

Escambia County School District

Kingsfield 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	0

Kingsfield Elementary School

900 W KINGSFIELD RD, Cantonment, FL 32533

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Quinn Evans

Start Date for this Principal: 6/19/2019

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
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 Escambia 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	0

Kingsfield Elementary School

900 W KINGSFIELD RD, Cantonment, FL 32533

www.escambiaschools.org

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="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">46%</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="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">31%</p>

School Grades History

<p>Year</p>	<p>2018-19</p>
<p>Grade</p>	<p>B</p>

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.

Kingsfield Elementary is a place where all students are encouraged to strive for excellence academically, socially, and emotionally in a safe and supportive atmosphere. Our goal is to work with our parents and community to create an environment where students are empowered to discover their strengths and to achieve their full potential through personalized learning. We set high expectations for all students. Our entire school community shares the belief that all children can and will learn.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Reaching the hearts and minds of every student every day.

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
Cunningham, Sabrena	Principal	Principal/Assistant Principal - Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making to ensure the implementation of MTSS/RtI components. Work to ensure the safety of all faculty, staff and students while working to include all stakeholders in the decision making process.
Coward, Maureen	Assistant Principal	Principal/Assistant Principal - Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making to ensure the implementation of MTSS/RtI components. Work to ensure the safety of all faculty, staff and students while working to include all stakeholders in the decision making process.
Windham, Chelsea	School Counselor	School Counselor: Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making to ensure the implementation of MTSS/RtI components. School Counselor and School Psychologist will conduct assessment of RtI skills of the school staff, and communicate with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.
Reynolds, Katherine	Teacher, ESE	ESE Teacher: Participates in the Tier process to provide support and offer strategies to the general education teacher. Communicate the needs of students to the administrative staff to create an atmosphere of support and well-being. The ESE teacher will also help implement identified BPIE targeted areas.
Shelnut, Stacey	Teacher, ESE	ESE Teacher: Participates in the Tier process to provide support and offer strategies to the general education teacher. Communicate the needs of students to the administrative staff to create an atmosphere of support and well-being. The ESE teacher will also help implement identified BPIE targeted areas.
Minchew, Erica	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher: Provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities.
Weber, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	General Education Teacher: Provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities.

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	150	134	104	112	119	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	752
Attendance below 90 percent	12	22	18	15	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	7	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	8	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	3	4	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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

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

41

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/19/2019

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	
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	
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	62%	53%	57%	0%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	55%	58%	0%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	52%	53%	0%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	67%	57%	63%	0%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	60%	62%	0%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	52%	51%	0%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	54%	53%	0%	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	150 (0)	134 (0)	104 (0)	112 (0)	119 (0)	133 (0)	752 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	12 ()	22 ()	18 ()	15 ()	13 ()	8 ()	88 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	2 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	9 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	3 (0)	7 (0)	5 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	17 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	8 (0)	19 (0)	31 (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	73%	56%	17%	58%	15%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	52%	12%	58%	6%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		64%				
05	2019	54%	51%	3%	56%	-2%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	75%	55%	20%	62%	13%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	58%	13%	64%	7%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		71%				
05	2019	58%	55%	3%	60%	-2%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	66%	55%	11%	53%	13%
	2018					
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	20	44	52	36	48	48	26				
BLK	42	63	53	47	68	67	54				
HSP	65	40		61	67						
MUL	60	50		65	64		64				
WHT	65	47	52	71	65	52	66				
FRL	51	49	50	54	64	53	61				

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
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

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	59
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	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	
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	56
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	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
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	60
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	55
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.

The subgroup of Students with Disabilities showed the lowest performance (20%) in ELA achievement. As a new school opening in August 2018, we do not have historical data prior to the 2018-19 school year. This group was identified early in the 2018-2019 school year by the MTSS team as a subgroup that would be followed closely to monitor growth and progress of our SWDs.

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

As a new school opening in August 2018, we do not have historical data prior to 2018-2019.

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 largest gap was in 5th grade including both ELA and Math. As a new school opening in August 2018, we do not have historical data prior to 2018-2019. We do know that opening a new school along with bringing faculty, staff and students together from multiple schools had an impact. Because we took possession of the building close to the beginning of the school year, many resources had to be ordered and some came in throughout the school year.

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

As a new school opening in August 2018, we do not have historical data that would allow us to identify actions that were taken to show improvement.

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

1. Students with attendance below 90% last year
2. Students scoring Level 1 on statewide assessment.

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

1. School has key person who coordinates and monitors implementation of inclusive education.
2. Students will have ongoing progress monitoring to measure growth and proficiency.
3. General education and ESE teachers will collaborate and plan on a regular basis.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increased proficiency in ELA in the subgroup of Students with Disabilities.
Rationale	ELA proficiency in the subgroup of students with disabilities (20%) should meet or exceed the 2018-2019 district (22%) and state (26%).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA proficiency in the subgroup of Students with Disabilities by at least 7 percentage points to exceed the 2018-2019 state average. The state average in 2018-19 was 26% while the average at Kingsfield was 20%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Sabrena Cunningham (scunningham@ecsdfi.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>* Encourage teachers to pursue Reading Endorsement courses</p> <p>* Provide faculty and staff with professional development in the following areas, and monitor implementation through classroom visits and walkthroughs.</p> <p>Writing Instruction - Being a Writer in K-3rd</p> <p>Jr. Great Book implementation in 3rd - 5th</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Reading Endorsement courses will strengthen teachers' knowledge of how to provide interventions to students with reading difficulties. Being a Writer and Jr. Great Books are both vetted programs that should lead to increased student proficiency with proper implementation.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train K-3rd grade teachers in the implementation of Being A Writer during the summer of 2019 2. Train 3rd - 5th grade teachers in the implementation of Jr. Great Books during the summer of 2019. 3. Provide follow up training and support for 3rd - 5th grade teachers with Jr. Great Books 4. Follow up on monitoring implementation through classroom walk throughs and grade level meetings.
Person Responsible	Sabrena Cunningham (scunningham@ecsdfi.us)

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).

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.

Kingsfield is not a Title One School and does not receive Title One funds.

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.

Kingsfield is not a Title One School and does not receive Title One funds.

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

Kingsfield is not a Title One School and does not receive Title One funds.

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.

Kingsfield is not a Title One School and does not receive Title One funds.

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

Kingsfield is not a Title One School and does not receive Title One funds.