Scenic Heights Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Scenic Heights Elementary School

3801 CHERRY LAUREL DR, Pensacola, FL 32504

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Cox G

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	86%
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: B (60%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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

Scenic Heights Elementary School

3801 CHERRY LAUREL DR, Pensacola, FL 32504

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	71%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	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.

At Scenic Heights, we strive to discover and develop the promise within each child. We, the staff of Scenic Heights Elementary School, consider the needs and interests of each child a priority.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that each child should acquire the fundamental skills necessary for participation in our democratic society. To insure success in our changing society, we challenge our students to pursue the ability to change and to cope with change.

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
Cox, Michelle	Principal	Administration
Maloney, Katie	Assistant Principal	Administration
Calder, Janette	Teacher, K-12	
Hyder, Amber	Teacher, K-12	instructor
Felder, Paul	Teacher, ESE	4th grade ESE teacher
Schreiber, Sharron	Teacher, K-12	first grade teacher
Thompson, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Eichelberger, Abby	Teacher, K-12	
Brault, Natalie	Teacher, K-12	
Guttery, Lisette	Teacher, K-12	
Trawick, Karla	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Michelle Cox G

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

62

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)	86%
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: B (60%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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](#).

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	122	130	116	134	101	149	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	752
Attendance below 90 percent	8	14	13	7	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	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	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	8	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/21/2020

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	133	129	144	105	159	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	832
Attendance below 90 percent	9	12	10	12	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	3	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	15	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	2	0	5	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	10	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	133	129	144	105	159	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	832
Attendance below 90 percent	9	12	10	12	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	3	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	15	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	2	0	5	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	10	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	64%	53%	57%	61%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	55%	58%	61%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	52%	53%	48%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	57%	63%	59%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	60%	62%	56%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	52%	51%	44%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	54%	53%	62%	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	73%	56%	17%	58%	15%
	2018	64%	52%	12%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	52%	3%	58%	-3%
	2018	57%	51%	6%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	59%	51%	8%	56%	3%
	2018	63%	44%	19%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	78%	55%	23%	62%	16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	64%	54%	10%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	58%	-1%	64%	-7%
	2018	62%	58%	4%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	68%	55%	13%	60%	8%
	2018	71%	52%	19%	61%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	55%	7%	53%	9%
	2018	72%	55%	17%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
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	37	45	60	40	60	61	25				
ELL	42	58	57	56	68	69	19				
ASN	69	64		84	83		67				
BLK	45	53	46	48	42	50	33				
HSP	48	53	57	65	69	70	47				
MUL	81	52		78	48		92				
WHT	73	59	57	75	68	45	71				
FRL	59	50	50	62	56	52	54				
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	44	60	32	60	71	58				
ELL	31	52	57	45	72	65					
ASN	61	50		74	84						
BLK	42	51	30	43	51	57	56				
HSP	55	46	40	62	73	53	73				
MUL	64	67		73	81						
WHT	72	64	52	74	72	74	81				

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
FRL	58	56	38	59	65	69	75				

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	18	45	47	21	36	31					
ELL	39	64		46	43						
ASN	69	92		77	62		73				
BLK	39	41	35	33	36	33	36				
HSP	59	55		56	58	45	63				
MUL	65	60		63	53		50				
WHT	67	65	45	65	61	49	67				
FRL	58	62	56	55	56	47	58				

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	61
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	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	491
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
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	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	60
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	70
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	64
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	56
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.

The lowest performance was in ELA learning gains and Math and ELA lower quartile learning gains. The progress monitoring data from AP 3 of 19-20 showed a greater decline in ELA learning gains and ELA lower quartile learning gains.

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

ELA learning gains showed the greatest decline from the prior year based on AP 3 progress monitoring data for 19-20.

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.

We were above the state average in all areas on the 18-19 State data except in ELA learning and ELA lower quartile learning gains. The biggest gap which is positive is our Science. In 18-19 we were well above the State average. However, this was a drop in performance for us. Our 19-20 progress monitoring data had us on track to increase another 11 points to 73% proficiency.

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

The area of Science showed the most improvement on the AP 3 progress monitoring data. However on the FSA data from 17-18 to 18-19 it had dropped significantly. Therefore, we believe that the course corrections implemented and teacher planning helped put the 5th graders on track to score a 3 or higher on the 19-20 FSA had they taken the test.

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

Our biggest concern from our EWS data is the there are 8 students currently in 5th grade that scored a level 1 on the FSA when they were in 3rd grade and 14 who had scored a level 1 on math when they were in 3rd grade. The other area of concern is that 67 of our current student' attendance is below 90 percent. This is a concern especially with COVID and remote learning.

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

1. ELA learning gains
2. Math learning gains
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus is needed as our learning gains in ELA and lower quartile learning gains dropped from the 18-19 FSA to our AP 3 progress monitoring in STAR. Students have not been in a school setting for 6 months so this drop has likely grew. Therefore standards-aligned instruction will be very important for students to close the gaps of learning lost and to focus on new learning.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA learning gains will increase 10 points from 40% to 50% based on AP 3 progress monitoring data. ELA lower quartile gains will increase 10 points from 37% to 47% based on AP 3 progress monitoring data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction to include summarizing the main idea both within paragraphs and across texts, asking questions about what they have read, paraphrasing what they have read, drawing inferences that are based on text information, answering questions at different points in the text, using graphic organizers. The strategies utilized will be connected to active participation of the students in the comprehension process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	After analyzing the 2018-2019 FSA data and the AP 3 of district progress monitoring utilizing explicit comprehension strategies from Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices practice guide from the What Works Clearing House shows a strong effective size in improving student academic performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students making learning gains and those in the lower quartile in 5th grade and any 4th graders that were retained in the 3rd grade during the 18-19 school year for ELA.
2. Communicate with teachers of which students would be in these two categories
3. Provide professional development on the different comprehension strategies outlined and the implementation of them. This PD would include how teachers would model the strategies, provide explanations of the strategies, giving guided practice and feed back on the use of the strategies, and promoting independent practice to apply the strategies. The focus on the implementation would be on active student participation in using the strategies.
4. Admin does classroom walks to monitor instruction and provide teacher feedback.
5. Track progress monitoring data for these students
6. Teachers conduct data chats with students in regards to student performance and usage of the specific strategies.

Person Responsible	Michelle Cox (mcox@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school as a whole will be focusing a lot on safety procedures and protocols due to COVID. They will also be moitoring student progress for traditional learners, remote learners, and virtual learners and making instructional shifts as needed.

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.

Scenic Heights has a teacher leadership program that utilizes the strengths of our staff members for school improvement. In order to generate a culture of learning and growth for all, we continuously provide teaching and learning for adults as an integral part of the learning cycle in our school. At SHE we set the tone through our words and actions, and we take every opportunity to model the behaviors we expect from others. Culture is built through every interaction we have with our students, staff and families, and we believe those interactions must be optimistic, inspiring and supportive. The administrative team ensures that every member of the faculty and staff feel that they are supported by leadership in a professional community that values innovation, growth and collegiality. Because parents have a huge impact on a school's culture, we encourage parents to be engaged with the learning process and active in the school community by volunteering. Our school leadership, faculty, and staff lead by example so students notice and learn from the adults' behaviors and the way we handle ourselves in daily situations. We are role models and continuously show students how to be kind, caring, and that we value them.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.