

Escambia County School District

O. J. Semmes Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	16

O. J. Semmes Elementary School

1250 E TEXAR DR, Pensacola, FL 32503

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Susan Sanders E

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: D (35%) 2015-16: C (49%) 2014-15: F (27%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
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	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	16

O. J. Semmes Elementary School

1250 E TEXAR DR, Pensacola, FL 32503

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 PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	88%

School Grades History

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

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Farish, Connie	Principal	
Roby, Amy	Assistant Principal	
Lobley, Uadona	Teacher, K-12	
Willem, Jen	Teacher, K-12	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	25	22	8	22	31	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	2	6	7	15	20	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	4	10	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	23	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	2	5	5	12	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	6	7	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

45

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/16/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	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 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	2	11	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	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 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	2	11	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	33%	53%	57%	26%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	55%	58%	35%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	83%	52%	53%	30%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	57%	63%	37%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	44%	60%	62%	44%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	52%	51%	31%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	30%	54%	53%	44%	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	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	25 (0)	22 (3)	8 (1)	22 (0)	31 (2)	18 (4)	126 (10)
One or more suspensions	2 (0)	6 (9)	7 (5)	15 (20)	20 (11)	14 (4)	64 (49)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	5 (9)	4 (11)	10 (20)	7 (8)	11 (4)	37 (52)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (12)	23 (20)	25 (15)	53 (47)

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	31%	56%	-25%	58%	-27%
	2018	23%	52%	-29%	57%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	52%	-19%	58%	-25%
	2018	31%	51%	-20%	56%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	34%	51%	-17%	56%	-22%
	2018	20%	44%	-24%	55%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	55%	0%	62%	-7%
	2018	37%	54%	-17%	62%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	58%	-16%	64%	-22%
	2018	67%	58%	9%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-25%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	38%	55%	-17%	60%	-22%
	2018	35%	52%	-17%	61%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	29%	55%	-26%	53%	-24%
	2018	23%	55%	-32%	55%	-32%
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	13	47		40	37						
BLK	30	55	83	50	45	45	26				
FRL	32	54	81	51	45	45	27				
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										

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
FRL	24	34	30	35	43	31	42				

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	49
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	340
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
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.

Science proficiency showed the lowest performance at 30%. There was a gain of 8 percentage points from the previous year. Contributing factors to the low performance could be a lack of reading

comprehension with students. More hands on activities will also help students to better understand Science content.

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

The Math Lowest 25th Percentile component showed the greatest decline with a loss of 33 percentage points from the previous year. Even though Math proficiency increased by 6 percentage points, other students did not have a year's worth of learning to achieve a learning gain. These students were not as strong in some math categories.

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 greatest gap compared to the state average is ELA Achievement, which has a 24 point gap. Reading continues to be a weak area for students, although there was a 9 percentage point increase from the previous year. The 2018 comparison showed a 32 point gap. The trend is showing an increase in the percentage of students who score proficient on ELA Achievement.

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 ELA Lowest 25th percentile. The students in this group received much small group instruction. Volunteers also spent time reading with these students to help them understand what they read. Also, the majority of the lower quartile students were retained third graders. Those students were with a teacher who is very strong in her standards' teaching.

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

Attendance is an on-going issue for students at Semmes. There are many absences, of which many are unexcused. There are 126 students whose attendance was below 90 percent. There were 64 students who had one or more suspensions from school.

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

1. Increase Reading proficiency by at least 7 percentage points to reach 40% proficient.
2. Increase Science proficiency by at least 10 percentage points to reach 40% proficient.
3. Increase Math Learning Gains by at least 20 percentage points to reach 64% learning gains.
4. Increase Math Lower Quartile Learning Gains by at least 32 percentage points to reach 75% learning gains.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Reading
Rationale	The FSA ELA proficiency has improved to 33% proficiency. However, there is still a 20 point gap compared to the district and a 24 point gap compared to the state.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The ELA proficiency will increase to at least 40%, which will be an increase of seven percentage points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Connie Farish (cfarish@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Continue the use of SRA Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading for those students who need it. Continue the use of Junior Greatbooks teaching strategies in grades 2-5.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies were used in classrooms last year. ELA proficiency improved from 24% to 33%, which was a 9 point increase.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kindergarten and first grade teachers will use SRA Reading Mastery in small groups. 2. Second through fifth grade students who are below grade level will receive SRA Corrective Reading strategies. 3. Second through fifth grade teachers will continue teaching strategies using Junior Greatbooks curriculum 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Connie Farish (cfarish@ecsdfl.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).

The other priorities for O. J. Semmes are the learning gains for Math and to increase Science proficiency. When students have increased in their reading strategies, they can use those strategies when reading math problems and Science content. Small group reading instruction can occur in the Science teaching. Teachers also help students break down Math problems into phrases they can understand.

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.

O. J. Semmes Elementary receives Title I Part A funds. A Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is written with parent input that establishes the expectations for parent and family engagement. This plan describes how O. J. Semmes delivers the programs, activities, and procedures in accordance with the definitions in Section 8101 of ESEA. This plan is developed jointly and agreed up with 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 overly counselor at the school four days per week. She provides counseling services to ESE students once parent permission is obtained. The classroom teachers know they can refer any student for counseling. Once parent permission is obtained, then counseling services are started.

Many student 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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Reading	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00