Kate M. Smith Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Kate M. Smith Elementary School

1447 SOUTH BLVD, Chipley, FL 32428

http://kms.wcsdschools.com

Demographics

Principal: Chris Tyre

Start Date for this Principal: 9/11/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
2019-20 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%)
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

Kate M. Smith Elementary School

1447 SOUTH BLVD, Chipley, FL 32428

http://kms.wcsdschools.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	90%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

Year	**2019-20**	**2018-19**	**2017-18**	**2016-17**
Grade	B	B	B	B

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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	
Walters, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 9/11/2020, Chris Tyre

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
63

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	153	175	169	138	151	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	929
Attendance below 90 percent	26	24	30	28	28	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	1	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	12	23	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/11/2020

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	
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

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	
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

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	
	(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.

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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
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
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
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	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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%	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	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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?

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:
No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

AVID Implementation: 5th grade teachers will continue to implement student binders, 3-4 grade teachers will implement student binders, and K-2 will implement student folders according to KMS AVID binder / folder expectations during the first week of school as an organizational tool to be used throughout the year.
2. We will continue to plant seeds of growth mindset focusing on college and career readiness through visual representation in classrooms and high traffic areas.
3. WICOR will be implemented across subject areas in K-5.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Stakeholders: We provide information by way of local newspapers, PTO/Facebook, School website and marquee. We provide local business with supply need and opportunities to support activities.
Parents/Guardians: We weekly send information via Schoolmessenger about opportunities to be involved and about guidelines that will make their visit to the school the best experience possible. Staff is available to answer questions and schedule meetings.
Students: Staff welcomes each child with a hello and a smile. Teachers prepare a warm and inviting classrooms. Students are told what is expected and given the best opportunity to learn and grow as possible. Positive, encouraging posters are placed around the school and classrooms to remind students how awesome they are.
Staff: Staff is treated with respect and from time to time administrators do things to let them know they are appreciated. They are encouraged to continue to be the awesome. We celebrate teachers, secretaries, students, custodians, lunchroom workers and bus drivers.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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