Escambia County School District

Myrtle 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 11

Planning for Improvement 16

Positive Culture & Environment 17

Budget to Support Goals 18

Myrtle Grove Elementary School

6115 LILLIAN HWY, Pensacola, FL 32506

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Robin Maloy G

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2020

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: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: F (31%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 11

Planning for Improvement 16

Title I Requirements 0

Budget to Support Goals 18

Myrtle Grove Elementary School

6115 LILLIAN HWY, 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	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	58%

School Grades History

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

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 Myrtle Grove Elementary School is to provide students with an academic foundation which will effectively develop communication, cooperation, creativity, and critical thinking skills. Achievement of this goal will require parental, community, and technological involvement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Myrtle Grove Elementary School will provide experiences which will nurture a love to read and give our children the skills and strategies to obtain knowledge and know the joy of reading as they become independent, life-long learners.

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
Maloy, Robin	Principal	The principal ensures that the school based team is implementing RtI, including intervention support and documentation. The principal also ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation. The team reviews progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who meet or exceeds expectations, as well as, students who are at risk of not meeting benchmark expectations. The Leadership Team will use the information to determine professional development and resource needs. The team will also share effective practices when collaborating with other school colleagues and evaluate the implementation of those practices.
Gantt, Anita	Assistant Principal	
Hoyland, Gina	Other	
Abercrombie, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Ellis, Tavia	Teacher, K-12	
Hatley, Donna	Teacher, ESE	
Virgin, Debra	Teacher, K-12	
Trawick, Jacob	Teacher, K-12	
Paul, Aurora	Teacher, K-12	
Carver, Angela	Teacher, K-12	
McAroy, Brigit	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/13/2020, Robin Maloy G

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
27

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: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: F (31%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	54	93	73	94	74	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	480
Attendance below 90 percent	9	23	15	28	9	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	4	2	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	1	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	11	8	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/13/2020

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	92	91	93	79	97	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	7	21	23	20	22	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	0	5	7	7	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	16	8	12	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	51	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	5	6	10	23	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	92	91	93	79	97	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	7	21	23	20	22	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	0	5	7	7	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	16	8	12	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	51	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	5	6	10	23	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	41%	53%	57%	45%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	55%	58%	36%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	52%	53%	14%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	35%	57%	63%	38%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	45%	60%	62%	28%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	51%	18%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	61%	54%	53%	36%	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	33%	56%	-23%	58%	-25%
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	57%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	52%	-15%	58%	-21%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	51%	51%	0%	56%	-5%
	2018	37%	44%	-7%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	25%	55%	-30%	62%	-37%
	2018	43%	54%	-11%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	58%	-21%	64%	-27%
	2018	65%	58%	7%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-28%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	44%	55%	-11%	60%	-16%
	2018	44%	52%	-8%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	58%	55%	3%	53%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	55%	-3%
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	18	35	25	8	19	20	31				
BLK	22	47	36	20	42	52	29				
HSP	45	46		55	77						
MUL	63	60		38	40						
WHT	51	57	57	41	40	42	72				
FRL	37	52	40	29	42	46	57				

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	18	42	38	32	55	46	11				
BLK	21	35	44	31	51	41	21				
HSP	47	50		73	70						
MUL	57	70		64	60						
WHT	52	52	47	60	65	44	63				
FRL	38	47	50	51	59	43	45				

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	20	18	4	13	13	17	16				
BLK	29	35	13	23	24	25	17				
HSP	62			62							
MUL	57	17		36	8						
WHT	53	37	12	46	31	13	55				
FRL	43	32	9	37	31	21	36				

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	333
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	50
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	51
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	43
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.

STAR AP3 data showed that ELA was the lowest component. One factor would be that 28 3rd graders and 19 5th graders had attendance below 90%. Another factor is that the rigor needed to challenge our students was not at the level it needed to be.

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

STAR AP3 Achievement level showed the greatest decline when compared to FSA 2019 ELA. There were too many absences and the rigor was not challenging enough. More scaffolding was needed. Also, One of the fifth grade teachers had to take medical LOA. After several substitutes that did not work out, the students had to be split into the 4 remaining 5th grade classes, increasing the numbers in those classrooms and changed the dynamics of the 5th grade 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.

Not having state testing to compare from last school year, the greatest gap compared with the STAR AP3 district average was in Math. Again, too many absences, rigor not challenging enough, and a change in 5th grade dynamics.

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

Compared to 2019 FSA scores, Math showed the most improvement with 2 percentage points. We worked with consultants from the district and from SREB (Southern Regional Education Board). We had monthly walkthroughs and PD.

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

Two areas of concern are the number of students with attendance below 90%, and the number of students with an achievement level 1 for FSA 2019.

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

1. Increasing achievement levels in FSA for 3rd-5th
2. Decreasing the number of students with attendance below 90%
3. Decreasing the number of students with two or more indicators
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on STAR AP3 data, which is the most current data available, ELA scores dropped significantly. While Math increased very slightly, it is still well below an appropriate proficiency level. If Instructional Practice specifically related to Standards-aligned Instruction is not implemented at a high enough level, student learning is not geared toward high achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is that 3rd-5th grade students will achieve 50% Proficiency on ELA and Math for 2021 FSA testing.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitor the reading and math progress throughout the year using STAR 360 and iReady data. Have monthly data meetings with grade levels. Teachers and Admin. will work with SREB for ELA and Math PD and modeling each month. Bi-monthly data meetings with district administration. Classroom walkthroughs observing standards-based instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our ELA scores dropped significantly when comparing STAR AP3 2020 and FSA ELA 2019 scores, and we need to focus more on standards- based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review data for STAR 360 and iReady
2. Monthly data meetings with grade levels/ESE teachers
3. Schedule PD with SREB team
4. Progress monitor all students on regular basis

Person Responsible	Robin Maloy (rmaloy@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 continue to post daily statistics on Class Dojo showing the number of absences, tardies, and early checkouts school-wide. Teachers will call parents to inquire about absences. We will have child study attendance meetings with school admin, SSW, and parent. Office staff asks parents reasons for tardies or early checkouts.

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.

Myrtle Grove Elementary School will plan on having as many parental involvement activities as the current situation will allow beginning second semester, unless district guidelines are allowing activities to occur before that time.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction				$88,800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0371 - Myrtle Grove Elementary School	TSSSA		$88,800.00
			Notes: SREB for Math and ELA Content Support for 24 days of coaching, modeling, and professional support.			
					Total:	**$88,800.00**