Ensley Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ensley Elementary School

501 E JOHNSON AVE, Pensacola, FL 32514

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Rhonda Sh UF Ord O

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 PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: D (39%)
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	

* 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

Ensley Elementary School

501 E JOHNSON AVE, Pensacola, FL 32514

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	85%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

All children at Ensley Elementary enter a supportive, encouraging, safe, and orderly environment where they learn at high levels and are encouraged to go forth being helpful, productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through united partnerships with every child, family and teacher we work together to increase student proficiency and close the achievement gap.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Shuford, Rhonda	Principal	To implement the vision and mission daily and monitor the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure evidence based strategies are being utilized to help Ensley Elementary meet our ELA and Math goals for 2021-22.
Everette, Nicole	Assistant Principal	To implement the vision and mission daily and monitor the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure evidence based strategies are being utilized to help Ensley Elementary meet our ELA and Math goals for 2021-22.
Sims, Megan	Curriculum Resource Teacher	To implement the vision and mission daily and monitor the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure evidence based strategies are being utilized to help Ensley Elementary meet our ELA and Math goals for 2021-22.
Parker, Taria	Teacher, K-12	To implement the vision and mission daily and monitor the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure evidence based strategies are being utilized to help Ensley Elementary meet our ELA and Math goals for 2021-22.
Grepke, Tracy	Teacher, K-12	To implement the vision and mission daily and monitor the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure evidence based strategies are being utilized to help Ensley Elementary meet our ELA and Math goals for 2021-22.
Lynn, Amy	Teacher, K-12	To implement the vision and mission daily and monitor the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure evidence based strategies are being utilized to help Ensley Elementary meet our ELA and Math goals for 2021-22.
Boch, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	To implement the vision and mission daily and monitor the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure evidence based strategies are being utilized to help Ensley Elementary meet our ELA and Math goals for 2021-22.
Simmons, Kenisha	Teacher, K-12	To implement the vision and mission daily and monitor the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure evidence based strategies are being utilized to help Ensley Elementary meet our ELA and Math goals for 2021-22.
Bryan, Megan	Teacher, K-12	To implement the vision and mission daily and monitor the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure evidence based strategies are being utilized to help Ensley Elementary meet our ELA and Math goals for 2021-22.
Ramirez, Roel	Other	To implement the vision and mission daily and monitor the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure evidence based strategies are being utilized to help Ensley Elementary meet our ELA and Math goals for 2021-22.
Smolensky, Regina	Teacher, K-12	To implement the vision and mission daily and monitor the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure evidence based strategies are being utilized to help Ensley Elementary meet our ELA and Math goals for 2021-22.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jones, Iris	School Counselor	To implement the vision and mission daily and monitor the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure evidence based strategies are being utilized to help Ensley Elementary meet our ELA and Math goals for 2021-22.
Morrissette, Cynthia	Reading Coach	To implement the vision and mission daily and monitor the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure evidence based strategies are being utilized to help Ensley Elementary meet our ELA and Math goals for 2021-22.
Wright, Susannah	Teacher, ESE	To implement the vision and mission daily and monitor the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to ensure evidence based strategies are being utilized to help Ensley Elementary meet our ELA and Math goals for 2021-22.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Rhonda Sh UF Ord O

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.*

1

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

22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

406

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	41	47	77	70	68	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	361
Attendance below 90 percent	11	30	35	32	33	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	13	13	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	11	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	28	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	8	19	14	29	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	10	11	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/26/2021

2020-21 - 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	39	69	66	65	55	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	351
Attendance below 90 percent	13	29	25	13	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	4	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	5	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

2020-21 - 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	39	69	66	65	55	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	351
Attendance below 90 percent	13	29	25	13	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	4	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	5	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				41%	53%	57%	36%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	55%	58%	37%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	52%	53%	27%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				49%	57%	63%	52%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				58%	60%	62%	54%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	52%	51%	36%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				38%	54%	53%	39%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	31%	56%	-25%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2021					
	2019	26%	51%	-25%	56%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	38%	55%	-17%	62%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	58%	8%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	31%	55%	-24%	60%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	30%	55%	-25%	53%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

STAR was utilized for Fall, Winter, and Spring ELA and Math progress monitoring. The science district quarterly assessment was used for science progress monitoring. The numbers reflect the membership, students tied to the school during both survey 2 and 3.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/22.4%	30/44.1%	24/33.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/28.9%	22/48.9%	17/34.7%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0.0%	3/42.9%	3/42.9%
	English Language Learners	0/0/0%	2/11.8%	1/5.6%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/27.3%	33/48.5%	32/44.4%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/31.8%	23/51.1%	22/44.9%
	Students With Disabilities	4/57.1%	4/57.1%	3/42.9%
	English Language Learners	0/0.0%	3/17.6%	4/22.2%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/25.9%	14/24.6%	19/29.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/29.8%	12/26.1%	16/31.4%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0.0%	1/20.0%	1/16.7%
	English Language Learners	0/0.0%	1/10.0%	1/9.1%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11/19.0%	10/18.9%	21/33.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/21.3%	8/18.6%	20/40.0%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0.0%	0/0.0%	0/0.0%
	English Language Learners	0/0.0%	1/10.0%	2/18.2%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/17.9%	12/22.2%	19/36.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/19.4%	7/20.6%	10/31.3%
	Students With Disabilities	1/25.0%	0/0.0%	1/25.0%
	English Language Learners	2/10.0%	2/14.3%	5/35.7%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13/26.0%	16/31.4%	15/28.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/25.8%	8/25.0%	8/25.2%
	Students With Disabilities	1/25.0%	0/0.0%	1/25.0%
	English Language Learners	1/5.0%	2/15.4%	5/33.3%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/25.5%	19/36.5%	17/34.0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/22.0%	10/31.3%	9/30.0%
	Students With Disabilities	1/11.1%	0/0.0%	1/11.1%
	English Language Learners	2/22.2%	2/28.6%	2/25.0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/22.2%	12/23.5%	13/26.0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/25.0%	5/15.6%	7/23.3%
	Students With Disabilities	1/11.1%	0/0.0%	0/0.0%
	English Language Learners	1/11.1%	1/14.3%	1/12.5%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/16.7%	5/10.6%	12/28.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/16.7%	3/8.3%	9/28.1%
	Students With Disabilities	1/16.7%	1/12.5%	1/16.7%
	English Language Learners	4/23.5%	1/9.1%	3/25.0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/10.4%	6/13.0%	7/16.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/13.9%	4/11.4%	5/15.6%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0.0%	0/0.0%	0/0.0%
	English Language Learners	2/11.8%	3/27.3%	4/33.3%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13/28.9%	17/36.2%	14/36.8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/31.3%	13/38.2%	10/34.5%
	Students With Disabilities	2/28.6%	4/50.0%	1/16.7%
	English Language Learners	5/27.8%	6/33.3%	4/36.4%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	10	18		11	30						
ELL	24	38		24	50		33				
BLK	23	21		11	6		6				
HSP	26	33		21	62		23				
WHT	52			40							
FRL	28	33	18	20	26		24				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	13	33	40	16	47	55					
ELL	37	56	45	49	55		31				
BLK	35	57	50	41	54	46	22				
HSP	34	55	50	46	50		31				

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
MUL	81	69		69	77						
WHT	36	44		54	63						
FRL	40	56	57	46	59	52	34				
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	5	6	12	15	28	25	14				
ELL	33	40		60	57						
ASN	60			80							
BLK	24	25	23	37	43	37	21				
HSP	49	54		64	61		25				
MUL	55	70		67	80						
WHT	37	29		60	58		69				
FRL	34	33	32	50	52	36	38				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	28
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	195
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	13
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	46
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	29
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA overall grade level proficiency: 3rd-24.6%; 4th-36%; 5th-28.3% - overall proficiency for grades 3-5: 29.4%
ELA LG: 4th-20%; 5th-31.4%; overall ELA LG - 30%
Economically disadvantaged 27.4% prof.; 34.3% LG
ELL- 20% proficient; 38.5% LG
SWD- 10.5% proficient; 20% LG
African American- 22.5% proficient; 21.1% LG
Hispanic- 23.4% proficient; 33.3% LG

Math overall grade level proficiency: 3rd-17.5%; 4th-20%; 5th-23.9%-overall proficiency for grades 3-5: 20.3%
Math LG: 4th-60%; 5th-22.9% Overall Math LG - 27.5%
Economically disadvantaged proficiency- 20.3%; LG 28.6%
ELL- 22.2% prof.; 42.9% LG
SWD- 10.5% prof.; 30% LG
African American- 11.3% prof.; 11.1% LG
Hispanic- 21.3% prof.; 53.8% LG

Science proficiency: 19.6%

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need is to improve proficiency in Science, Math, and ELA.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors for needing this improvement are we had many students who were Remote Instruction

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math learning gains in 4th grade showed the most improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We partnered with SREB and the ECSD math department to focus on backward planning, data analysis, helping teachers build their conceptual understanding of math concepts, and used classroom walkthroughs with feedback.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In ELA, Math and Science we will be planning with district and school based support and have ongoing data monitoring to guide instruction. In ELA, our CC will push in and provide TIER 3 interventions, our reading teacher will provide intensive intervention to K-3 TIER II. We will continue our partnership with the district and meet bi-monthly and will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs which we will use to guide our decision making for professional learning opportunities. In Science, teachers will attend science PLC's through the district science department. We will use a variety of methods to keep students engaged using science writing, hands on learning, and integration of ELA and science standards by implementing the MyOn program. In Math, the CC will provide side-by-side coaching using classroom walkthrough data. Teachers will use hands on manipulatives to connect targeted standards and application.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

In Math, we will implement our PLC's and continue our partnership with SREB math support.
In ELA, we will implement our PLC's using the district support throughout the school year.
In Science, we will implement our PLC's using district support throughout the school year.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We will identify four metrics that will be monitored on a weekly basis by admin and teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Kindergarten ELA proficiency rate was 32.6% on the Spring 2021STAR Assessment. First grade ELA proficiency rate was 33.3% on the Spring 2021 STAR Assessment. Second grade ELA proficiency rate was 29.7% on the Spring 2021 STAR Assessment. Third grade ELA proficiency rate was 26% on the 2021 FSA. Fourth grade ELA proficiency rate was 32% on the 2021 FSA. Fifth grade ELA proficiency rate was 26% on the 2021 FSA. Achievement in ELA for grades 3rd - 5th has not reached 41% proficiency in all subgroups: Economically Disadvantaged (27.4%) ELL (20%) Students with Disabilities (10.5%) African American (22.5%) Hispanic (23.4%)
Measurable Outcome:	Kindergarten ELA proficiency will reach 42.6% proficiency on the Spring 2022 STAR Assessment First grade ELA will reach 43% proficiency on the Spring 2022 STAR Assessment. Second grade ELA will reach 39% proficiency on the Spring 2022 STAR Assessment. Third grade ELA will reach 36% proficiency on the 2022 FSA. Fourth grade ELA will reach 42% proficiency on the 2022 FSA. Fifth grade ELA will reach 36% proficiency on the 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	1. Data from STAR360 and core language arts instructional materials will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed and broken down by teacher and ESSA groups. 2. School administrators will conduct weekly walkthroughs and will review school wide data twice a month. They will monitor the progress of students receiving intervention and share findings with teachers so that data chats will occur in grades K-5. Administration will seek district coaching support to recommend adjustments to interventions and/or to provide professional development needs to help improve the effectiveness of intervention. 3. The RtI Coordinator and MTSS team will meet to analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for individual students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rhonda Shuford (rshuford@escambia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Teach students academic language skills, including the use of inferential and narrative language, and vocabulary knowledge (promising evidence) 2. Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words (strong evidence) Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension (moderate evidence) 3. Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies: question generation, visualization, text structure, self-monitoring, inference and retelling. (strong evidence) 4. This is defined as intentional mental actions during reading that improve reading comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Comprehension is hindered when a student lacks ability to apply decoding strategies, lacks vocabulary and background knowledge. As text complexity increases from grades K-3 to grades 4 and 5, students need explicit instruction in reading comprehension strategies such as visualization, questioning, making inferences, and retelling. Embedding instruction in how to use intentional mental actions to improve comprehension will help students navigate the more complicated texts they encounter in grades 4 and 5. The practices selected are based on the recommendations of The What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guides: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade, and Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade. Fourth and fifth grade students needing intervention in foundational skills and/or comprehension benefit from instruction aligned to the recommendations outlined in these What Works Clearinghouse practice guides for K-3. These strategies align to the Escambia County K-12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan.

Action Steps to Implement

Participate in the district High Quality Reading Project for K-2 teachers to increase teacher knowledge and provide evidence-based foundational skills instruction.

Person Responsible	Tracy Grepke (tgrepke@escambia.k12.fl.us)

The leadership team will review student performance in 2021 FSA data, 2021 progress monitoring data, and analysis of their STAR goals for the 2021-2022 school year after each assessment period.

Person Responsible	Rhonda Shuford (rshuford@escambia.k12.fl.us)

The leadership team will meet with teachers to review this data after each assessment period, identify the students in the focus ESSA subgroups, specifically relating to SWD, and develop goals for students.

Person Responsible	Rhonda Shuford (rshuford@escambia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will meet with students to develop goals based on student data.

Person Responsible	Megan Sims (msims1@ecsdfl.us)

The leadership team will provide professional development on the following areas: General Education and ESE teachers on use of the new ELA instructional materials; reading comprehension strategies; teaching students to decode multisyllabic words, and B.E.S.T. standards in grades K-2 to align to the High Quality Reading Project.

Person Responsible	Nicole Everette (neverette@ecsdfl.us)

District literacy coaches will provide weekly planning support with the new curriculum and LAFS in 3-5 and B.E.S.T. in K-2

Person Responsible	Nicole Everette (neverette@ecsdfl.us)

The interventions provided to ESSA subgroups, specifically related to SWD, will be matched to their need. Some of the interventions include usage of the Sonday System, differentiated instruction during Tier III intervention time, utilizing the co-teaching model to further support the interventions for SWD students.

Person Responsible	Rhonda Shuford (rshuford@escambia.k12.fl.us)

The leadership team and district curriculum specialist will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation of professional development, planning and support systems for ESSA subgroups. Feedback will be provided to teachers after each visit.

Person Responsible   Nicole Everette (neverette@ecsdfl.us)

Person Responsible   Nicole Everette (neverette@ecsdfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Achievement in Math has not reached 41% proficiency in all subgroups: Economically Disadvantaged (20.3%) ELL (22.2%) Students with Disabilities (10.5%) African American (11.3%) Hispanic (21.3%)
Measurable Outcome:	Math proficiency will go from 20.3% on the 2021 FSA to 25% or higher on the 2022 FSA school wide and/or Math Learning gains will go from 27.5% to 50%. Increase the Federal Index of our SWD from 34% on the 2019 FSA to 41% or higher on the 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	1. Data from STAR360 and core math instructional materials will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed and broken down by teacher and ESSA groups. 2. School administrators will conduct weekly walkthroughs and will review school wide data twice a month. They will monitor the progress of students receiving intervention and share findings with teachers. Administration will seek district coaching support to recommend adjustments to interventions and/or to provide professional development needs to help improve the effectiveness of intervention. 3. The RtI Coordinator and MTSS team will meet to analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for individual students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Representations - Set of concrete representations to support students' learning of mathematical concepts and procedures 2. Word Problems - Provide deliberate instruction on word problems to deepen students mathematical understanding and support their capacity to apply math ideas. Teach students to understand the concepts of Number Sense, Fluency, Math concepts, Hands on/Visual Representations, Problem Solving Strategies, Show and explain work in oral and written forms, technology when appropriate, differentiated instruction, precise math language, beliefs and attitudes about math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Mathematical understanding is hindered when a student lacks ability to understand the concrete to representational, to abstract though process. As math complexity increases from grades K-3 to grades 4 and 5, students need explicit instruction in concrete, semi-concrete, and abstract representation to make mathematics more visible and accessible for students. Creating visual models helps students think through and solve problems more successfully as they understand the logic behind the concepts and procedures. The practices selected are based on the recommendations of The What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guides: Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades. Additionally, the 10 Key Mathematics Practices for All Elementary Schools with strong evidence of effectiveness from high-quality research was used to determine the 10 key math practices.
Action Steps to Implement	

Participate in SREB for K-5 teachers to increase teacher knowledge and provide evidence-based foundational skills and hands on instructional strategies to include ongoing professional learning, planning sessions, and classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible   Rhonda Shuford (rshuford@escambia.k12.fl.us)

The interventions provided to ESSA subgroups, specifically related to SWD, will be matched to their need. Some of the interventions include usage of hands on manipulatives, differentiated instruction during Tier III intervention time, utilizing the co-teaching model to further support the interventions for SWD students.

Person Responsible   Rhonda Shuford (rshuford@escambia.k12.fl.us)

The leadership team and district curriculum specialist will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation of professional development, planning and support systems for ESSA subgroups. Feedback will be provided to teachers after each visit.

Person Responsible   Nicole Everette (neverette@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Behavior and discipline data will be monitored each nine weeks. Each classroom will establish a social contract and positive behavior supports to foster a classroom community. Students are empowered to work collaboratively and teachers are encouraged to understand their individual student behavioral and emotional needs.

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.

We will promote and encourage our families to attend Parent University to help empower them to learn strategies they can use at home with their child to support academics and social emotional well being. We will send home monthly packets to include real world informational text in the form of Scholastic NEWS and

Math strategies to help empower our families to work in the areas of both math and ELA to increase student interest and achievement in these subject areas. Ensley Elementary School's positive school culture and environment is reflective in our school community. All stakeholders are given the opportunity for input through various forms: meetings, surveys, and face to face opportunities. Our SAC (School Advisory Council) is comprised of parents, a teacher representative, ed support representative, and administrator. This group, along with our staff, work togehther to carry out the strategies set forth in the School Improvement Plan.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our administrative team promotes school-wide community culture by getting to know individual students, building relationships with families, and conducting daily walkthroughs for visibility.

Our guidance counselor will do Suite 360 social lessons and meet with class, small groups, and individuals for counseling sessions based on needs. She will also coordinate the weekend feeding program for our families in need.

Our school social worker/Navigator will work with translating and communicating with our ESOL families. She will assist with health immunizations and physicals, and assist families with making appointments and other needs. In addition, she will provide uniform clothing to students in need.

Teachers will greet their students every morning as they enter the class to set the tone for the day. Each classroom will create a social contract wherein students have a part in creating the classroom expectations. Teachers will work to build relationships with families through promotion of FOCUS parent portal and classroom Dojo to encourage families to be involved in academic and behavioral progress.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00