O. J. Semmes Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

O. J. Semmes Elementary School

1250 E TEXAR DR, Pensacola, FL 32503

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Susan Sanders E   Start Date for this Principal: 8/4/2020

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: D (35%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
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

O. J. Semmes Elementary School

1250 E TEXAR DR, Pensacola, FL 32503

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	90%

School Grades History

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

The mission of O. J. Semmes Elementary School is to provide an environment where all students can achieve their highest academic potential while developing physically, emotionally and socially into productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of O. J. Semmes Elementary School is to create a safe, nurturing environment conducive to teaching and learning.

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
Cross, Shannon	Principal	Instructional Leader, Curriculum, Budget, Purchasing, Scheduling, Personnel, Safety
Roby, Amy	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, Curriculum, Budget, Purchasing, Scheduling, Personnel, Safety
Lobley, Uadona	Teacher, K-12	Student safety and instruction
Bell, Taylor	Teacher, K-12	Student safety and instruction
Hughes, Richard	Teacher, K-12	Student safety and art instruction
Ladner, Stacey	School Counselor	Student mental health, safety, testing
Martin, Heather	Teacher, PreK	Student safety and instruction
Massey, Mitzie	Teacher, K-12	Student safety and instruction
McGlothan, Tamiko	Teacher, K-12	Student safety and instruction
Merritt, Rickie	Teacher, ESE	Student safety and instruction
Mullett, Spencer	Teacher, K-12	Student safety and instruction
Dublin, Tammy Jo	Teacher, K-12	Student safety and instruction
Mendoza, Abby	Other	Curriculum leader, testing, safety

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/4/2020, Susan Sanders E

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.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
40

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: D (35%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
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	58	80	68	52	69	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	394
Attendance below 90 percent	19	24	20	14	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	1	7	3	8	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA	0	5	8	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	3	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
	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	0	4	4	4	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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		
Attendance below 90 percent	25	22	8	22	31	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	2	6	7	15	20	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	4	10	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	23	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	12	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	7	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	25	22	8	22	31	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	2	6	7	15	20	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	4	10	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	23	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	12	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	7	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	33%	53%	57%	26%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	55%	58%	35%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	83%	52%	53%	30%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	57%	63%	37%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	44%	60%	62%	44%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	52%	51%	31%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	30%	54%	53%	44%	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	23%	52%	-29%	57%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	52%	-19%	58%	-25%
	2018	31%	51%	-20%	56%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	34%	51%	-17%	56%	-22%
	2018	20%	44%	-24%	55%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	55%	55%	0%	62%	-7%
	2018	37%	54%	-17%	62%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	58%	-16%	64%	-22%
	2018	67%	58%	9%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-25%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	38%	55%	-17%	60%	-22%
	2018	35%	52%	-17%	61%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	29%	55%	-26%	53%	-24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	23%	55%	-32%	55%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	47		40	37						
BLK	30	55	83	50	45	45	26				
FRL	32	54	81	51	45	45	27				

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	9	46	53	29	71	79	10				
BLK	19	42	52	43	69	74	19				
WHT	80										
FRL	24	45	52	46	74	75	21				

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	8	8		24	27	27					
BLK	21	35	31	35	43	30	41				
MUL	55										
FRL	24	34	30	35	43	31	42				

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	49
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	340
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
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	
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	48
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
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 data component with the lowest performance in 2019 is science achievement. As the science assessment consists of a significant amount of reading, and the school scores for English Langauge Arts are also low, most likely student difficulties with reading resulted in lower science test scores.

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

The data component with the greatest decline between testing years 2018 and 2019 is fourth grade math which decreased from 67% proficient to 42% proficient This decline is likely attributed to teacher turnover and inconsistent behavior management in some classes.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the greatest gap between the state average and OJ Semmes is in English Language Arts lowest quartile learning gains. 83% of the students in Semmes' LQ group made learning gains while only 53% of the lowest quartile students in the state made learning gains. This can be attributed to a deliberate focus by the administration and teachers on small group reading interventions. A guided reading library was added and professional development was provided to ensure teachers knew how to offer differentiated instruction for all students. The greatest negative gap, when compared to the state average, is in English Language Arts proficiency. 33% of Semmes students scored proficient on the ELA assessment while 57% of Floria students scored proficient. This is indicative of a schoolwide struggle with reading comprehension and vocabulary.

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

The data component with the greatest improvement is also in English Language Arts lowest quartile learning gains. This can be attributed to a deliberate focus by the administration and teachers on small group reading interventions. A guided reading library was added and professional development was provided to ensure teachers knew how to offer differentiated instruction for all students.

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

The areas of most concern in the Early Warning System data that are not a direct reflection of academics as indicated in the data above are attendance and students with suspensions. In 2018 there were 126 students with attendance below 90% and in 2019 there were 118 students with attendance below 90% yet we only completed three quarters of the school year. It might be presumed that number would have increased to 157 or more had we completed the school year. Similarly, there were 64 students with one or more suspensions in 2018 and there were 37 students in 2019 with only three quarters of the school year completed. Again, it might be presumed that there could have been 50 or more students suspended for one or more days had the school year been completed.

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

1. Increase the proficiency of students in English Language Arts.
2. Increase the proficiency of students in science.
3. Increase the learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains of students in mathematics.
4. Reduce the number of out of school suspensions.
5. Increase the percentage of students who attend 90% or more of school days.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Description of Area of Focus: Teachers, administration, and staff at OJ Semmes will work collaboratively to plan and provide direct, explicit, and targeted small group reading instruction in English Language Arts in order to improve schoolwide proficiency in English Language Arts on the Florida Standards Assessment. Rationale for Area of Focus: Standards-based assessment data including FSA results (2019), STAR scores, and common district assessments, and walkthrough information collected from the 2019 - 2020 school year indicate that many OJ Semmes students perform below grade level in English Language Arts. Improving direct, small group instruction focused on basic reading skills including vocabulary, phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, and comprehension will increase student participation in tasks aligned to state standards.
Measurable Outcome:	By October of 2020, at least 75% of teachers (traditional, remote, and virtual) will provide enhanced, direct, and explicit small group reading comprehension instruction. By January 2021, 100% of teachers (traditional, remote, and virtual) will provide enhanced, direct, and explicit small group reading comprehension instruction. Common Assessment Data - STAR, iReady, distirct, and teacher made tests - will show at least 40% of students performing at or above proficiency. The percentage of students scoring proficient on the English Language Arts portion of the Florida Standards Assessment in 2021 will increase from the current 33% to at least 40%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Direct and Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction Direct and explicit instruction involves a series of steps that include explaining and modeling the strategy, using the strategy for guided practice, and using the strategy for independent practice. Explaining and modeling include defining each of the strategies for students and showing them how to use those strategies when reading a text. Guided practice involves the teacher and students working together to apply the strategies to texts they are reading. Independent practice occurs once the teacher is convinced that students can use the strategies on their own and practice applying the strategies to a new text.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	What Works Clearinghouse states that research has shown that providing students with multiple, explicit comprehension strategies improves reading comprehension by actively involving students in the comprehension process. Teachers will be supported through weekly common planning and professional learning focused on teaching reading comprehension. John Hattie's Effect Size for Interventions for Students with Learning Needs 0.77 John Hattie's Effect Size for Direct Instruction 0.60 IES Practice Guide: Improving Adolescent Literacy https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/adlit_pg_082608.pdf#page=22
Action Steps to Implement	

- Establish weekly planning and data sharing sessions for each grade level to include all traditional, remote, and virtual teachers.
- Establish the expectations for grade-level planning and data sharing meetings.

Person Responsible   Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfl.us)

- Provide teachers with resources that provide high-quality texts, specific, direct instruction routines, and reliable data. These will include Junior Great Books, Ready Reading, STAR, iReady, and district standards-based assessments.
- Provide teachers with professional learning to support high quality, explicit comprehension instruction

Person Responsible   Amy Roby (aroby@ecsdfl.us)

Establish expectations for small group instruction and ensure fidelity with implementation using data, walkthroughs, and grade-level meetings.

Person Responsible   Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Description of Area of Focus: Teachers, administration, and staff at OJ Semmes will work collaboratively to implement a Positive Behavior Intervention and Support program, improve relationships with students, and increase our understanding of trauma and how it impacts student behavior.
	Rationale for Area of Focus: Schoolwide data from the 2019-2020 school year indicate a high number of students with discipline referrals and a high number of out of school suspensions. There has not been a consistently enforced behavior plan nor any positive behavior supports. Providing students with incentives for good behavior, teaching them appropriate social skills, and building relationships will reduce the number of referrals and out of school suspensions.
Measurable Outcome:	Beginning in August 2020, all teachers will have a dedicated block of instruction dedicated to Community Meetings and social skills lessons. Teachers will be provided with training that develops their skills in social skills instruction and relationship building. Throughout the 2020-2021 school year, teachers and staff will participate in a book study that will increase their understanding of childhood trauma and how it affects student behavior. By September of 2020, the PBIS team will have begun its training to become an officially recognized PBIS school. Basic plans will have been implemented for schoolwide and classroom incentives. Teachers and staff will have begun a book study on becoming a trauma-informed school. By January of 2020, OJ Semmes will be a formally recognized PBIS school. Schoolwide data collected in Focus will show a reduction in the number of students with one or more referrals. from 37 in March of 2020 to less than 30 in March of 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Roby (aroby@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Actively teaching students socially- and behaviorally-appropriate skills to replace problem behaviors using strategies focused on both individual students and the whole classroom and increasing the incentives for positive behavior increases desired behaviors and reduces the need for referrals and suspensions. Teachers help students with behavior problems learn how, when, and where to use these new skills; increase the opportunities that the students have to exhibit appropriate behaviors; preserve a positive classroom climate, and manage consequences to reinforce students' display of positive "replacement" behaviors and adaptive skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As with any area of weakness, direct instruction in desired skills allows students to perform those skills. If a student struggles with addition, teachers focus on addition strategies. If he struggles with reading, we focus on reading strategies. Similarly, if a child struggles with appropriate behaviors we must teach him appropriate behaviors. Research has indicated that teaching students appropriate behaviors and rewarding them for displaying those behaviors significantly reduces negative behaviors.
	John Hattie's Effect Size for Behavioral Intervention Programs 0.62
	IES Practice Guide - Reducing Behavior Problems in the Elementary School Classroom https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/behavior_pg_092308.pdf#page=35

Action Steps to Implement

The master schedule will include a block of 30 minutes for dedicated social skills instruction for all classes in all grades. Teachers will be provided with resources and professional learning to maximize the effectiveness of this instruction.

Person Responsible   Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfl.us)

Teachers will participate in ongoing professional learning through a book study of Help for Billy - A Beyond Consequences Approaching to Helping Challenging Children in the Classroom.

Person Responsible   Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfl.us)

A PBIS team will be formed and commit to training and planning to become a formally recognized Positive Behavior Intervention and Support School. Schoolwide and classroom incentives will be developed.

Person Responsible   Stacey Ladner (sladner@ecsdfl.us)

Data will be collected to track the number of incidents of misbehavior, kinds of behavior, possible reasons for behavior, consequences, interventions, the times of day that behaviors occur. This data will be used to guide social skills instruction and to provide specific interventions to some students and teachers.

Person Responsible   Rickie Merritt (rmerritt@ecsdfl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Description of Area of Focus - Teachers and staff at OJ Semmes will offer targeted, explicit, differentiated instruction to students with disabilities in order to improve their performance in mathematics. Rationale of Area of Focus - According to the ESSA Federal Index, Students with Disabilities at OJ Semmesare performing at 34% which is below the requirement of 41%. This indicates that our students with disabilities are not making as much progress as other students. In addition, the 2019 Flordia Standards Assessment results in Mathematics indicate that only 44 percent of students in grades three, four, and five made learning gains, and only 43 percent of those in the lowest quartile made learning gains. As students with disabilities comprise a large portion of our lowest quartile, increasing the performance of these students will increase our learning gains, learning gains in the lowest quartile, and our ESSA Federal Index for Students with Disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	By September of 2020, all students will have been given baseline testing to determine their skill level in mathematics. This data will be used to group the students strategically into small groups for targeted instruction. By October of 2020, at least 75% of teachers (traditional, remote, and virtual) will provide direct small group mathematics instruction using instructional materials that are systematic and explicit. They will include clear models of easy and difficult problems, with accompanying teacher think-alouds. Lessons will allow students to solve problems in a group and communicate problem-solving strategies. A cumulative review will be included with each lesson. By January 2021, 100% of teachers (traditional, remote, and virtual) will provide small group mathematics instruction as described above. Common Assessment Data - STAR, iReady, district, and teacher-made tests - will show at least one year of growth for at least 50% of all students and 50% of students with disabilities. The percentage of students in grades three, four, and five showing at least one year of growth on the FSA Mathematics assessment will be at least 55 percent of all students and at least 55 percent of students in the lowest quartile.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Explicit and Systematic Intervention Instruction Students who are struggling with mathematics, including those with disabilities, will be provided with explicit instruction that includes teachers provide clear models for solving a problem type using an array of examples, students receiving extensive practice in the use of newly learned strategies and skills. Students will be provided with opportunities to discuss their problem-solving strategies with peers and instructors. Students are provided with extensive feedback. In addition, instruction will ensure that students possess the foundational skills and conceptual knowledge necessary for understanding their grade-level mathematics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	What Works Clearinghouse states that research has shown that mathematics instruction during intervention should be explicit and systematic. This includes providing models of proficient problem solving, verbalization of thought processes, guided practice, corrective feedback, and frequent cumulative review.

John Hattie's Effect Size for Interventions for Students with Learning Needs 0.77
John Hattie's Effect Size for Direct Instruction 0.60

IES Practice Guide: Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for Elementary and Middle Schools
https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/rti_math_pg_042109.pdf#page=32

Action Steps to Implement

Use baseline testing data to group students according to mathematical ability. Use this data to guide instruction of each group according to need, ensuring that students possess the foundational skills and conceptual knowledge necessary for understanding their grade-level mathematics.

Person Responsible Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfl.us)

Provide teachers with professional development in order to improve their mathematical instruction for small groups - specifically teaching them how to think aloud while problem-solving, encourage mathematical discussions, and provide effective feedback.

Person Responsible Amy Roby (aroby@ecsdfl.us)

Establish expectations for small group instruction and ensure fidelity with implementation using data, walkthroughs, and grade-level meetings.

Person Responsible Shannon Cross (scross@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Improving student skills in reading vocabulary and comprehension will allow for further success in both science and mathematical problem-solving. Improving the delivery of direct, explicit small group instruction for all students will increase academic achievement in all areas. Increasing the positive culture of the school will make it a more welcoming and accepting place, encouraging improved attendance. In addition, we will implement other strategies to improve student attendance including absence tracking calendars, having students track their own attendance, phone calls, and home visits.

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.

Parent and community involvement is emphasized in all areas at OJ Semmes Elementary School. Some of the following may be limited due to safety measures implemented to reduce exposure to the Covid virus. Our teachers and administration have planned an interactive open house program that will allow families to review student data and learn how to improve reading skills with fun activities at home. Each year the school provides quarterly parent programs including reading, math, science, and wellness events. We hold parent
conferences and/or home visits. School musicals and other performances are held each quarter. Parents are invited to participate in field trips, volunteer in the school, and share lunch with their children. Teachers and administrators also contact parents and families frequently with positive phone calls and thank you cards. Parents are invited to attend activities through the call out messenger system, fliers sent home, and posts on our
school's Facebook page and website.
Parents and community members are invited to participate in our School Advisory Council which allows them to participate in school decisions and budgeting. School Advisory Council meetings are held at least four times per year. We also have an annual Title I meeting at the beginning of each school year where concerns and goals are
discussed.
OJ Semmes is supported by many local churches and businesses. These organizations maintain landscaping and flower beds, donate school supplies and funds, and participate in volunteer activities. They provide teacher support in the form of meals, cards, and even renovations. In addition, some local churches invite families to food drives and other health and wellness programs.

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: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00