

Escambia County School District

Ensley Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Ensley Elementary School

501 E JOHNSON AVE, Pensacola, FL 32514

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Rhonda Sh UF Ord O

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Ensley Elementary School

501 E JOHNSON AVE, Pensacola, FL 32514

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 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	83%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	D	D

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.

All children at Ensley Elementary can and must learn.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through united partnerships with every child, family and teacher; we can grow together to build student success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Shuford, Rhonda	Principal	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Jones, Iris	School Counselor	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Grepke, Tracy	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Guice, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Smolensky, Regina	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Everette, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Mathis, Alicia	Instructional Coach	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Hawk, Vonda	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Lynn, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
White, Katina	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Hawks, Malinda	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Simmons, Kenisha	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.
Woodard, Donna	Teacher, ESE	Facilitates the development of the School Improvement Plan and uses data as the driving force to create programmatic instructional change.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Rhonda Sh UF Ord O

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	39	69	66	65	55	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	351
Attendance below 90 percent	13	29	25	13	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	4	4	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	5	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/4/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	21	23	15	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	6	9	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	4	2	9	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	21	23	15	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	6	9	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	4	2	9	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	

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	41%	53%	57%	34%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	58%	38%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	53%	41%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	49%	57%	63%	40%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	60%	62%	45%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	51%	37%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	54%	53%	37%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	31%	56%	-25%	58%	-27%
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	57%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	56%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	26%	51%	-25%	56%	-30%
	2018	26%	44%	-18%	55%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	38%	55%	-17%	62%	-24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	54%	-1%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	58%	8%	64%	2%
	2018	48%	58%	-10%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2019	31%	55%	-24%	60%	-29%
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	30%	55%	-25%	53%	-23%
	2018	35%	55%	-20%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	33	40	16	47	55					
ELL	37	56	45	49	55		31				
BLK	35	57	50	41	54	46	22				
HSP	34	55	50	46	50		31				
MUL	81	69		69	77						
WHT	36	44		54	63						
FRL	40	56	57	46	59	52	34				
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	5	6	12	15	28	25	14				
ELL	33	40		60	57						
ASN	60			80							
BLK	24	25	23	37	43	37	21				
HSP	49	54		64	61		25				
MUL	55	70		67	80						
WHT	37	29		60	58		69				
FRL	34	33	32	50	52	36	38				

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	4	34	33	14	33	37					
ELL	33	47		47	63						
ASN	55			73							
BLK	27	28	33	32	36	33	24				
HSP	45	42		47	50		54				
MUL	42	31		47	64						
WHT	33	52		38	40		50				
FRL	34	41	44	41	47	38	39				

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	51
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	74
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	49
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 from 39% in 2018 down to 38% in 2019. Factors contributing to low performance in 2019 included 2 out of 3 teachers being new to our 5th grade team and had no previous teaching experience.

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

Math proficiency showed the greatest decline from 52% in 2018 to 49% in 2019. Factors contributing to this decline included teachers in 3rd and 5th grade who were new to teaching in 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.

Ensley's ELA data had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Factors contributing to this gap include low ELA proficiency scores across the grade levels.

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

ELA lowest quartile learning gains showed the most improvement increasing from 27% in 2018 to 48% in 2019, which is an increase of 21 percentage points. Our Literacy Coach pulled the lowest quartile groups and worked with them 3 times per week and we also utilized iReady next steps lessons to help individual students work on areas of weakness.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

In reflecting on the EWS data, our potential area of concern is the number of course failures in ELA and Math.

In 2018-2019 we had 29 course failures in ELA or Math. In 2019-2020, we had 12 course failures in ELA and 11 course failures in Math for a total of 23 failures and we want to reduce the numbers of course failures in both of these content areas.

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

1. Students with Disabilities Federal Index
2. Instructional Practices (ELA learning gains, Math learning gains and Science proficiency)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ESSA Subgroup includes our Students with Disabilities. Based on 2019 FSA Data, the Federal Index for our Students with Disabilities was 34%, which fell below the 41% state target.
Measurable Outcome:	Ensley will increase the Federal Index for our Students with Disabilities working toward reaching the state target of at least 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rhonda Shuford (rshuford@escambia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>We will provide professional learning opportunities on accommodations for General Education and Special Education teachers to help strengthen their ability to teach Students with Disabilities.</p> <p>We will strengthen the overall Tier I level of instruction by providing professional learning opportunities to the faculty on the topic of Universal Design for Learning (UDL). We will monitor implementation of UDL strategies with classroom walkthrough visits wherein multiple forms of content representation, multiple options of action and expression, and multiple means of engagement are present.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Ensley Elementary has many teachers who are new to the teaching profession. We feel it is necessary to provide UDL professional learning opportunities that will enable teachers to learn more about how to maximize learning for Students with Disabilities within general education classrooms. According to the Higher Education Opportunity Act, Universal Design for Learning shows a positive effect size on student performance because:</p> <p>(A) provides flexibility in the ways information is presented, in the ways students respond or demonstrate knowledge and skills, and in the ways students are engaged;</p> <p>(B) reduces barriers in instruction, provides appropriate accommodations, supports, and challenges, and maintains high achievement expectations for all students</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Identify ESE personnel to provide UDL professional learning opportunities to teachers.
Establish dates for professional learning opportunities.

Person Responsible Rhonda Shuford (rshuford@escambia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Our area of focus is Instructional practice specifically relating to standards-aligned instruction. We will focus on supporting teachers with research-based practices that follow state adopted standards within the specific content area. Standards based data (FSA, District common unit assessments, and walkthroughs) collected from 2019-2020 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support learning. Walkthrough data collected from the 2019-2020 school year showed that 50% of teachers provided grade appropriate standards-aligned tasks.

By October 2020, at least 80% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in standards-aligned tasks according to classroom walkthroughs (both virtual and in-person). By December 2020, 100% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in standards-aligned tasks.

Measurable Outcome:

Common assessment data in ELA will show 30% of students performing at or above proficiency.

Common assessment data in Math will show 40% of students performing at or above proficiency.

Common assessment data in Science will show 45% of students performing at or above proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Everette (neverette@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) is our evidenced based strategy. PLC's will be focused on standards-based planning, student work analysis, backward planning with common assessments, and analyzing data to drive instructional decisions. PLC's will utilize Rick DuFour's 4 Essential PLC questions to maintain our focus:

1. What is it we want our students to learn?
2. How will we know if each student has learned it?
3. How will we respond when some students do not learn it?
4. How can we extend and enrich the learning for students who have demonstrated proficiency?

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In an effort to provide students with opportunities to engage in grade appropriate standards-based tasks, in either traditional, remote, or virtual settings, teachers will be supported through Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) focused on effective teaching methods for increased student learning. John Hattie's research on effect size on specific, job imbedded, ongoing professional development has an effect size of 0.62. Learning by Doing: A Handbook for PLC's at Work written by DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, Many, & Mattos.

Action Steps to Implement

Establish Structure and Expectations for PLC's -

Common planning times have been included on the master schedule and designated afternoons have been established for PLC meetings. We will establish the structure and expectations of content PLC's through the following:

August, 2020 - DuFour's PLC Framework and how teachers will be supported with effective teaching

methods for standards-based instruction. Administration will clearly communicate the PLC expectation and protocol with Ensley Elementary School K-5 teachers. By the end of pre-planning week, content teams will collectively develop expectations, and define roles and responsibilities of team members to include teachers, coaches, and admin.

Person Responsible Nicole Everette (neverette@ecsdfi.us)

Strategic Planning and Analyzing Student Data to Build Teacher Capacity -

We will implement backwards planning and analyzing student work samples within our PLC's. During PLC's, teachers will reach a consensus on a common standards-aligned task that will be used to monitor progress toward mastery. Teachers will collect student work and bring to PLC's to analyze and sort student work based on criteria. Teachers will identify trends, opportunities to adjust their instructional practice, and create actionable next steps for implementation.

Person Responsible Alicia Mathis (amathis@ecsdfi.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The School Leadership Team (SLT) will address the EWS of students in danger of course failure in ELA and Math throughout the school year as the SLT meets each month to specifically discuss student progress.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Ensley Elementary School's positive school culture and environment is reflective in our school community. All stakeholders are given the opportunity for input through various forms: meetings, surveys and face-to-face opportunities. Our SAC (School Advisory Council) is comprised of parents, a teacher representative, an ed support representative and an administrator). This group, along with our staff, work to carry out the strategies set forth in the School Improvement Plan.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$224,687.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6300	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$66,103.00
			<i>Notes: Assist with classroom walkthroughs, data chats with students, attend RTI meetings, provide training for teachers, coach teachers, assist with monitoring and tracking schoolwide data.</i>			
	5100	150-Aides	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$26,030.00
			<i>Notes: K-1 Assist with SRA "Walk and Read: model.</i>			
	5100	520-Textbooks	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$6,206.00
			<i>Notes: i-Ready Workbooks (Supplemental) for ELA and Math for grades 3-5.</i>			
	5100	520-Textbooks	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$3,367.00
			<i>Notes: Everglades Workbooks (Supplemental) for Math for grades 3-5.</i>			
	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	TSSSA	1.0	\$42,600.00
			<i>Notes: Ensley TSSSA Domain 5: Contract with SREB for math professional development and coaching cycles (30 days x \$1850 per day from July 2020-May 2021. \$12,900 of the contract paid with roll forward funds of the 19-20 TSSSA and \$42,600 from the 20-21 TSSSA) (Contract approved in the amendment for the 19-20 Ensley TSSSA)</i>			
	6300	100-Salaries	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	TSSSA	1.0	\$40,960.00
			<i>Notes: Ensley TSSSA Domain 5: Extra pay for teacher planning in all content areas to be facilitated by SREB, district content specialists, administration, curriculum coordinator, and school-based literacy coach (2 hours x 4 weeks x 10 months x 32 teachers/teacher assistants/curriculum coordinator/coaches x \$16) (Item previously approved in the 19-20 Ensley TSSSA budget)</i>			
	6300	210-Retirement	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	TSSSA	1.0	\$4,096.00
			<i>Notes: Ensley TSSSA Domain 5: Retirement for teacher planning in all content areas (.10 x 2 hours x 4 weeks x 10 months x 32 teachers/teacher assistants/curriculum coordinator/coaches x \$16) (Item previously approved in the 19-20 Ensley TSSSA budget)</i>			
	6300	220-Social Security	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	TSSSA	1.0	\$3,133.00
			<i>Notes: Ensley TSSSA Domain 5: Social Security for teacher planning in all content areas (.0765 x 2 hours x 4 weeks x 10 months x 32 teachers/teacher assistants/curriculum coordinator/coaches x \$16) (Item previously approved in the 19-20 Ensley TSSSA budget)</i>			
	6300	240-Workers Compensation	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	TSSSA	1.0	\$491.00
			<i>Notes: Ensley TSSSA Domain 5: Workers Comp for teacher planning in all content areas (.012 x 2 hours x 4 weeks x 10 months x 32 teachers/teacher assistants/curriculum coordinator/coaches x \$16) (Item previously approved in the 19-20 Ensley TSSSA budget)</i>			

	6400	100-Salaries	0271 - Ensley Elementary School	TSSSA	1.0	\$31,701.00
			Notes: Ensley TSSSA Domain 4: School-based literacy coach to work part time with administration, teachers, and students) (0.5 of \$66,258 salary = \$31,701.00) (Position was previously approved in Ensley TSSSA narrative for 19-20 budget, funding was previously covered with Title 1 funds for the 19-20 year)			
Total:						\$224,687.00