Escambia County School District

Blue Angels 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 0

Budget to Support Goals 0

Blue Angels Elementary School

1551 DOG TRACK RD, Pensacola, FL 32506

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Jayne Murphy P

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 KG-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)	57%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: A (66%)
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

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 0

Budget to Support Goals 0

Blue Angels Elementary School

1551 DOG TRACK RD, Pensacola, FL 32506

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	No	50%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

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

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.

Our mission at Blue Angels Elementary School is to promote joy in learning in a safe, child-centered environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to meet the academic needs of each student at Blue Angels Elementary School while helping to develop well rounded 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
Murphy, Jayne	Principal	
Griffin, Vanessa	School Counselor	
Southworth, Gary	School Counselor	
Jenkins, Christine	Assistant Principal	

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	10	15	12	17	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	3	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	26	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	1	3	3	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

56

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

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	1	2	3	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	3	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	35	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	1	2	3	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	3	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	35	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	68%	53%	57%	64%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	55%	58%	61%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	52%	53%	52%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	70%	57%	63%	66%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	60%	62%	75%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	52%	51%	63%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	54%	53%	71%	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	10 (1)	15 (2)	12 (3)	17 (0)	17 (2)	18 (3)	89 (11)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (2)	1 (3)	2 (1)	0 (3)	3 (1)	7 (10)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	7 (5)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (0)	5 (2)	24 (14)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (2)	26 (35)	26 (20)	59 (57)

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	64%	52%	12%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	52%	10%	58%	4%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	64%	51%	13%	56%	8%
	2018	57%	44%	13%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	55%	6%	62%	-1%
	2018	61%	54%	7%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	58%	13%	64%	7%
	2018	71%	58%	13%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	72%	55%	17%	60%	12%
	2018	68%	52%	16%	61%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	69%	55%	14%	53%	16%
	2018	67%	55%	12%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	35	40	26	35	71	69	43				
ASN	77	62		95	92						
BLK	47	41	36	55	65	46	41				
HSP	72	63		70	68		43				
MUL	75	74		67	93		80				
WHT	71	63	41	73	83	68	78				
FRL	58	51	38	61	80	72	59				

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	32	33	35	32	51	57	48				
ASN	78	58		78	75						
BLK	43	48	44	52	60	64	50				
HSP	53	50		63	75	80	83				
MUL	70	68		81	84		77				
WHT	65	57	42	68	65	58	64				
FRL	54	54	36	57	64	56	66				

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	29	25	21	29	50	40	33				
ASN	71	77		76	77						
BLK	47	43	20	48	69	57	52				
HSP	70	60		63	87						
MUL	75	64		71	76	60	88				
WHT	63	63	59	68	76	66	72				
FRL	52	54	51	54	73	63	57				

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	65
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	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
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	63
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	78
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	68
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	60
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.

Our lowest data component on the FSA was ELA lower quartile learning gains at 43%. This area has been the lowest for the last two testing years.

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

The data shows no decline in any of the testing areas.

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 biggest gap, when compared to the state average, is our ELA lower quartile learning gains at 43%
while the state is 53%.

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

The area showing the most improvement was Math learning gains at 81%, which is 12
points gain from the previous year, 69%. All students received individualized math instruction using supplemental math programs such as i-Ready, Accelerated Math and Moby Max. Teachers and administration
reviewed progress monitoring data together on a quarterly basis, and teachers adjusted instructional calendars and activities accordingly.

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

We have 89 students who have attendance below 90% and 24 who failed ELA or Math in grades 1-5.

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

1. Based on FSA data: Learning Gains for our Lower Quartile
2. Based on FSA Data: Science Achievement
3. Based on EWS: the number of students with attendance below 90%
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Lower quartile learning gains
Rationale	Based on FSA data, we gained 1% point from 42% to 43% this year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Blue Angels will increase ELA lower quartile learning gains to 45%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jayne Murphy (jmurphy3@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will continue SRA small groups in grade 3-5; teachers will provide small group differentiated instruction in the classroom based on STAR 360, i-Ready data as well as daily observations; Students will complete leaner specific i-Ready lessons weekly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	SRA offers a direct teaching approach based on the students current reading level; differentiated small groups int the classroom, based on data, provides different avenues for learning objectives; i-Ready offers individual lesson based on the students skill base and they move at their own pace.
Action Step	
Description	1. Provide a scheduled time for SRA groups 2. Provide materials and training as needed for differentiated learning groups 3. Meet with instructional staff to discuss the progress of students 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Jayne Murphy (jmurphy3@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).