

Gulf County Schools

Port St. Joe 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Port St. Joe Elementary School

2201 LONG AVE, Port St Joe, FL 32456

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Duane Mcfarland

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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)	77%
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: C (44%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (44%) 2014-15: B (56%)
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 Gulf 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Port St. Joe Elementary School

2201 LONG AVE, Port St Joe, FL 32456

[no web address on file]

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-6	Yes	68%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Gulf 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.

Port St. Joe Elementary School strives to be a school where children are challenged to learn beyond today and for life. We are committed to the idea of helping each child learn, to achieve his/her greatest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Port St. Joe Elementary School envisions the family, the school, and the community working together in a cooperative effort to create a safe learning environment enriched with enthusiasm and respect with a common mission- our students.

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
Mock, Joni	Principal	Leader of the school
Adkison, Janice	Administrative Support	School wide curriculum coordinator/support, principal designee, and provides services to tier II and III students in mathematics.
Patterson, Jacqueline	School Counselor	Provides support to administrators, assists with data collection, and progress monitors and coordinates/provides supports for student social and academic needs.
Daniels, Anna	Teacher, K-12	Leads school wide ELA initiatives, supports teachers in ELA, and provides services in reading to Tier II and III students.

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	80	70	70	71	81	82	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	544
Attendance below 90 percent	19	6	6	5	5	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	2	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	14	28	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	1	1	0	0	2	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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)

33

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/23/2019

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	18	10	10	14	16	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	2	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	28	36	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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	5	2	0	5	8	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	53%	50%	57%	56%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	48%	58%	59%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	37%	53%	50%	46%	52%
Math Achievement	47%	49%	63%	61%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	40%	48%	62%	46%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27%	38%	51%	33%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	59%	46%	53%	37%	45%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	80 (0)	70 (0)	70 (0)	71 (0)	81 (0)	82 (0)	90 (0)	544 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	19 ()	6 ()	6 ()	5 ()	5 ()	15 ()	9 ()	65 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	4 ()	2 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	12 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	14 (0)	28 (0)	36 (0)	80 (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	62%	53%	9%	58%	4%
	2018	56%	46%	10%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	46%	3%	58%	-9%
	2018	49%	49%	0%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	44%	42%	2%	56%	-12%
	2018	46%	48%	-2%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
06	2019	52%	53%	-1%	54%	-2%
	2018	56%	58%	-2%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	55%	10%	62%	3%
	2018	61%	57%	4%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	52%	2%	64%	-10%
	2018	51%	54%	-3%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	37%	39%	-2%	60%	-23%
	2018	33%	47%	-14%	61%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
06	2019	33%	47%	-14%	55%	-22%
	2018	54%	66%	-12%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	57%	46%	11%	53%	4%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	28	25	26	37	39	29					
BLK	34	28	12	16	10						
HSP	40	43		40	36						
MUL	31	43		25	50						

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
WHT	59	51	42	55	45	34	65				
FRL	44	41	34	38	34	27	51				
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	28	44	29	27	35	21	36				
BLK	27	41	32	32	28	22	31				
HSP	35	33		40	53						
MUL	50	42		39	8						
WHT	59	44	22	58	50	21	72				
FRL	43	43	30	44	39	24	49				
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	31	52	50	27	37	21	18				
BLK	24	32	18	33	35	22					
HSP	33	55		60	64						
MUL	65	69		52	21						
WHT	63	65	68	67	49	48	48				
FRL	45	54	41	51	42	30	26				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	306
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Students With Disabilities	
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	17
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	37
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	50
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Mathematics achievement in proficiency, overall learning gains, and lowest 25% learning gains was the lowest. A contributing factor could include a curriculum adoption gap year and teachers not having adequate materials and curriculum.

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

Math achievement and overall learning gains. A contributing factor mentioned above. Our lowest 25% learning gains in math went up although still well below state average. The small incline could be attributed to pushing in our students with disabilities in grades 3-6 but we still have a lot of work to do in this area.

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.

Math achievement and overall learning gains, as well as the lowest 25% learning gains for both math and ELA had the greatest gap. Contributing factors include need for professional development in meeting the needs and providing adequate supports for our lower performing students.

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

Our school showed improvement in ELA proficiency, overall learning gains, and the lowest 25% learning gains. These improvements could be attributed to pushing in our students with disabilities in grades 3-6 and again, concerning the lowest 25% learning gains in ELA, it did incline but still well below state average.

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

Students who exhibit 2 or more indicators need additional support to address attendance and grade level performance.

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

1. Increasing Mathematics achievement and learning gains (overall and bottom 25%)
2. Increasing the learning gains of the bottom 25% in ELA
3. Improving attendance and academic support for EWS high risk students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Mathematics Achievement and Learning Gains
Rationale	Based upon the 2019 FSA results, our students in grades 3-6 showed a lower than projected proficiency on the 2019 FSA in Mathematics. 47% of students demonstrated proficiency, 40% showed learning gains, and 27% of our lowest performing students (lowest 25%) showed learning gains.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	At least 63% of our students in grades 3-6 will demonstrate proficiency in Mathematics on the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment. At least 62% of our students will make learning gains. At least 37% of our lowest performing 51% will make learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Joni Mock (jmock@gulf.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ongoing Progress Monitoring -Tier II and III support for low performing students -After School Tutoring -Professional Development -Increasing push in of SWD in Math Courses
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies were selected to ensure that teachers and administrators are monitoring student progress and adjusting instruction to meet the needs of our low performing students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IReady will be utilized by all teachers to review and reinforce Math standards and progress monitor student performance- Data will be reviewed continuously by teachers and monthly in grade level meetings. 2. Reflex Math will be utilized by all teachers to review and reinforce Mathematics addition, subtractions, multiplication, and division facts in grades 1-6. 3. All teachers are utilizing focus calendars outlining implementation of the Florida Standards and progression through the Pearson Envision Mathematics curriculum, as well as test specifications for the FSA. 4. The progress of students who scored below grade level on the beginning of the year IReady diagnostic in grades K-3 and students who scored a Level 1 or 2 on the 2019 FSA in grades 4-6 will be monitored monthly to identify supports needed. 5. Title I After School Tutoring will be open to Level 1 and 2 students 3 days a week for 1 1/2 hours each day. 6. Continuous professional development in scaffolding.
Person Responsible	Joni Mock (jmock@gulf.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Lowest 25% ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	Based upon the 2019 FSA results, our students in grades 4-6 showed a lower than projected learning gain on the 2019 FSA in ELA. 33% of our lowest performing students (lowest 25%) showed learning gains.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	At least 53% of our students in grades 4-6 will demonstrate learning gains on the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Joni Mock (jmock@gulf.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ongoing Progress Monitoring -Tier II and III support for low performing students -After School Tutoring -Professional Development -Increasing push in of SWD in ELA courses
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies were selected to ensure that teachers and administrators are monitoring student progress and adjusting instruction to meet the needs of our low performing students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IReady will be utilized by all teachers to review and reinforce ELA standards and progress monitor student performance- Data will be reviewed continuously by teachers and monthly in grade level meetings. 2. Students in grades 1-6 will participate in the Accelerated Reader Program 3. All teachers are utilizing focus calendars outlining implementation of the Florida Standards and progression through the Harcourt Journeys and IReady curriculum, as well as test specifications for the FSA. 4. The progress of students who scored below grade level on the beginning of the year IReady diagnostic in grades K-3 (also FLKRS for grade K) and students who scored a Level 1 or 2 on the 2019 FSA in grades 4-6 will be monitored monthly to identify supports needed. 5. Title I After School Tutoring will be open to Level 1 and 2 students 3 days a week for 1 1/2 hours each day. 6. Continuous professional development in providing reading instruction across the curriculum and scaffolding.
Person Responsible	Joni Mock (jmock@gulf.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	EWS
Rationale	Students possessing two or more of the EWS indicators are at risk of dropping out or not acquiring levels of proficiency while remaining in school. At the end of the 2018-19 school year, we had 38 students who had 2 or more EWS indicators. As of September of the 2019-20 school year, we have 19 students who have 2 or more EWS indicators. The most common indicators included low academic performance in the classroom or on the FSA and attendance below 90%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	50% of the high risk EWS students will reduce to moderate risk by the end of 2019-20 school year as reported in the Florida Reports in FOCUS.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Joni Mock (jmock@gulf.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ongoing Progress Monitoring -After School Tutoring -Tier II and III support for low performing students -Address chronic absences -School/Parent Consultation
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies were selected to ensure that teachers and administration are monitoring student progress and identifying supports to meet the needs of our students with 2 or more EWS indicators.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The progress of students with 2 or more EWS indicators will be monitored monthly to identify academic supports needed. 2. Title I After School Tutoring will be open to Level 1 and 2 students 3 days a week for 1 1/2 hours each day. 3. "Attendance Works" approaches, strategies and tools will be implemented to address chronic absences. 4. Quarterly meetings with parents of our 6th grade students identified with 2 or more EWS indicators.
Person Responsible	Joni Mock (jmock@gulf.k12.fl.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).