

The School District of Palm Beach County

# Franklin Academy Boynton Beach School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

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

# Franklin Academy Boynton Beach

7882 S MILITARY TRL, Boynton Beach, FL 33463

<http://bb.franklin-academy.org/>

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 12/9/2023.

## 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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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.**

Utilizing an intercultural-mindedness model and a standards-based curriculum, the mission of Franklin Academy is to create compassionate, engaged, life-long learners by promoting a culture of collaboration and high expectations that emphasizes character development through active service in the local, national and international community, while adhering to the principle that all children can learn.

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

Utilizing an intercultural mindedness model and a standards-based curriculum, the mission of Franklin Academy is to create compassionate, engaged, life-long learners by promoting a culture of collaboration and high expectations that emphasize character development through active service in the local, national and international community, while adhering to the principle that all children can learn.

### 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   |
|------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| L'Etoile, Alison | Principal                   | <p>The Principal will monitor and work with all staff listed above to ensure implementation with MTSS and SIP support. The Principal oversees the execution and monitoring of all strategies and action steps towards continuous improvement process at the school. The Principal will guide and facilitate instruction with the use of best practices and recommended resources/ materials. It is the principal's responsibility to deepen the understanding of standards and engage faculty, students, parents, and the community members to understand the standards and the vision of academic success aligned to college and career readiness. In addition, the principal hires and retains highly qualified employees, uses data to inform decisions and instruction, professional learning, performance, and student learning. The principal quickly and proactively addresses problems in instruction and student learning. Finally, as principal, Ms. L'Etoile must reflect on competing priorities and focus attention on those that will have the greatest leverage in improving instruction and learning.</p> |
| Atway, Fatan     | Assistant Principal         | <p>As assistant Principal, Ms. Atway supports professional learning and collaboration amongst teachers and resource staff and facilitates and leads professional learning focused on content, instruction, and pedagogical content knowledge. She must demonstrate through daily decisions and actions that the school's priority is academic success for every student. The Assistant Principal assists with eliminating barriers and distractions that interfere with effective teaching and learning. Supports the principal in building a culture of pride, trust, and respect. Monitors the implementation of cultural competence, equity, and access within the instructional practices at the school center. She also monitors and improves instruction by visiting classrooms to support and monitor instruction.</p>   |
| Elsesser, Erica  | Curriculum Resource Teacher | <p>The Curriculum Specialist assists with the coordination and implementation of the District approved ELA curriculum, which follows state standards. She utilizes the coaching model (planning, demonstrating, and providing feedback) with teachers at the school site. Provides site based professional development to staff that is aligned to the needs of students based upon student assessment data. Assists administration and the classroom teachers in the interpretation of student assessment data. Participates in professional development and shares the content with school staff. She participates in and facilitate weekly Professional Learning Communities or PLC's. Finally, the Curriculum Specialist will provide support to classroom teachers in assisting with the Response to Intervention (RTI) process and ensure SIP goals are met for ELA (Reading/ Writing). She will also lead standards-based planning and follow the FCIM coaching cycle.</p>   |

**Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development**

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

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

The Franklin Academy Leadership team and ESE Coordinator were involved in adding input to the development of the SIP. A meeting was held to go over why Franklin was identified for a SIP. The data was looked over and in a roundtable discussion a needs assessment was conducted. The focus of the conversation was identifying the why SWD were performing below performance level, identified the potential causes, and possible actionable goals to accomplish by the end of the school year.

**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 each state assessment progress monitoring period, the collection and analyzation of the student data is done to monitor for progress. Interim assessment tools are used for progress monitoring prior to state assessment benchmarks. These progress monitoring checks are essential to ensure that the action steps detailed in the SIP are working effectively towards student achievement gains. Based on the results of these ongoing checks, the team will decide if necessary changes must be made prior to state assessment benchmarks. A key element to achieve success involves conducting data chats and curriculum meetings where our general education teachers and ESE facilitators collaborate to discuss student-specific data. These meetings result in the creation of tailored action plans that best address the individual needs of each student. Formal data chats will persist after each progress monitoring assessment, facilitating an ongoing, detailed review of student progress. Additionally, informal data chats will be conducted during department meetings to ensure continuous monitoring of student advancement. By taking these comprehensive measures, we aim to significantly improve the academic status of our SWD subgroup and ensure that all students achieve their full potential. The goal is to ensure that positive progress is evident.

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>KG-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | No   |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 80%  |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 68%  |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No   |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | ATSI   |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><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>Asian Students (ASN)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL) |



|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C<br>2019-20: A<br>2018-19: A<br>2017-18: B              |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>  |   |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>  |   |

**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   | 47          | 31 | 29 | 30 | 34 | 37 | 22 | 23 | 19 | 272   |
| One or more suspensions   | 9           | 5  | 4  | 14 | 7  | 8  | 26 | 27 | 10 | 110   |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 49 | 29 | 5  | 83    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36 | 53 | 21 | 110   |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 38 | 41 | 26 | 38 | 32 | 29 | 204   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 41 | 54 | 44 | 40 | 26 | 16 | 221   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 9           | 3  | 17 | 10 | 27 | 16 | 11 | 0  | 9  | 102   |

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 | 5           | 2 | 0 | 32 | 36 | 32 | 61 | 53 | 31 | 252   |

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     | 2           | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3     |

**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 |
|---|-------------|-------|
| Absent 10% or more school days  |             |       |
| One or more suspensions   |             |       |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   |             |       |
| Course failure in Math  |             |       |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment   |             |       |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment  |             |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. |             |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators |             |       |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Retained Students: Current Year     |             |       |
| Students retained two or more times |             |       |

**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 school days  | 47          | 31 | 29 | 30 | 34 | 37 | 22 | 23 | 19 | 272 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 9           | 5  | 4  | 14 | 7  | 8  | 26 | 27 | 10 | 110 |       |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 49 | 29 | 5  | 83  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36 | 53 | 21 | 110 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 38 | 41 | 26 | 38 | 32 | 29 | 204 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 41 | 54 | 44 | 40 | 26 | 16 | 221 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 9           | 3  | 17 | 10 | 27 | 16 | 11 | 0  | 9  | 102 |       |

**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 | 5           | 2 | 0 | 32 | 36 | 32 | 61 | 53 | 31 | 252 |       |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 2           | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3     |

## 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*                | 51     | 49       | 53    | 52     | 52       | 55    | 59     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 51     |          |       | 53     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 43     |          |       | 39     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 47     | 51       | 55    | 46     | 45       | 42    | 42     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 56     |          |       | 32     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 49     |          |       | 28     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 44     | 46       | 52    | 41     | 48       | 54    | 55     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     | 81     | 63       | 68    | 76     | 57       | 59    | 61     |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      | 82     | 68       | 70    | 63     | 51       | 51    | 65     |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        | 73       | 74    |        | 38       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        | 39       | 53    |        | 62       | 70    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 64     | 53       | 55    | 58     | 64       | 70    | 42     |          |       |

*\* 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)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 60   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 417  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 7    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100  |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 54   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 535  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 10   |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99   |
| 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                                | 34                              | Yes                | 2   |   |
| ELL                                | 46                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                | 77                              |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 54                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 56                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 50                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 71                              |                    |   |   |

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |                                 |                    |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup                      | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| FRL                                | 56                              |                    |   |   |

| 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                                | 35                              | Yes                | 1   |   |
| ELL                                | 43                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                | 65                              |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 51                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 50                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 44                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 63                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 52                              |                    |   |   |

**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                                   | 51       |        |             | 47        |         |              | 44       | 81      | 82        |                   |                     | 64           |
| SWD  | 20       |        |             | 16        |         |              | 28       | 50      |           |                   | 6                   | 58           |
| ELL  | 36       |        |             | 37        |         |              | 31       | 79      |           |                   | 6                   | 64           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 64       |        |             | 70        |         |              | 58       |         | 100       |                   | 5                   | 91           |
| BLK  | 45       |        |             | 38        |         |              | 34       | 77      | 89        |                   | 7                   | 54           |
| HSP  | 50       |        |             | 46        |         |              | 39       | 83      | 60        |                   | 7                   | 68           |
| MUL  | 43       |        |             | 57        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 64       |        |             | 62        |         |              | 65       | 86      | 79        |                   | 6                   |              |
| FRL  | 47       |        |             | 43        |         |              | 38       | 81      | 83        |                   | 7                   | 61           |

| 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                                   | 52       | 51     | 43          | 46        | 56      | 49           | 41       | 76      | 63        |                   |                     | 58           |
| SWD  | 19       | 37     | 35          | 16        | 38      | 36           | 18       | 45      |           |                   |                     | 70           |
| ELL  | 38       | 51     | 47          | 30        | 49      | 43           | 19       | 56      |           |                   |                     | 58           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 68       | 46     |             | 68        | 72      |              | 70       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 42       | 48     | 43          | 36        | 53      | 48           | 33       | 77      | 72        |                   |                     | 59           |
| HSP  | 54       | 53     | 35          | 43        | 52      | 44           | 39       | 59      | 59        |                   |                     | 63           |
| MUL  | 48       | 36     |             | 43        | 50      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 66       | 59     | 60          | 61        | 63      | 56           | 57       | 85      | 58        |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 48       | 50     | 37          | 43        | 52      | 42           | 38       | 81      | 67        |                   |                     | 60           |

| 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                                   | 59       | 53     | 39          | 42        | 32      | 28           | 55       | 61      | 65        |                   |                     | 42           |
| SWD  | 14       | 28     | 28          | 21        | 30      | 38           | 14       | 27      |           |                   |                     | 36           |
| ELL  | 45       | 49     | 39          | 32        | 22      | 15           | 34       | 29      |           |                   |                     | 42           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 76       | 67     |             | 70        | 47      |              | 77       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 47       | 47     | 38          | 31        | 27      | 23           | 41       | 47      | 69        |                   |                     | 33           |
| HSP  | 61       | 54     | 37          | 43        | 34      | 31           | 56       | 75      | 62        |                   |                     | 45           |
| MUL  | 71       | 55     |             | 59        | 36      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 72       | 59     | 43          | 55        | 36      | 39           | 67       | 71      | 63        |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 53       | 50     | 40          | 35        | 27      | 25           | 46       | 58      | 55        |                   |                     | 38           |

**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 |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 55%    | 56%      | -1%                        | 54%   | 1%                      |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 54%    | 48%      | 6%                         | 47%   | 7%                      |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 49%    | 47%      | 2%                         | 47%   | 2%                      |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 52%    | 58%      | -6%                        | 58%   | -6%                     |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 54%    | 45%      | 9%                         | 47%   | 7%                      |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 44%    | 48%      | -4%                        | 50%   | -6%                     |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 47%    | 54%      | -7%                        | 54%   | -7%                     |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 50%    | 36%      | 14%                        | 48%   | 2%                      |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 49%    | 57%      | -8%                        | 59%   | -10%                    |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 45%    | 52%      | -7%                        | 61%   | -16%                    |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 53%    | 65%      | -12%                       | 55%   | -2%                     |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 41%    | 56%      | -15%                       | 55%   | -14%                    |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08      | 2023 - Spring | 33%    | 46%      | -13%                       | 44%   | -11%                    |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 46%    | 51%      | -5%                        | 51%   | -5%                     |

| ALGEBRA |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A     | 2023 - Spring | 100%   | 48%      | 52%                        | 50%   | 50%                     |

| GEOMETRY |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade    | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A      | 2023 - Spring | *      | 50%      | *                          | 48%   | *                       |

| BIOLOGY |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A     | 2023 - Spring | 93%    | 63%      | 30%                        | 63%   | 30%                     |

| CIVICS |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade  | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A    | 2023 - Spring | 80%    | 65%      | 15%                        | 66%   | 14%                     |

### 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.**

Franklin Academy BB Campus demonstrated the lowest performance on overall ELA student achievement in the SWD subgroup with 19%, compared to our general ed population who scored a 52%. A contributing factor to students' performance was the initial first full year of students returning back on campus from virtual learning post pandemic, students coming in below grade level, and lack of data driven instruction to support student achievement and growth. Another contributing factor was students were on a 7 period schedule, students had a restrained time to get acquainted in class and focus.

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

The greatest decline from the previous year was our SWD subgroup that decreased from a 21% to 16%. Contributing factors related to this decline and more than half of our students were virtual or hybrid and participated in an instructional model during COVID and did not participate in State Assessments. Additional contributing factors were new teachers to the profession with limited knowledge on implementing accommodations through the tier 1 instruction.

**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.**

Greatest gap compared to the state was Science Achievement with a 41% compared to the state at 51%.



The contributing factors were an influx of new teachers to the profession with limited knowledge on implementing tier 1 instruction.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the SS Achievement from 27% to 45%. A Contributing factor was Franklin Academy students were on campus for instruction, allowing teachers and support facilitators to provide appropriate services to students and accommodations in person. ESE team members were able to make changes to IEPs from temporary distance learning plans to original plans to adding services and accommodations.

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

After reviewing the EWS data, a potential area of concern in proficiency levels in Math.

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

1. Supporting our students with disabilities
2. Tier 1 Differentiated instruction
3. Implement MTSS Process with fidelity

**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.

Overall retention and recruitment of highly qualified educators. If we focus on retaining and recruiting highly qualified teachers to increase learning gains in school-wide ELA and Math, then we will increase student achievement for all students, but especially for our low-performing subgroups. In alignment with the District's Strategic Plan, we enhance a sense of belonging, safety, and acceptance for all. Our instructional priority is to use trends in student data to identify needs in order to support positive behaviors.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By the end of FY24 school year, Franklin Academy will retain 75% of the current teaching staff.

**Monitoring:**

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

Teachers will participate in weekly check in surveys. This data will allow support and resources to be put in place weekly. The teachers will be provided with monthly morale calendars to increase the community atmosphere. Professional development will be assigned to teachers based on walk-through and informal observations.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Alison L'Etoile (alison.letaille@pbcharterschools.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.)

All teachers will participate in professional development trainings monthly. Teachers will participate in committee meetings that are based on the schools need and culture.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The chosen intervention will help teachers identify areas of growth and to collaborate with other teachers.

**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.

1. Weekly Monday Check in surveys
2. Monthly Morale calendars
3. Professional Development trainings based on survey, walk-throughs and informal observations.

**Person Responsible:** Alison L'Etoile (alison.letaille@pbcharterschools.org)

**By When:** Beginning in November 2023

## #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

If we focus on standards-based instruction to increase learning gains in school-wide ELA and Math, then we will

increase student achievement and ensure alignment to the District's Strategic Plan; This area of focus aligns directly with our District Strategic Plan, Theme A-Goal 3, Academic Excellence & growth. Our first instructional priority is to deliver, content, concept, or skill that is aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

Franklin Academy BB Campus demonstrated the lowest performance on overall ELA student achievement in the SWD subgroup with 19%, compared to our general education population who scored a 52%. Math student achievement in the SWD subgroup with 16%, compared to our general education population who scored a 46%. The greatest decline from the previous year was our Math Achievement for SWD subgroup that decreased from a 21% to 16%. Students with disabilities continue to perform below 41% index level for the last year. Our focus this year will be improving academic achievement for our Students With Disabilities subgroup.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the PM3, 50% of students with disabilities within ELA achievement will make one achievement level gain on the FAST ELA assessment from FY23 PM 3 to FY24 PM 3.

### Monitoring:

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

The ESE team will participate in bi-weekly curriculum meetings with grade level and department team meetings. During these meetings, current data for all students will be examined and monitored for progress. The ESE team will have their own department meeting to check in on individual student progress. The ESE team will participate in ongoing data chats with grade level and departments to ensure students at risk are being supported.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alison L'Etoile (alison.lettoile@pbcharterschools.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.)

Students with disabilities will have the opportunity to receive remediation through Progress Learning Software- an instructional software aligned to standard based lessons, assessments and practice skills. Students will be provided with small group instruction to close the achievement gap within tier 1 instruction with our HMH ELA resources. Ongoing data chats will be implemented based on progress monitoring data checks. ESE students will be provided with a Learning Strategies class added to their schedule. Learning Strategies class consists of students will be working on independent functioning skills that will support core classes.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The chosen intervention will help provide remediation in a small group setting to assist with tier 1 instruction and be able to meet the needs of our students with disabilities. Data chats are an integral part of monitoring for student growth and ensuring that the support provided is effective. Placing our ESE

Students in an intensive reading an/or math intensive math class will increase the effectiveness of their independent functioning skills to support academic growth.

**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.

1. Remediation through Progress Learning
2. Differentiated Small Group Instructions
3. Data Chats
4. Implementation of intensive reading and/or math class in current schedule

**Person Responsible:** Alison L'Etoile (alison.leteoile@pbcharterschools.org)

**By When:** Beginning in November 2023

**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).

SDPBC requires schools to complete a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) aligned to the district's 5-Year Strategic Plan in the Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS) portal. Since our schools was identified as Additional Targeted Support & Improvement (ATSI), we are provided personalized, one-on-one or small group support to assist the principal and leadership teams in developing comprehensive plans of action steps in the SIP for improving student achievement. These sessions ensure SIP and Strategic Plan alignment, provide an overview of the requirements of the School Board and school improvement updates. The training is mandatory for all principals. Principals select members of their SIP leadership teams to attend a session with them. Working in collaboration with the school leadership team, Performance Accountability/School Improvement, School Transformation and Federal/State Programs, the District ensures that the SIP and other grant funded plans or allocations are in alignment with the District's Five-Year Strategic Plan and complementary in the funded strategies and supports for each school's continuous improvement. All plans are carefully reviewed and approved by the School Board and the Office of School Improvement.

Resources and allocations are focused on:

1. Resource teachers (ESOL and ESE) support during small group instruction.
2. Teachers and support staff will attend ongoing professional development to engage deep, focused, collaborative planning to support and strengthen data analysis and small group planning and implementation.
3. Professional Learning Community (PLC)/Professional Development will ensure teachers collaboratively unite to focus on best practices and methodologies.
4. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework to ensure students are provided with the specific instruction, resources, time, and intensity needed for success.
5. Curriculum Resources: Curriculum resources to enhance ELA, Science, Civics & Math skills and support student mastery of the Florida B.E.S.T. standards, will support literacy across the content areas, will support social emotion growth through the resources found in the Skills for Learning & Life (SLL) Resource Center to

promote character education.

6. We have partnerships with multiple community and business partners. Together the schools, partner organizations, and businesses provide additional high-quality resources and services to students and families and comprehensively focus on health and wellness, as well as academic achievement.