

Escambia County School District

Pleasant Grove 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	18

Pleasant Grove Elementary School

10789 SORRENTO RD, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Nicole Owens Braggs

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2020

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: B (60%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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

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	18

Pleasant Grove Elementary School

10789 SORRENTO RD, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>94%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>53%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	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 at Pleasant Grove Elementary is to encourage learning and creativity that will prepare students for success and lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision at Pleasant Grove is to promote the recognition of positive behaviors and academic success that aligns with the school-wide expectation to create a positive learning environment encouraging students, teachers, staff, and parents to exhibit school and community pride.

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
Farish, Connie	Principal	The role of the Leadership team is to meet monthly with admin to monitor progress of goals.
Tindell, Sunday	Assistant Principal	
Crigler, Lori	Teacher, ESE	
Lee, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	
Lee, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/31/2020, Nicole Owens Braggs

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

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: B (60%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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	42	74	71	91	82	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	464
Attendance below 90 percent	4	10	10	14	6	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	2	6	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	1	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	7	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/2/2020

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	77	75	96	88	100	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	532
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	19	12	20	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	3	6	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	32	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	3	11	8	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	3	8	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	77	75	96	88	100	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	532
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	19	12	20	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	3	6	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	32	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	3	11	8	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	3	8	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	56%	53%	57%	55%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	55%	58%	53%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	52%	53%	40%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	57%	63%	54%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	60%	62%	38%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	52%	51%	22%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	54%	53%	48%	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	46%	52%	-6%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	56%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	55%	51%	4%	56%	-1%
	2018	48%	44%	4%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	55%	-3%	62%	-10%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	58%	5%	64%	-1%
	2018	62%	58%	4%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	53%	55%	-2%	60%	-7%
	2018	48%	52%	-4%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	65%	55%	10%	53%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	61%	55%	6%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	29	53	53	24	64	55	25				
ASN	64			64	80						
BLK	40	56	36	33	52	63	46				
HSP	71	67		57	67		58				
MUL	59	43		63	59		83				
WHT	60	62	71	66	67	67	81				
FRL	50	55	55	52	61	55	65				
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	29	29	13	30	38	24					
ASN	55			58							
BLK	34	40	30	31	45	41	50				
HSP	50	47		67	60						
MUL	71	58		77	63						
WHT	58	46	19	64	57	50	74				
FRL	46	42	32	53	52	41	64				
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	16	27	21	16	20	19	33				
ASN	73			73							
BLK	37	41	45	36	34	30	22				
HSP	57	43		62	50		60				
MUL	76	79		73	43		60				
WHT	57	53	33	56	38	12	57				
FRL	51	52	38	50	35	25	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)	N/A

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	419
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	
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	69
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	47
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	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
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	68
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 2018-19 FSA scores show 56% proficient in both ELA and Math. The Math proficiency was unchanged from the 2017-18 school year. Learning gains and lower quartile learning gains for ELA and Math both showed increases from the previous year.

The African American population of students in the lower quartile only had 36% learning gains from the previous year.

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

There were no components on the school grade that decreased on the 2018-19 FSA tests. Math proficiency remained the same at 56%.

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 greatest gap when compared to the state average was third grade math proficiency. There was a ten point deficiency between the school proficiency (52%) and the third grade state proficiency (62%). That gap decreased by three points from the previous year, which indicated a positive trend.

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

ELA lower quartile learning gains showed the most improvement by 30 points. The 2018 lower quartile gains were 29% and the 2019 lower quartile learning gains increased to 59%. Also, notable were the students with disabilities in the lower quartile. In 2018 only 13% of those students had a learning gain. There was a 40 point increase on the 2019 lower quartile points to have 53% of those students with a learning gain.

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

The one area of concern would be the African American population of students who are in the lower quartile for ELA. In 2018 30% of them had a learning gain and increased to 36% in 2019. In comparison, 71% of the white students in the lower quartile had a learning gain.

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

1. African American students in the ELA lower quartile
2. Math lower quartile
3. African American students in Math Proficiency
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: The African American population of students in the ELA lower quartile had only 36% of them with a learning gain, while the Caucasian population in that same component had 71% learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: There will be a 10 percentage point gain in the African American population of students in the ELA lower quartile learning gain. That gain will show 46% of this subgroup with a learning gain.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sunday Tindell (stindell@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: SRA instruction will be used for Level 1/2 students as a reading intervention. Word Journeys provides a comprehensive approach to assessing and building children's word knowledge. Students will receive practice to increase their word knowledge through classroom instruction and additional practice at home. Teachers will meet monthly with administration to discuss data from STAR testing, standards tests, and other data gained from small group instruction.
 Grade level teachers will select a book for a Professional Learning Community throughout the year. Selections are from Jennifer Serravallo's books, "Reading Strategies", "Understanding Texts and Readers", and "Writing Strategies".

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: There is a discrepancy in proficiency between the African American students and the Caucasian students.

Action Steps to Implement

Level 1/2 students will be tested for SRA placement.

Person Responsible Sunday Tindell (stindell@ecsdfl.us)

Classroom teachers will test students for placement in Word Journeys. They will reassess at the end of each quarter.

Person Responsible Sunday Tindell (stindell@ecsdfl.us)

Data meetings held monthly to discuss data from STAR testing, standards, tests, and other data gained from small group instruction.

Person Responsible Sunday Tindell (stindell@ecsdfl.us)

Grade level teachers will select from one of Jennifer Serravallo's books, "Reading Strategies", "Understanding Texts and Readers", and "Writing Strategies".

Person Responsible Sunday Tindell (stindell@ecsdfl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The African-American population for Math proficiency was 33%, while the Caucasian population was 66%.

Measurable Outcome:

There will be a 10 point increase in the African American group for Math proficiency, which would be 43% of this subgroup to score proficient on the Math FSA Test.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Connie Farish (cfarish@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

There will be monthly data analysis meetings of STAR and iReady with each grade level. An additional data component for grades 3-5 will be the quarterly math assessments on the standards taught during a given nine weeks. Small group instruction will be on-going with teachers adjusting the small groups, depending on the standards that need to be retaught.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

There is a 33% gap in the proficiency between the African American students and the Caucasian students.

Action Steps to Implement

Scheduling of monthly data meetings.

Person Responsible

Connie Farish (cfarish@ecsdfi.us)

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.

The Title I Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) in collaboration with parents, community stakeholders, and school personnel is written and implemented each year. The plan outlines goals, strategies, and activities to better communicate with families and focuses on building the capacity of parents to address the needs of all students. The Family-School Compact is developed jointly with parents at the annual Title I Parent meeting scheduled after school begins.

Parent conferences are scheduled throughout the year either through in person meetings or phone calls to parents.

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: African-American	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00