Dropout Prevention School

2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dropout Prevention School

301 4TH ST SW, Largo, FL 33770

http://it.pinellas.k12.fl.us/schools/dropout-prevent/

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Topping

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19:
School Grades History	2017-18: 2016-17: 2015-16: 2014-15: 2013-14:
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Tracy Webley
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org.](www.floridacims.org)

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Educational Alternative Services, through unified community efforts, provides quality educational opportunities and services for students and their families by educating and preparing each student for college, career and life.
Educational Alternative Services has schools serving students throughout the county.

Provide the school's vision statement

100% Student Success

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
McManus, Eric	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Fields, Christina	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
TOPPING, MICHELLE	Principal
Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	34	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	68	114
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	44	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	6
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	34	38

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	41	52
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	10	24

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
17

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 7/15/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	1	2	5	6	34	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	42	54	107
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	33	0	0	1	3	7	13	6	63

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	1	2	7	41	52	123

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	70%	61%	0%	65%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	54%	0%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	72%	62%	0%	69%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	64%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	52%	0%	59%	52%
Science Achievement	0%	64%	56%	0%	62%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	81%	78%	0%	82%	77%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	34 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	8 (0)	68 (0)	114 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	3 ()	4 ()	44 ()	51 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	6 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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**
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	55%	-55%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	54%	-54%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	60%	-60%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	60%	-60%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	31%	-31%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	31%	-31%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
	2018	9%	57%	-48%	55%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	51%	-51%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	62%	-62%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	63%	-63%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	70%	-70%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	70%	-70%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	55%	-55%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	2
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	12
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	65%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	2
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	0
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	0
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	1
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

Based on the ESSA data provided, Black/African American and Hispanic subgroups were at 0. However, White, SWD, and EDS are 1-2%; all fall below the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index for the past two years.
However, it is difficult to accurately reflect our population as our students are served through several different programs and the length of their enrollment varies. All students served in Educational Alternative Services (EAS) meet at least one (usually multiple identifiers) of the State Dropout Prevention eligibility criteria: "The student is academically unsuccessful as evidenced by low test scores, retention, failing grades, low grade point average, falling behind in earning credits, or not meeting the state or district proficiency levels in reading, mathematics, or writing. The student has a pattern of excessive absenteeism or has been identified as a habitual truant."

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

Due to fluctuating enrollment we use Renaissance STAR testing to measure our students' reading and math progress each quarter. Students in most of our programs are tested when they enroll and quarterly throughout their stay with us. When an exit date is known, we make every effort to test students prior to their exit. Our Renaissance STAR testing data indicates a decline of 2% in the number of students making at least a year's growth in mathematics. However, data available is limited and does not allow for easy comparison as EAS programs serve a constantly changing population throughout the year. The length of student enrollment varies greatly based upon the program in which they are enrolled. Programs serve students who need assistance with course/ credit recovery, substance abuse treatment, and who exhibit behaviors that contribute to students' risk for dropping out of school. All students served in Educational Alternative Services (EAS) meet at least one (usually multiple identifiers) of the State Dropout Prevention eligibility criteria: "The student is academically unsuccessful as evidenced by low test scores, retention, failing grades, low grade point average, falling behind in earning credits, or not meeting the state or district proficiency levels in reading, mathematics, or writing. The student has a pattern of excessive absenteeism or has been identified as a habitual truant."

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

Our available data is limited and does not allow for easy comparison as EAS programs serve a constantly changing population throughout the year. The length of student enrollment varies based upon the program in which they are enrolled. Programs serve students who need assistance with course/ credit recovery, substance abuse treatment, and who exhibit behaviors that contribute to students' risk for dropping out of school. All students served in Educational Alternative Services (EAS) meet at least one (usually multiple identifiers) of the State Dropout Prevention eligibility criteria: "The student is academically unsuccessful as evidenced by low test scores, retention, failing grades, low grade point average, falling behind in earning credits, or not meeting the state or district proficiency levels in reading, mathematics, or writing. The student has a pattern of excessive absenteeism or has been identified as a habitual truant."

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

Our Renaissance STAR testing data indicates an increase of 2% in the number of students making at least a year's growth in reading. We assigned a reading teacher to serve as our reading coach for all of our EAS programs. She provided one on one coaching and support to all reading teachers and worked one on one and with small groups of students throughout the year. She maintained the running records for students at Alpha, facilitated and monitored the Reading Plus program at all other EAS sites, and implemented a recognition and awards programs for students making gains in reading as evidenced by data from Renaissance STAR assessments and the Reading Plus program.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Student attendance and their performance on reading and math assessments are preventing them from being successful in traditional school environments. Students enrolled in EAS programs often meet multiple indicators of the EWS. Due to the nature of a Dropout Prevention Program, we serve a constantly changing population throughout the year. All students served in Educational Alternative Services (EAS) meet at least one (usually multiple identifiers) of the State Dropout Prevention eligibility criteria: "The student is academically unsuccessful as evidenced by low test scores, retention, failing grades, low grade point average, falling behind in earning credits, or not meeting the state or district proficiency levels in reading, mathematics, or writing. The student has a pattern of excessive absenteeism or has been identified as a habitual truant." Most of our students meet multiple indicators over the course of several years.

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

1. Reading and Math Performance - Alpha and Operation Par

2. Attendance - Alpha and Success Center

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Reading and Math Gains
Rationale	In five of the eight ESSA subgroups, we scored less then 41% on the Federal Percent of Points Index in ELA and Math gains. These subgroups include: white, black, Hispanic, SWD, and EDS. It is difficult to accurately reflect our population as our students are served through several different programs and the length of their enrollment varies. Due to this fluctuating enrollment we use Renaissance STAR testing data to measure our students' reading and math progress each quarter. We noticed a 2% decline in the number of students making more than a year's gain in math and a 2% increase in the number of students making more than a year's gain in reading.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 2019-20 school year, our students will increase their ELA and math performance by 3% as measured by FSA and Renaissance STAR assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	MICHELLE TOPPING (toppingl@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	In our EAS programs we utilize a variety of technology based resources to individualize instruction for all students in order to improve their reading and math skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The technology programs used are evidence based, prescriptive in nature and provide individualized for instruction for each student based on their unique math and reading needs.

Action Step	
Description	1. Students will be assessed using Renaissance STAR at program entrance and quarterly throughout their enrollment to monitor basic reading and math skills. 2. Each classroom will be equipped with supplemental, culturally relevant reading materials to create a literature-rich environments. 3. Each classroom will be equipped with supplemental math materials and manipulatives to enhance math instruction. 4. Teachers will be provided focused professional development related to program needs, strategies for creating a culturally relevant classroom and the use of instructional best practices. 5. A Progress Monitoring Plan will be developed for each student addressing ELA and math goals based on the STAR results. 6. Teachers and students will be provided access to FEV Tutor which is available 24-7 for individual tutorial support in all subjects and grade levels.

Person Responsible	MICHELLE TOPPING (toppingl@pcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	All students served in Educational Alternative Services (EAS) meet at least one (usually multiple identifiers) of the State Dropout Prevention eligibility criteria: "The student is academically unsuccessful as evidenced by low test scores, retention, failing grades, low grade point average, falling behind in earning credits, or not meeting the state or district proficiency levels in reading, mathematics, or writing. The student has a pattern of excessive absenteeism or has been identified as a habitual truant." Average daily attendance(ADA) at Alpha averaged 92.5% for Operation PAR ADA was 99.5% for the the 2018-2019 school year. Students at the Success center had an ADA of 65.5%, we will be addressing the attendance concerns at the Success Center.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Throughout the 2019-2020 school year attendance at the Success Center will improve by 5%, as evidenced by student daily attendance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	MICHELLE TOPPING (toppingl@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	This year we will be utilizing Remind 101 to improve student and parent communication in order to increase student engagement and attendance. ,
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students in our programs are generally disconnected from or do not recognize the value of education to their future. Our programs focus on building relationships that promote and foster a positive learning environment and lifelong learners. This is accomplished through additional support staff and technology tools (Remind 101) to address individual learner needs.

Action Step	
Description	1. EAS Attendance Specialist will meet regularly with staff and students to address any concerns. 2. Professional development will be provided to implement Remind 101. 3. Monthly Child Study Team meetings to review attendance and implement strategies for improvement. 4. Monthly recognition to celebrate students reaching their attendance goals. 5.
Person Responsible	Michelle Pool (poolm@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Not applicable