Escambia County School District

Blue Angels Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Blue Angels Elementary School

1551 DOG TRACK RD, Pensacola, FL 32506

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Jayne Murphy P

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
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 (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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.](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

Blue Angels Elementary School

1551 DOG TRACK RD, Pensacola, FL 32506

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	52%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

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

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.

Our mission at Blue Angels Elementary School is to promote joy in learning in a safe, child-centered environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to meet the academic needs of each student at Blue Angels Elementary School while helping to develop well rounded citizens.

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
Murphy, Jayne	Principal	
Griffin, Vanessa	School Counselor	
Southworth, Gary	School Counselor	
Henry-Slater, Michel	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Jayne Murphy P

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.*
9

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
64

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)	57%
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 (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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	94	144	131	114	133	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	751
Attendance below 90 percent	11	26	16	8	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	4	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	9	4	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/11/2020

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	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	10	15	12	17	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	3	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	26	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	3	3	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	10	15	12	17	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	3	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	26	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	3	3	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	68%	53%	57%	64%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	55%	58%	61%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	52%	53%	52%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	70%	57%	63%	66%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	60%	62%	75%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	52%	51%	63%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	54%	53%	71%	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	74%	56%	18%	58%	16%	
	2018	64%	52%	12%	57%	7%	
Same Grade Comparison		10%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	62%	52%	10%	58%	4%	
	2018	62%	51%	11%	56%	6%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison		-2%					
05	2019	64%	51%	13%	56%	8%	
	2018	57%	44%	13%	55%	2%	
Same Grade Comparison		7%					
Cohort Comparison		2%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	61%	55%	6%	62%	-1%	
	2018	61%	54%	7%	62%	-1%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	71%	58%	13%	64%	7%	
	2018	71%	58%	13%	62%	9%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison		10%					
05	2019	72%	55%	17%	60%	12%	
	2018	68%	52%	16%	61%	7%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison		1%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	69%	55%	14%	53%	16%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	67%	55%	12%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	35	40	26	35	71	69	43				
ASN	77	62		95	92						
BLK	47	41	36	55	65	46	41				
HSP	72	63		70	68		43				
MUL	75	74		67	93		80				
WHT	71	63	41	73	83	68	78				
FRL	58	51	38	61	80	72	59				
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	33	35	32	51	57	48				
ASN	78	58		78	75						
BLK	43	48	44	52	60	64	50				
HSP	53	50		63	75	80	83				
MUL	70	68		81	84		77				
WHT	65	57	42	68	65	58	64				
FRL	54	54	36	57	64	56	66				
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	29	25	21	29	50	40	33				
ASN	71	77		76	77						
BLK	47	43	20	48	69	57	52				
HSP	70	60		63	87						
MUL	75	64		71	76	60	88				
WHT	63	63	59	68	76	66	72				
FRL	52	54	51	54	73	63	57				

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	65
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	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	82
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	63
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	78
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	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 lowest data component on the FSA was ELA lower quartile learning gains at 42%. This area has been the lowest for the last two testing years.

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

The greatest decline was in ELA lower quartile learning gains from 52% in 2016/2017 to 42% in 2017/2018.

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 biggest gap, when compared to the state average, is our ELA lower quartile learning gains at 42% while the state is 48%.

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

The area showing the most improvement was Math lower quartile learning gains at 63%, which is 16 points gain from the previous year, 47%. This is not a trend as the percentage is the same in 2016/ 2017.

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

An area of concern is the number of students with attendance below 90 percent.

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

1. Increase lower quartile gains from 42%.
2. Decrease the number of students with attendance below 90%.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Small group instruction allows teachers to work more closely with their students and identify their learning needs. Through classroom observations and data conversations, small group instruction was not differentiated to a degree that would strongly benefit the students involved. Developing a solid core of instruction would allow teachers to work more closely and provide consistent strategies to help students increase their level of proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Students in the lower quartile will increase from 43% proficiency to 45% in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jayne Murphy (jmurphy3@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	While working in small groups, students will use appropriate text and comprehension strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using appropriate text with individual small groups and developing their comprehension skills will increase their understanding and fluency.

Action Steps to Implement

Use I-Ready and Star Data to identify appropriate text to use in small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Michel Henry-Slater (mhenry-slater@ecsdfl.us)

Continued PD through ELA Reps and information shared with teachers.

Person Responsible	Jayne Murphy (jmurphy3@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will track student attendance using FOCUS and Raptor.
Parents will participate in "Attendance Child Study," meetings to address attendance concerns.
Additional training in the core areas of Reading and Math utilizing I-Ready and STAR 360.
Teachers will utilize Curriculum frameworks with Studies Weekly and Supplemental Resources linked in the CORE LMS.
Participate in the Science Olympiad and Sunshine Math Program building on research, writing, speaking, and listening skills in 4th and 5th grades with categories of exhibits, performance, and websites.

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.

We are a Capturing Kids' Hearts." school. This process emphasizes community, personal responsibility, and the value of treating each other well. Each classroom will have a "Social Contract" to set guidelines for behavior. In addition, we have a strong PBIS program that recognizes our student's behavior.

We provide all teachers with a PBS Survival Guide. The guide includes our PB mission: To facilitate a pro-active learning environment through modeling and recognizing positive behavior that aligns with school-wide expectations. The Survival Guide also includes expectations, school pledge, guidelines for tickets, school-wide PBS event calendar; data tracking sheet, and much more.

We have PBS assemblies for all grade levels at the beginning of each semester and PBS Celebration four times a year.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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