

Escambia County School District

Ferry Pass 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ferry Pass Elementary School

8310 N DAVIS HWY, Pensacola, FL 32514

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Catrena Fieg H

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ferry Pass Elementary School

8310 N DAVIS HWY, 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 KG-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	66%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	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 Ferry Pass Elementary School is to develop self-confident, lifelong learners. We recognize that to guarantee students success, partnerships among schools and parents are critical. It is our goal to create a climate of mutual trust and respect that support substantial parent involvement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to create an environment of collaboration for both students and teachers to increase achievement that promotes student development in all areas.

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
Fieg, Catrena	Principal	
Bryan, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Sanstead, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Gunter, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	
Keith, Porita	Teacher, K-12	
Frasseti, Sara	Teacher, K-12	
Maggiore, Ginger	Teacher, K-12	
Kostic, Laurie	Teacher, ESE	
Walker, Debbie	School Counselor	
Pantaleo, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	
Freeman, Jacob	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Catrena Fieg H

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.*

2

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (43%)
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 .	

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	42	93	110	87	84	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	516
Attendance below 90 percent	4	22	17	15	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	2	4	11	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	5	2	4	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	10	10	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/5/2020

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	95	111	82	92	97	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	583
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	5	5	13	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	11	14	2	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	95	111	82	92	97	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	583
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	5	5	13	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	11	14	2	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	52%	53%	57%	50%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	55%	58%	50%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	52%	53%	41%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	57%	63%	55%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	60%	62%	56%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	52%	51%	44%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	54%	53%	64%	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	58%	56%	2%	58%	0%
	2018	48%	52%	-4%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	52%	1%	58%	-5%
	2018	43%	51%	-8%	56%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	48%	51%	-3%	56%	-8%
	2018	50%	44%	6%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	55%	-1%	62%	-8%
	2018	45%	54%	-9%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	58%	-5%	64%	-11%
	2018	51%	58%	-7%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	45%	55%	-10%	60%	-15%
	2018	47%	52%	-5%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	55%	-4%	53%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	64%	55%	9%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
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	18	39	31	23	62	64	36				
BLK	39	46	33	36	61	60	39				
HSP	81	47		88	71		73				
MUL	51	50		74	76						
WHT	57	55	50	55	47	40	57				
FRL	46	50	43	48	59	57	46				
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	26	45	47	31	55	53	24				
BLK	38	47	46	39	53	46	47				
HSP	68	63		47	38						
MUL	42	38		48	56		67				
WHT	57	52	40	58	62	42	76				
FRL	44	45	36	42	52	45	56				
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	14	22	20	20	44	44	18				
BLK	36	40	31	38	51	54	38				
HSP	71	67		60	50						
MUL	52	69		63	43						
WHT	55	51	45	66	61	29	79				
FRL	42	42	34	46	48	36	51				

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
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	368
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	45
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	72
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	63
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	52
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	50
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.

SWD showed the lowest performance in five of the seven reported categories on the 2019 FSA tests.

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

Science proficiency decreased from 65% in 2018 to 54% 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.

ELA Lowest Quartile and Math proficiency were 10 points below the state average.

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

Black students identified in the lowest quartile for Math gains improved from 46% in 2018 to 60% in 2019.

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

Level 1 Statewide Assessment
Attendance below 90%

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

1. Learning gains in ELA for SWD
2. Learning gains in ELA for students in the lowest quartile
3. Science proficiency
4. Math proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement**Areas of Focus:****#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Math proficiency increased from 49% in 2018 to 53% in 2019. Proficiency continues to be below the district average of 57% and state average of 63%.

Measurable Outcome: Our math proficiency will increase 4% from 53% in 2019 to 57% this 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In analyzing the 2019 FSA data and the current 2020 progress monitoring, complex mathematical problems and problems that require different strategies appear to be an issue. According to Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4 Through 8 found on What Works Clearinghouse, exposing students to multiple problem-solving strategies had a strong positive effect on student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide PD for instructional practices after each STAR 360 math assessment.
2. Strategies will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs conducted by school administration and district specialists.
3. Leadership team will meet with grade levels to disaggregate data from Schoolnet, iReady, and STAR 360 math assessments.
4. Plan instruction and remediate based on data.

Person Responsible

Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Science proficiency decreased from 65% in 2018 to 54% in 2019. Proficiency was the same as the district average and 1% more than the state average of 53%.

Measurable Outcome: Our science proficiency will increase 10% from 54% in 2019 to 64% this 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Create a classroom environment that sparks initial curiosity and fosters long-term interest in science.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In analyzing the 2019 FSA data and the current 2020 progress monitoring, we noticed student performance in application of science concepts had decreased from previous years. According to Encouraging Girls in Math and Science found on What Works Clearinghouse, creating a classroom environment that sparks initial curiosity and fosters long-term interest in science has a strong positive effect on student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide PD for instructional practices after each Schoolnet quarterly assessment.
2. Strategies will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs conducted by school administration and district specialists.
3. Leadership team will meet with grade levels to disaggregate data from Schoolnet and Study Island Science.
4. Plan instruction and remediate based on data.

Person

Responsible Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdfi.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Reading learning gains for SWD dropped from 45% in 2018 to 39% in 2019. Gains were below the district average of 52% and state average of 53% in 2019.

Measurable Outcome: Our reading learning gains for SWD will increase 6% from 39% in 2019 to 45% this 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdf.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Provide intensive small-group reading interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In analyzing the 2019 FSA data and the current 2020 progress monitoring, we noticed SWD reading gains had decreased significantly. According to Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades found on What Works Clearinghouse, providing intensive small-group reading interventions has a strong positive effect on SWD performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide PD for instructional practices after each STAR 360 reading assessment.
2. Strategies will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs conducted by school administration and district specialists.
3. Leadership team will meet with grade levels to disaggregate data from Schoolnet, iReady, and STAR 360 reading assessments.
4. Plan instruction and remediate based on data.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Ferry Pass Elementary sends home a parent/student handbook (school folder) at the beginning of each school year, which outlines our school's mission and vision statement. Teachers send home weekly citizenship reports and parents have access to our district's parent portal, which gives up-to-date information about attendance and grades. Parents receive daily calls via School Messenger if students are absent and also about special events at school. Information is also available on our digital school sign. Title I funds have been set aside to allow classroom teachers the opportunity to conference with parents.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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