

Escambia County School District

A. K. Suter 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

A. K. Suter Elementary School

501 PICKENS AVE, Pensacola, FL 32503

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Alicia Mathis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2004

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
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: A (66%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

A. K. Suter Elementary School

501 PICKENS AVE, 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 KG-5	No	49%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

School Grades History

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

The faculty, staff, families, and community of A.K. Suter Elementary unite to instill in our students a high standard of academic excellence and responsible behavior that will prepare them to compete in a rapidly changing and culturally diverse society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A.K. Suter Elementary School strives to be a complete educational experience for all students, a place where all children are nurtured, educated, and loved.

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
		Russell Queen - Principal, Dr. Patrice Moody - Assistant Principal, Kelly Low - School Psychologist, Amy Proshek - Guidance Counselor, as well as the leadership team, share a common vision to make sound decisions for students based on site based assessment data. We ensure implementation of the Rtl process, professional learning opportunities to keep teachers current with best practices, and curriculum based instructional strategies. Additionally, we intentionally communicate with parents about our school based plans.
Loggins, Jesse	Teacher, K-12	
Low, Kelly	Psychologist	
Proshek, Amy	School Counselor	
Moody, Dr. Patrice	Assistant Principal	
McWethy, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Ryan, Deirdre	Teacher, K-12	
Martin, Darian	Teacher, K-12	
Queen, Russell	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2004, Alicia Mathis

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.*

3

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

10

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
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: A (66%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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	52	71	92	73	93	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	477
Attendance below 90 percent	1	9	3	9	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/3/2020

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	73	107	85	100	102	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	569
Attendance below 90 percent	6	11	9	7	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	0	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	73	107	85	100	102	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	569
Attendance below 90 percent	6	11	9	7	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	0	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	75%	53%	57%	73%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	55%	58%	65%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	52%	53%	46%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	75%	57%	63%	73%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	60%	62%	55%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	51%	34%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	54%	53%	70%	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	76%	56%	20%	58%	18%
	2018	80%	52%	28%	57%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%
	2018	71%	51%	20%	56%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	76%	51%	25%	56%	20%
	2018	66%	44%	22%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	55%	21%	62%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	77%	54%	23%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	58%	20%	64%	14%
	2018	70%	58%	12%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	70%	55%	15%	60%	10%
	2018	80%	52%	28%	61%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	69%	55%	14%	53%	16%
	2018	80%	55%	25%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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	55	55	40	48	60						
BLK	64	63	67	58	63	48	47				
HSP	62			77							
MUL	82	83		88	83						
WHT	79	68	44	80	72	48	74				
FRL	69	63	59	67	64	44	53				
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	43	42	55	49	44		36				
BLK	59	42	44	60	39	53	39				
HSP	63	33		75	33						
MUL	78	77		89	62						
WHT	78	58	55	79	70	61	87				
FRL	66	51	45	67	56	55	62				

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	46	60		38	30						
BLK	44	58	65	40	27	21	35				
HSP	89			83							
MUL	75			83							
WHT	81	69	33	82	64	53	81				
FRL	62	62	57	61	48	30	48				

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	66
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	460
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
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	
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	59
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	70
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	84
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	66
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	60
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.

Our Math Lowest 25th Percentile learning gains declined from the previous year, to 48% . Last year, our Math Lowest 25th Percentile component yield 58% learning gains. Although, this area is a challenge, we will continue to monitor our lower quartile students and strive for improvement with this component.

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

Overall, our Math Lowest 25th Percentile learning gains showed the greatest decline from the previous year. Last year, our Math Lowest 25th Percentile component yield 58% learning gains; however, recent 2019 data revealed this component showing 48% learning gains. Although, this area is a challenge, we will continue to monitor our lower quartile students and strive for improvement.

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.

Our school out performed and/or scored the same as the state average in all but one component, Math Lowest 25th Percentile. Our Math Lowest 25th Percentile learning gains declined from the previous year. Although, this area is a challenge, we will continue to monitor our lower quartile students and strive for improvement.

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

Our ELA Learning Gains component showed the most improvement. We yield a 13% point increase with this component, as our students' performance grew from 55% points to 68%. During the previous year, ELA Learning Gains revealed the greatest decline; however, with intense instructional focus on Florida Standards, student performance improved.

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

In reflecting/reviewing our Early Warning System (EWS) data, the one potential area of concern is our number of students with attendance below 90%. Currently, we have 51 students, which is approximately 9% of our student body, demonstrating potential early warning attendance concerns.

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

1. After thoroughly reviewing our school data, in the Needs Assessment/Analysis section of our School Improvement Plan and our Florida Standard Assessment data results, our highest priority for school-wide improvement, in the upcoming school year, will be to focus attention on increasing our student performance in the component of Math Lowest 25th Percentile.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math Lowest 25th Percentile: Following an extensive review of our Needs Assessment/ Analysis data and our 2018-2019 Florida Standard Assessment (FSA) data, our school observed an unexpected decline in the Math Lowest 25th Percentile component. Thus, we will continue to ensure intentional standard based planning, instruction, data review, and alignment to acknowledge we are meeting the needs of our students.

Measurable Outcome: Our Math Lowest 25th Percentile group will increase a minimum of 5 percentage points, in learning gains, from 48% to 53%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Russell Queen (rqueen@escambia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing our districts-wide math curriculum, Pearson enVision 2020, all classrooms will continue to utilize Math Frameworks and Math Year-at-a-Glance. We will continue to focus on standards based planning and instruction as well as utilize our district's pacing guides. Teachers will implement these evidence-based instructional tips:

- * Assisting students in monitoring and reflection on the problem-solving process
- * Teaching students to use visual representations to solve problems
- * Helping students make sense of algebraic notations

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In analyzing the 2019 FSA and the current 2020 progress monitoring data, our students, in the Math Lowest 25th Percentile subgroup, appear to be displaying deficiencies with problem-solving process, lacking skills with the use of visual representation, and making sense of algebraic notation. According to Improving Mathematical Problem Solving, found on What Works Clearinghouse, monitoring and reflecting on the problem solving process, the use of visual representation to solve problems, and internalizing algebraic notation have proven to have a strong positive effect size on student performance. Thus, based upon the needs of our students, our teachers will be implementing these evidence based strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All teachers will participate in district-wide update training to review best practices for continued successful implementation of our math curriculum, Pearson enVision 2020.
2. Review of weekly assessments.
3. Review quarterly district assessments.
4. Daily classroom walk-through with focus on data observation
5. FSA Assessment data

Person Responsible Dr. Patrice Moody (pmoody@ecsdfi.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School safety is a critical component for all educational institutions. Especially now, as we embark on unprecedented times with the outbreak of the national crisis, coronavirus or COVID-19. Therefore, district-wide we have implemented numerous safety protocol practices at all school sites. Our primary goal is to maintain the safety of our students, faculty, and staff, as we continue to provide the best education possible.

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 school host regular parental and family engagement activities throughout the year. Our active PTA networks within our community to support our students and families by providing parental workshops and/or family night out events to ensure involvement. Additionally, our PTA, with strong community support, hosts several school-wide fund-raising challenges to support our teachers and classrooms. Our special area teachers, music and art, sponsor countless student lead and driven fine art events that are opened to our school-wide community. Also, our media specialist sponsors school-wide engaging literacy based events that ensure all of our stakeholders are involved and engaged in student learning.

* A. K. Suter is designated as a non-Title i school for the 2020-2021 school term.

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: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00