

Escambia County School District

# O. J. Semmes Elementary School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>11</b> |

## O. J. Semmes Elementary School

1250 E TEXAR DR, Pensacola, FL 32503

www.escambiaschools.org

### School Demographics

|   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | <b>2017-18 Title I School</b> | <b>2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                               | Yes                           | 100%  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | <b>Charter School</b>         | <b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                                  | No                            | 88%   |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C       | D       | C       | F*      |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

The mission of O. J. Semmes Elementary School is to provide an environment where all students can achieve their highest academic potential while developing physically, emotionally and socially into productive citizens.

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

The vision of O. J. Semmes Elementary School is to create a safe, nurturing environment conducive to teaching and learning.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name            | Title               |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Farish, Connie  | Principal           |
| Burton, Natasha | Instructional Media |
| Roby, Amy       | Assistant Principal |
| Lobley, Uadona  | Teacher, K-12       |
| Willem, Jen     | Teacher, K-12       |

#### Duties

##### Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The Principal and Assistant Principal ensure the overall process moves smoothly and uses this time to gather information on individual students and assists with teacher concerns.

The Curriculum Coordinator ensures that the staff has curriculum needs met and works with the discipline process.

General education teachers provide information about the core curriculum.

The Media Specialist ensures that teachers and students have access to the Media Center for books and other materials.

### Early Warning Systems

#### Year 2017-18

##### 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           | 3 | 1  | 0  | 2  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 10 |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 9 | 5  | 20 | 11 | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 49 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 9 | 11 | 20 | 8  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 52 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0  | 12 | 20 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 47 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 3 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 30 |

**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     | 1           | 13 | 4 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 31 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0           | 1  | 0 | 3  | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 9  |

**Date this data was collected**

Friday 8/17/2018

**Year 2016-17 - 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     | 0           | 18 | 20 | 12 | 7  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 69 |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 11 | 7  | 5  | 6  | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 48 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 4  | 20 | 20 | 6  | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 77 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 7  | 21 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 72 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |    |
|--|-------------|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12 |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 5 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 63 |

**Year 2016-17 - 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           | 18 | 20 | 12 | 7  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 69    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 11 | 7  | 5  | 6  | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 4  | 20 | 20 | 6  | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 77    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 7  | 21 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 72    |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 5 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 63    |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

FCAT Science proficiency performed the lowest. It is not a trend. Science proficiency was 37% in 2016, 44% in 2017, and 22% in 2018.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

FCAT Science proficiency showed the greatest decline from the 2017 scores.

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

ELA and Science had the biggest gaps when compared to the state average. The 3-5 ELA proficiency was 24% and the state average was 56%. The FCAT Science data also had a large gap in that the fifth grade proficiency was 22% and the state average was 55%.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

The lower quartile Math proficiency showed the most improvement. It is not a trend, as, two years ago in 2016 the learning gains were 61%. In 2017 the learning gains were 31%. This 2018 year the learning gains increased to 76%

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.**

Teachers were targeted in their instruction of math standards and giving much remediation to those students in the lower quartile. Also, the majority of these students had no learning gain the previous year.

### 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      | 2018   |          |       | 2017   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 24%    | 49%      | 56%   | 30%    | 46%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 46%    | 46%      | 55%   | 41%    | 46%      | 52%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 52%    | 40%      | 48%   | 71%    | 43%      | 46%   |
| Math Achievement            | 45%    | 55%      | 62%   | 47%    | 52%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 71%    | 57%      | 59%   | 55%    | 50%      | 58%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 76%    | 48%      | 47%   | 61%    | 43%      | 46%   |
| Science Achievement         | 22%    | 55%      | 55%   | 37%    | 51%      | 51%   |

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |        |         |         |         |         | Total   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1      | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       |         |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0 (0)                             | 3 (18) | 1 (20)  | 0 (12)  | 2 (7)   | 4 (12)  | 10 (69) |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 (0)                             | 9 (11) | 5 (7)   | 20 (5)  | 11 (6)  | 4 (19)  | 49 (48) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 (0)                             | 9 (4)  | 11 (20) | 20 (20) | 8 (6)   | 4 (27)  | 52 (77) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)   | 12 (7)  | 20 (21) | 15 (44) | 47 (72) |

**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                    | 2018 | 23%    | 52%      | -29%                       | 57%   | -34%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 28%    | 59%      | -31%                       | 58%   | -30%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 31%    | 51%      | -20%                       | 56%   | -25%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 20%    | 49%      | -29%                       | 56%   | -36%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 20%    | 44%      | -24%                       | 55%   | -35%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 34%    | 47%      | -13%                       | 53%   | -19%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -14%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2018 | 37%    | 54%      | -17%                       | 62%   | -25%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 41%    | 54%      | -13%                       | 62%   | -21%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -4%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 04                    | 2018 | 67%    | 58%      | 9%                         | 62%   | 5%                      |
|                       | 2017 | 31%    | 54%      | -23%                       | 64%   | -33%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 36%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 26%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 35%    | 52%      | -17%                       | 61%   | -26%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 40%    | 50%      | -10%                       | 57%   | -17%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2018 | 23%    | 55%      | -32%                       | 55%   | -32%                    |
|                   | 2017 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data

| 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                                       | 9        | 46     | 53          | 29        | 71      | 79           | 10       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 19       | 42     | 52          | 43        | 69      | 74           | 19       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 80       |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 24       | 45     | 52          | 46        | 74      | 75           | 21       |         |           |                   |                     |

  

| 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                                       | 8        | 8      |             | 24        | 27      | 27           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 21       | 35     | 31          | 35        | 43      | 30           | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 55       |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 24       | 34     | 30          | 35        | 43      | 31           | 42       |         |           |                   |                     |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

### Areas of Focus:



### Activity #1

**Title** ELA - Integration of Knowledge and Ideas

**Rationale** The FSA ELA proficiency was 24%. There has been a decline for the past three years in the grade 3-5 proficiency.

**Intended Outcome** Proficiency for ELA will increase by at least 6 percentage points.

**Point Person** Amy Roby (aroby@ecsdfl.us)

#### Action Step

**Description** Monthly professional development on the use of Junior Greatbooks, iReady, and the new Science curriculum will be scheduled for each grade level. iReady and STAR will be used as data sources to identify students in need of intervention.

**Person Responsible** Connie Farish (cfarish@ecsdfl.us)

#### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description** Teachers will share student work particularly Junior Greatbooks and iReady with the administration. Teachers will be required to print student reports on iReady every two weeks and write two comments about the data, which will be submitted to the administration.

**Person Responsible** Connie Farish (cfarish@ecsdfl.us)

### Activity #2

**Title** Science

**Rationale** The proficiency was 22% for the 2017-18 school year.

**Intended Outcome** Proficiency will increase by at least 10 percentage points.

**Point Person** Connie Farish (cfarish@ecsdfl.us)

#### Action Step

**Description** Teachers will participate in monthly professional development to analyze student writings and discuss Science labs. They will plan labs for each unit of study with the Curriculum Coordinator assisting in the purchase and coordination of supplies. Nature of Science will be taught all year through hands-on activities and reviewed with bell ringers. Science content will be integrated into the ELA block through the use of Junior Great Books and leveled books.

**Person Responsible** Connie Farish (cfarish@ecsdfl.us)

#### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description** The Principal and Assistant Principal will monitor the Google Doc template where teachers will enter information about the Science labs. Monthly professional development will be used to analyze student writings of the Science labs.

**Person Responsible** Connie Farish (cfarish@ecsdfl.us)

## 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 Pilot SIP 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.**

O. J. Semmes Elementary receives TITLE I, Part A funds and is developing a written Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) that establishes the expectations for parent and family engagement. This plan will describe how O. J. Semmes will deliver the programs, activities, and procedures in accordance with the definitions in Section 8101 of ESEA. This plan is developed jointly and agreed upon with the families of children participating in TITLE I, Part A programs.

#### **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.**

The school has a full time counselor who is available to talk with students who might have a concern. She provides counseling services to students when parents make that request. There is also an overlay counselor at the school four days per week. He provides counseling services to ESE students once parent permission is obtained. The classroom teachers know they can refer any child for counseling. Once parent permission is obtained, then counseling services are started.

Many students have mentors to come to the school to talk with them each week. These mentors might come during the lunch period and sit at a separate table. Or they may take the student to the Media Center if the time is different from lunch. They provide assistance to the student with school work.

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

Escambia County School District offers pre-k classes on 14 school campuses for students living in a Title I attendance zone. The pre-k program is a full day program established in collaboration with VPK and Head Start. Transition activities are provided to participating families to assist with school readiness for students who will attend kindergarten at our school.

#### **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 Rtl Team focuses on meeting, developing and maintaining a problem-solving process and encourage and support high achievement and support in students. The Team meets weekly to review students who are meeting, exceeding or are below expectations.

Title I, Part A: Title 1 provides funding for the Curriculum Coordinator and part-time Technology

Coordinator.

Title I, Part C-Migrant and Part D: All migrant students will be provided support services by the district Title I office. Our local student information system (FOCUS) is used to track student data and is used to indicate the specific Title I services each migrant student will be provided (attendance, guidance, psychology services, dental and health services, nutrition assistance, outreach, advocacy, social services, transportation, and/or needs assessment services). The district Migrant Coordinator will monitor services and student needs.e.

Title II: Professional development is offered is at both the school and district level.

Title III: Services for English Language Learners are provided as required by law. Several ESOL centers are provided at various key locations in the district. Students who do not attend centrally located school-based sites attend there zoned school where ESOL endorsed teachers provide services.

Title X Homeless: The school works with the district's Homeless Coordinator to provide transportation and resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as Homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. This program is overseen by the Title I office.

O. J. Semmes houses a Head Start program. The Head Start program is totally self contained. Additionally, three PK classes are District run programs but collaborate with Head Start.

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

Not Applicable

### Part V: Budget

|        |               |
|--------|---------------|
| Total: | <b>\$0.00</b> |
|--------|---------------|