

Washington County School District

Kate M. Smith Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Kate M. Smith Elementary School

1447 SOUTH BLVD, Chipley, FL 32428

<http://kms.wcsdschools.com>

Demographics

Principal: Chris Tyre

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: A (67%) 2014-15: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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 Washington 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.

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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Kate M. Smith Elementary School

1447 SOUTH BLVD, Chipley, FL 32428

<http://kms.wcsdschools.com>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">62%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">27%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://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.

Our mission is to empower all students to become well educated, productive citizens by providing appropriate, high quality, and rigorous educational programs in a safe learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Kate M. Smith Elementary School is to be recognized as a high performing school of excellence.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Burdeshaw, Lesa	Principal	
Lindsey, Bonnie	Assistant Principal	
Tyre, Chris	Assistant Principal	
Locke, Sule	School Counselor	
Clifton, Tiffany	School Counselor	
Ellis, Paula	Instructional Coach	
Walters, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	175	175	139	149	158	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	939
Attendance below 90 percent	20	47	30	29	34	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194
One or more suspensions	1	10	3	12	19	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	3	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	25	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	4	1	9	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	5	29	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

67

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/27/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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	44	36	25	25	34	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	197
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	5	4	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	33	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	1	0	3	7	21	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	44	36	25	25	34	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	197
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	5	4	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	33	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	1	0	3	7	21	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	64%	59%	57%	63%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	59%	58%	59%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	49%	53%	48%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	70%	64%	63%	68%	68%	61%
Math Learning Gains	69%	63%	62%	51%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	47%	51%	34%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	48%	53%	58%	61%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	175 (0)	175 (0)	139 (0)	149 (0)	158 (0)	143 (0)	939 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	20 (44)	47 (36)	30 (25)	29 (25)	34 (34)	34 (33)	194 (197)
One or more suspensions	1 (1)	10 (1)	3 (0)	12 (0)	19 (4)	14 (1)	59 (7)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (5)	7 (4)	3 (11)	1 (2)	14 (22)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (11)	25 (33)	21 (36)	50 (80)

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	58%	60%	-2%	58%	0%
	2018	70%	66%	4%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	65%	2%	58%	9%
	2018	59%	55%	4%	56%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	56%	50%	6%	56%	0%
	2018	57%	53%	4%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	51%	3%	62%	-8%
	2018	72%	70%	2%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	77%	0%	64%	13%
	2018	76%	73%	3%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	70%	60%	10%	60%	10%
	2018	55%	52%	3%	61%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	47%	6%	53%	0%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	34	43	25	50	51	31	33				
BLK	33	45	53	49	54	47	43				
MUL	73	61		67	61						
WHT	70	66	43	75	74	56	58				
FRL	53	56	47	63	61	52	45				

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	38	47	34	45	46	43	22				
BLK	51	47	33	58	45	29	45				
HSP	58	55		83	91						
MUL	64	62		60	64						
WHT	70	60	59	74	64	40	63				
FRL	58	55	46	65	58	37	61				

2017 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
SWD	31	35	24	44	42	29	19				
BLK	47	53	50	54	49	38	32				
HSP	44	40		72	30						
MUL	48	73		68	42						
WHT	69	61	48	70	54	33	65				
FRL	54	55	44	62	50	36	36				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	419
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Our lowest component was Third Grade Math. Multiple teachers in this data component had long term leave during the year. We also had multiple teachers new to the grade level. Previous years scores had been much higher so this percentage score is not reflective of years past.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline was Third Grade Math. This component dropped 18 percentage points. Multiple teachers in this data component had long term leave during the year. We also had multiple teachers new to the grade level. Previous years scores had been much higher so this percentage score is not reflective of years past.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Third Grade Math. Multiple teachers in this data component had long term leave during the year. We also had multiple teachers new to the grade level. Previous years scores had been much higher so this percentage score is not reflective of years past.

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 5th grade math as it increased fifteen percentage points. We focused more on standards based teaching versus following the text book. We also used new supplemental materials.

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

Our major area of concern is the number of student whose attendance is below 90%.

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

1. Students with Disabilities.
2. Third Grade Math Achievement
3. Third Grade ELA Achievement
4. African American ELA Achievement
5. Fifth Grade Science Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Students With Disabilities
Rationale	Although Students with disabilities did make gains in some subgroups compared to 2018, we are looking to improve in all areas for these students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan on increasing our achievement percentage to at least 50% in all measurable areas and increase our learning gains to 75% in each measurable area.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephanie Walters (stephanie.walters@wcsdschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	For the 2019-2020 school year we have implemented the inclusion model for grades 3 - 5. Within these classrooms, a general education teacher and ESE teacher use the co-teaching model to service all students within the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The reason behind selecting this strategy is that research has shown that students with and without disabilities achieve and thrive more within the regular classroom setting.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training for teachers 2. Visitation of schools with successful implementation of inclusion. 3. Strategically scheduling students with classes and teachers to best meet their needs. 4. Additional Para Professional support for inclusion classrooms.
Person Responsible	Bonnie Lindsey (bonnie.lindsey@wcsdschools.com)

#2	
Title	English Language Arts Proficiency and Learning Gains
Rationale	Our highest area of concern is ELA proficiency and learning gains. ELA proficiency and learning gains dropped as a school for the 2018-19 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Kate M. Smith Elementary schools goal is for 75% of our students to be proficient in ELA and 75% of our students will make learning in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephanie Walters (stephanie.walters@wcsdschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers collaborated during the summer analyzing previous years data to determine weaknesses and deficiencies in student achievement. They created curriculum maps based on standards and the use of best practices and strategies to implement during the 2019-20 school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Use of this strategy was based on the data collected and researched best practices to help students achieve proficiency.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaboration of teachers during summer 2. Weekly grade group meetings to review implementation of standards based curriculum maps 3. Teachers and academic analysts monitoring student achievement 4. Implementation of fluid small group intervention
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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).

Teachers will use previous year's data to set individual goals on their Professional Learning Plan to ensure better student achievement.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

We have attended PD, are conducting book studies and increased communication to assist in building positive relationships with families. We are making efforts to increase our outreach and have more events for the parents at the school.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

We have a mental health counselor to help with severe issues students may have. We have added back character education to our curriculum for all students as well.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

We take our 5th graders to the middle school for a visit in the spring to help the transition. We have orientation for kindergarten and prek during the summer just before school begins. The county Head Start program works closely with kindergarten teachers. They bring their children who will be in kindergarten here in the spring and invite our teachers to visit the center for special occasions.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The leadership team works together to ensure schedules are followed for maximum impact. We analyze data frequently, attend Mtss meetings, and confer to ensure programs purchased are being used and are effective. This includes classroom observation and teacher input.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

While this has less impact here at a Prek-5 school, we do talk to children about career choices and partner with such organizations as the city Garden Club, local businesses and Kiwanis to help with a positive influence on children. Our kindergarten visits many local businesses during their exploration of community in the spring.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students With Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: English Language Arts Proficiency and Learning Gains	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00