

Escambia County School District

# Ferry Pass Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Ferry Pass Elementary School

8310 N DAVIS HWY, Pensacola, FL 32514

www.escambiaschools.org

## Demographics

Principal: Catrena Fieg H

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (51%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

## Ferry Pass Elementary School

8310 N DAVIS HWY, 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 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	67%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Ferry Pass Elementary School is to develop self-confident, lifelong learners. We recognize that to guarantee students success, partnerships among schools and parents are critical. It is our goal to create a climate of mutual trust and respect that support substantial parent involvement.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to create an environment of collaboration for both students and teachers to increase achievement that promotes student development in all areas.

### 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
Fieg, Catrena	Principal	
Bryan, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Freeman, Jacob	Instructional Coach	
Walker, Debbie	School Counselor	
Frasseti, Sara	Teacher, K-12	
Golden, Sara	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Burt, Gethia	Teacher, K-12	
Case, Mary Alice	Teacher, K-12	
Rockwell, Patricia	Teacher, ESE	
Horn, Heather	Instructional Media	
Price, Bonnie	Teacher, K-12	
Bradley, Jina	Teacher, K-12	
Bridges, Diondria	Teacher, K-12	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 7/26/2021, Catrena Fieg H

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

2

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

6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

29

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

528

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

8

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

8

### 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	97	96	82	106	74	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	530
Attendance below 90 percent	14	35	26	37	26	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	2	8	16	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	14	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	21	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	19	37	31	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

**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	3	3	13	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

**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	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 8/16/2021

## 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	42	93	110	87	84	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	516
Attendance below 90 percent	4	22	17	15	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	2	4	11	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

**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	2	5	2	4	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	10	10	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

## 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	42	93	110	87	84	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	516
Attendance below 90 percent	4	22	17	15	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	2	4	11	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

#### 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	2	5	2	4	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	10	10	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

## 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				52%	53%	57%	49%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	55%	58%	51%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	52%	53%	41%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	57%	63%	49%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	60%	62%	57%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	52%	51%	44%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				54%	54%	53%	65%	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	58%	56%	2%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	52%	1%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	51%	-3%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	54%	55%	-1%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	58%	-5%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	55%	-10%	60%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	51%	55%	-4%	53%	-2%
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				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	86/32.6	89/48.3	90/40.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	56/26.8	59/40.7	59/33.9
	Students With Disabilities	16/25.0	17/47.1	18/27.8
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	86/45.3	88/52.3	90/51.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	56/39.3	58/44.8	59/45.8
	Students With Disabilities	16/37.5	16/50	18/55.6
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	100/29.0	104/33.7	101/37.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	76/30.3	79/31.6	75/34.7
	Students With Disabilities	11/18.2	12/8.3	12/16.7
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	100/21.0	103/30.1	105/32.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	77/22.1	79/27.8	79/27.8
	Students With Disabilities	11/18.2	12/8.3	12/8.3
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	72/31.9	77/31.2	72/40.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	42/31.0	43/25.6	38/39.5
	Students With Disabilities	16/25.0	15/20.0	15/20.0
	English Language Learners	2/0.0	2/0.0	2/0.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71/28.2	77/39.0	72/36.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	42/28.6	42/31.0	38/28.9
	Students With Disabilities	16/12.5	16/18.8	15/13.3
	English Language Learners	2/0.0	2/50.0	2/0.0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	68/30.9	78/33.3	71/42.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	52/21.2	57/26.3	50/36.0
	Students With Disabilities	13/7.7	16/12.5	16/12.5
	English Language Learners	1/0.0	1/100.0	1/100.0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	68/25.0	77/39.0	69/40.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	52/17.3	56/35.7	49/32.7
	Students With Disabilities	13/0.0	15/13.3	16/6.3
	English Language Learners	1/0.0	1/100.0	1/100.0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	93/30.1	93/30.1	87/42.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	56/32.1	50/32.0	48/45.8
	Students With Disabilities	12/0.0	12/0.0	12/8.3
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	92/21.7	97/29.9	87/39.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	55/21.8	54/27.8	48/43.8
	Students With Disabilities	12/0.0	14/0.0	12/8.3
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79/41.8	85/43.5	76/57.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	45/37.8	49/42.9	41/53.7
	Students With Disabilities	7/14.3	9/33.3	11/9.1
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

## 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	20	65	77	16	59	77	18				
BLK	35	49	46	30	44	67	33				
HSP	62	54		45	43		71				
MUL	40	42		50	45		45				
WHT	51	58		45	41		61				
FRL	42	51	58	38	49	77	52				
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	39	31	23	62	64	36				
BLK	39	46	33	36	61	60	39				
HSP	81	47		88	71		73				
MUL	51	50		74	76						

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
WHT	57	55	50	55	47	40	57				
FRL	46	50	43	48	59	57	46				
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	26	45	47	31	55	53	24				
BLK	38	47	46	39	53	46	47				
HSP	68	63		47	38						
MUL	42	38		48	56		67				
WHT	57	52	40	58	62	42	76				
FRL	44	45	36	42	52	45	56				

### 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	51
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	354
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

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	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	44
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	51
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Multi-racial and Black/African American subgroups both saw a drop to below the Federal Index to a 38%. SWD also dropped to a 31%. Science scores held with 51% of students showing proficiency. Math scores for the student body dropped across the board by an average of 10 percentage points and ELA scores dropped by an average of 8 percentage points with 3rd and 4th grade seeing the largest drops.

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

The area for greatest improvement lies with our SWD subgroup. Their math gains went from a 62% to a 24% last year.

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

We were highly focused last year on addressing learning gains in ELA for our SWD. In this area, we saw a dramatic improvement. However, we saw a decrease in math with those students. Last year also saw many students suffer from loss of instruction due to quarantining, illness, remote learning, and the like. This year we have made one of our school improvement goals to increase our SWD math learning gains by 17% to 41%. We are planning to use proven math strategies from What Works Clearinghouse.

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

Reading gains for our SWD went up by 20 percentage points. Our 5th grade ELA scores were even with the district with 46% of students showing proficiency. We also saw ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% of our economically disadvantaged students jump from 43% to 82%.

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

A contributing factor to our reading gains for SWD lies in the fact that it was a targeted improvement goal in our School Improvement Plan. We provided PD for instructional practices after each STAR 360 reading assessment and met with grade levels to disaggregate data from Schoolnet, iReady, and STAR 360 reading assessments.

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

We are using What Works Clearinghouse to identify high impact strategies to use in our Tier 1 instruction. We also have additional staff to assist with interventions and the RTI process to get students what they need to be successful. Staff will also be provided professional development sessions throughout the year and have been placed into professional learning community groups.

#### 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.

We have recently gotten two ESE teachers trained on the Sonday Reading System to help our most struggling readers. There is also a training being planned on Universal Design for Learning led by two instructional staff members along with a session on engagement strategies to help make our Tier 1 instruction more robust. Renaissance Place and iReady PD Teams will provide trainings for our staff throughout the year. We also have book studies planned along with district led professional development with instructional personnel from the Science Department, ELA Department, and Math Department.

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

WIN time (what I need) has been added into our daily schedule. This is a time where all additional staff push into classrooms to help with small groups and anything else a teacher or students may need. ROAR (reach out and read) has been implemented into our daily morning routine where all students and staff stop and read for 15 minutes. The school has also received additional staff in reading intervention and a RTI Coordinator.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Math learning gains for SWD dropped from 62% in 2019 to 24% in 2021. Gains were below the district average of 48% and state average of 52%.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Our math learning gains for SWD will increase 17% from 24% in 2021 to 41% in 2022.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Schoolnet test data and quarterly STAR 360 Math data will be utilized to monitor student progress.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdfi.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Representations: Use a well-chosen set of concrete and semi-concrete representations to support students' learning of mathematical concepts and procedures.</p> <p>Number Lines: Use the number line to facilitate the learning of mathematical concepts and procedures, build understanding of grade-level material, and prepare students for advanced mathematics.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	In analyzing the 2019 FSA data and the current 2021 FSA data, we noticed SWD math gains had decreased significantly. According to "Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades" Practice Guide found on What Works Clearinghouse, providing concrete mathematical representations and using number lines to facilitate the learning of mathematical concepts and procedures has a strong positive effect on SWD performance.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Provide PD for instructional practices after each STAR 360 reading assessment.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Strategies will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs conducted by school leadership and district specialists.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Leadership team will meet with grade levels to disaggregate data from Schoolnet, iReady, and STAR 360 math assessments.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Plan instruction and remediate based on data.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Math proficiency decreased from 53% in 2019 to 39% in 2021, a loss of 14%. Proficiency continues to be below the district average of 48% and state average of 52%.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Our math proficiency will increase by 6% from 39% in 2021 to 45% on the 2022 FSA Math test school wide.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Schoolnet test data and quarterly STAR 360 Math data will be utilized to monitor student progress.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdf.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Mathematical Language: Teach clear and concise mathematical language and support students' use of the language to help students effectively communicate their understanding of mathematical concepts.</p> <p>Word Problems: Provide deliberate instruction on word problems to deepen students' mathematical understanding and support their capacity to apply mathematical ideas.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	In analyzing the 2019 FSA data and the current 2021 FSA data, we noticed school wide math proficiency had decreased significantly. According to "Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades" Practice Guide found on What Works Clearinghouse, teaching clear and concise mathematical language and providing deliberate instruction on word problems to deepen students' mathematical understanding has a strong positive effect on elementary student performance.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Provide PD for instructional practices after each STAR 360 math assessment.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Strategies will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs conducted by school leadership and district specialists.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Leadership team will meet with grade levels to disaggregate data from Schoolnet, iReady, and STAR 360 math assessments.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Plan instruction and remediate based on data.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	K-2 ELA proficiency for Spring AP 3 STAR was 38% in 2021. 3-5 ELA proficiency dropped from 52% in 2019 to 42% in 2021, a drop of 10 points. Proficiency was 6% lower than the district ELA proficiency average of 48% and 11% lower than the state ELA proficiency average of 53%.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Our K-2 ELA proficiency will increase 12% from 38% in 2021 to 50% or higher on the 2022 STAR AP 3. Our 3-5 ELA proficiency will increase 8% from 42% in 2021 to 50% or higher on the 2022 FSA ELA test school wide.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Schoolnet test data and quarterly STAR 360 ELA data will be utilized to monitor student progress for all students in K-5.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdfl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Provide intensive, systematic instruction on up to three foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the benchmark score on universal screening.  Teach students to become fluent with handwriting, spelling, sentence construction, typing, and word processing.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	In analyzing the 2019 FSA data and the current 2021 FSA data, we noticed school wide ELA proficiency had decreased noticeably. According to "Teaching Elementary Students to Be Effective Writers" Practice Guide and "Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades" Practice Guide found on What Works Clearinghouse, providing intensive, systematic instruction on foundational reading skills in small groups and teaching students to become fluent with writing conventions and methods have a strong positive effect on elementary student performance.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Provide PD for instructional practices after each STAR 360 reading assessment.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Strategies will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs conducted by school leadership and district specialists.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Leadership team will meet with grade levels to disaggregate data from Schoolnet, iReady, and STAR 360 reading assessments.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Plan instruction and remediate based on data.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

**In the 2019-2020 school year our school had 0.8 incidents per 100 students, which is below the state average of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. Our primary area of concern is "violent incidents", which was rated "moderate" with an incident rating of 0.5 incidents per 100 students. We will monitor this behavior through regular reports in Focus on both major and minor incidents and referrals.**

**Students with minor referrals are assigned lessons in Suite 360 as needed and classroom teachers hold whole group weekly lessons in the platform.**

#### **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.**

Ferry Pass Elementary sends home a parent/student handbook at the beginning of each school year, which outlines our school's mission and vision statement. Parent Nights and events are also a huge part of the Ferry Pass Elementary culture. Leadership is planning on nights themed around math, science, and reading. Our full-time music instructor has performances planned for each grade level scheduled throughout the year. We are in our second year of implementing the Social Emotion Learning program "Miss Kendra." We share a dedicated staff member with one other school for the program and all teachers and staff are trained on how to implement the lessons and activities with the students they interact with. We are also a PBIS (Positive Behavioral Intervention & Supports) school. Students can earn Leopard Loot and spend it in our school store twice a month. Classes also work on earning "spots" for their class leopard during special areas. When their leopard is full they earn a class party.

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

Staff are trained to implement programs such as Miss Kendra and PBIS. Leadership has daily morning news check ins that the entire school watches at the start of their day. Community Partners in Education provide us with school supplies, mentors and volunteers, and other resources that improve our culture and environment here at the school for students and staff. Students have a community garden located on school property run by the Garden Committee. We spend time involving students in the PBIS program.

Our PTA creates a yearbook for students. Parents are encouraged to volunteer at school and partner with their student's teachers via communication folders sent home daily with students.

## Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00