Escambia County School District

Byrneville Elementary School, Inc.

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Byrneville Elementary School, Inc.

1600 BYRNEVILLE RD, Century, FL 32535

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Ashley Trawick   Start Date for this Principal: 6/18/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	85%
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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (49%) 2014-15: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

N/A

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

Byrneville Elementary School, Inc.

1600 BYRNEVILLE RD, Century, FL 32535

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	83%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	36%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

Byrneville Elementary School is committed to the constant improvement of skills and knowledge to provide an appropriate and safe learning environment in which students can develop their academic, emotional, physical, and social abilities to their fullest extent.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Byrneville Elementary School is for our students to have success today, be prepared for success in secondary education, and to flourish as a responsible citizens.

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
Wolfe-Sullivan, Dee	Principal	Instructional Leader
Dunsford, Tame'	Teacher, K-12	Instructional leader for intermediate grades/third grade teacher
Johnston, Jacke'	Teacher, K-12	Science leader and advisor to our Board of Directors
Slade, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Literacy rep/kindergarten teacher
Thornton, Candi	Teacher, K-12	Intermediate math rep/fourth grade teacher
Weaver, Deana	Teacher, K-12	Math rep/third grade teacher

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	31	32	27	36	34	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184
Attendance below 90 percent	2	9	10	8	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	4	3	2	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
13

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 8/28/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	0	0	0	

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	70%	53%	57%	67%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	58%	54%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	52%	53%	25%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	65%	57%	63%	68%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	60%	62%	57%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	52%	51%	60%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	59%	54%	53%	46%	50%	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	31 (0)	32 (0)	27 (0)	36 (0)	34 (0)	24 (0)	184 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 ()	9 ()	10 ()	8 ()	12 ()	6 ()	47 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 ()	2 ()	5 ()	1 ()	0 ()	8 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	3 ()	3 ()	3 ()	9 (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	74%	56%	18%	58%	16%	
	2018	70%	52%	18%	57%	13%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	62%	52%	10%	58%	4%	
	2018	67%	51%	16%	56%	11%	
Same Grade Comparison		-5%					
Cohort Comparison		-8%					
05	2019	71%	51%	20%	56%	15%	
	2018	55%	44%	11%	55%	0%	
Same Grade Comparison		16%					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	55%	13%	62%	6%
	2018	64%	54%	10%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	58%	11%	64%	5%
	2018	53%	58%	-5%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	57%	55%	2%	60%	-3%
	2018	58%	52%	6%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	55%	6%	53%	8%
	2018	58%	55%	3%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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
MUL	50			70							
WHT	78	52		73	62		59				
FRL	57	58		52	58	50	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
BLK	29	27		21	18						
WHT	68	61	46	65	41		64				
FRL	55	53	43	45	38	20	52				

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
BLK	42	47		32	47						
WHT	74	55		79	59		67				
FRL	58	48	25	63	50	54	33				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	60
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	65
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	53
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.

On the 2019 FSA, ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% showed the greatest decline with only 38% of our students making learning gains compared to 50% in 2018. Many of our proficient students did not show learning gains.

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

On the 2019 FSA, ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% showed the greatest decline with only 38% of our students making learning gains compared to 50% in 2018. One factor is that the third grade students are faced with a retention law that encourages parents and students to take the FSA very seriously. It is much more difficult to motivate the fourth and fifth graders to make learning gains.

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.

There was a 15 point gap between the state and school percentages for lowest 25% ELA.

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

We showed significant gains in mathematics. After reviewing the data from the students who were to be in the fourth and fifth grade for the 2017-2018 school year the teachers and the principal made the decision to departmentalize, but due to the lack of adequate instruction in mathematics the students did not perform as well as they should on the 2017-18 FSA. For the 2018-2019 school year we went back to each teacher instructing their students in all core areas.

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

Upon reflection, we are very concerned that the black subgroup only showed 40% learning gain in ELA on the 2019 FSA.

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

1. Performance in ELA by the black subgroup on the FSA
2. Performance of lowest 25% in math on the FSA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	The area of focus is learning gains of the black subgroup in ELA on the FSA
Rationale	This need was identified using 2017-18 FSA and 2018-19 FSA. 40 percent of the black subgroup made learning gains in ELA on the FSA 2019. 27 percent of the black subgroup made learning gains in ELA on the FSA 2018..
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	41 percent of the black subgroup will show learning gains on the 2019-20 FSA ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dee Wolfe-Sullivan (dwsullivan@byrnevilleelementary.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Reading Wonders, Vocabulary instruction using Vocabulary Workshop texts, Grammar, Usage, and Mechanics program, SRA Multiple Skills resource, FCRR
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The resources provide strategies and practice to improve comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, oral language, phonics, grammar, and writing.
Action Step	
Description	1. Administer STAR 360 at least four times per year. 2. Collaborate monthly with grade level team and RtI resource teacher to review classroom/diagnostic assessment data for low performing students in black subgroup. 3. Use the ELA decision tree to determine the level of intervention needed. 4. Implement a vocabulary curriculum in grades 2-5. 5. Utilize the computer based reading program Learning A-Z. 6. Consistent remediation/intervention by the classroom teacher, teacher assistant, and/or RtI resource teacher
Person Responsible	Dee Wolfe-Sullivan (dwsullivan@byrnevilleelementary.com)

#2	
Title	The area of focus if science achievement.
Rationale	Of the three FSA tested academic areas, the percentage of proficient students in science was lower than math and reading.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	60% of the students will be proficient in science on the FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Dee Wolfe-Sullivan (dwsullivan@byrnevilleelementary.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	HMH Florida Science, District Science Bell Ringers
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The resources provide Florida standards based scenarios and content.
Action Step	
Description	1. provide daily science instruction 2. increase hands-on science activities 3. utilize quarterly assessment to help drive instruction 4. provide science learning opportunities through assemblies and field trips
Person Responsible	Dee Wolfe-Sullivan (dwsullivan@byrnevilleelementary.com)

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).

n/a

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.

Byrneville Elementary school, Inc. will have programs, activities, and procedures for the involvement of parents/guardians. These programs, activities, and procedures will be planned and operated using meaningful consultation with parents/guardians.

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 communicate directly with the Campfire USA pre-k program concerning students transitioning to kindergarten at our school. The pre-k children are bused to our school and partake in touring our facility, visiting kindergarten classrooms where they are mentored by kindergarten students. Our fifth grade students take part in presentations concerning registration information, extra curricular choices, and meeting administrators and guidance counselors from the middle school they will attend.

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

If students in BES are migrant, neglected, ELL, or homeless we ask for support services from the district. Our teachers participate in professional learning opportunities provided through Title II. Our Title I funds and state funds go directly to enhancing academics, cultural enrichment, and insuring a safe school environment for all of our students. Our Board of Directors, the principal, and teacher representatives meet monthly to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

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 administrator and staff meet during preschool and as monthly to discuss what will be needed to enhance the curriculum at BES. Grade level teachers confer with each other on a weekly basis. The Byrneville Board of Directors is kept informed at their Board meetings as to assessments, strategies for

improvement, and use of TitleI funding. Consideration of resources (federal, state, local) is taken to help determine what to use to fill the needs of our students.

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

BES has business and community partners that speak to the students about careers and higher education.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: The area of focus is learning gains of the black subgroup in ELA on the FSA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: The area of focus if science achievement.	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00