-one mentor opportunities with school staff. Students will meet at least twice monthly to set goals, review attendance, and academic progress as well as identify personal challenges, develop strategies for overcoming these obstacles and, ultimately, creating a plan for getting back on track for graduation.

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

"Changing Perspectives", PACHS's Mentoring Program, is designed to empower students to intentionally invest in their future through life skills development, college readiness, and vocational preparedness training.

Attitudes and beliefs about school affect academic performance. Mentoring programs improve attendance and graduation rates by changing the student's perspective.

The mentoring relationship does several things:
· Builds trust
· Builds positive relationships
· Encourages goal setting
· Fosters accountability
· Teaches specific external and internal skills
· Facilitates an immediate response to intervention
· Delivers advocacy
· Provides community resource assistance

When students experience minor successes, they are empowered to take academic risks. The sense of well-being increases attendance and ultimately leads to graduation.

Chronic absent students are at a high risk of dropping out of school. Students who take excessive days from school due to issues like caring for siblings, homelessness, bullying, limited resources, or mental health issues are far more likely to drop out.

Mentoring builds resiliency. Through mentoring, students feel a sense of belonging, participate in school activities and develop positive peer relationships. These students are more likely to improve attendance, grades and ultimately graduate from high school.

D Lyonsa, M., & Chan, W. (n.d.). Mentoring for Enhancing School Attendance, Academic Performance, and Educational Attainment. National Mentoring Resource Center. https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/nmrc-mentoring-enhancing-school-attendance.pdf

Mentoring programs for high school graduation. County Health Rankings & Roadmaps. (n.d.). https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/take-action-to-improve-health/what-works-for-health/strategies/mentoring-programs-for-high-school-graduation#:~:text=Students%20participating%20in%20group%20mentoring,high%20school%20on%2Dtime9.

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.

- Assign incoming students a staff mentor
- Set student mentor program schedule
- Document regular mentor meetings
- Review student data/changes in data

Person Responsible: Sarah White (sarahwh@leeschools.net)

By When: ASAP

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).

Monies to fund the hiring of certified and other staff to accomplish the goals listed above will come primarily from FEFP funding received from the State through the District based on enrollment. During FY24, additional funds may be utilized from the ESSER III grant monies. The addition of qualified staff should result in increased enrollment which will fund the positions going forward after FY24.