# Jim Allen Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Jim Allen Elementary School

## 1051 N HIGHWAY 95A, Cantonment, FL 32533

### www.escambiaschools.org

## Demographics

**Principal: Shannon Cross L**                    Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2007

| | |
|---|---|
| **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) | 98% |
| **2020-21 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: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (51%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | [Rachel Heide] |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **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.](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

# Jim Allen Elementary School

1051 N HIGHWAY 95A, Cantonment, FL 32533

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 | 97% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 30% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | | B | B | B |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

The mission of Jim Allen Elementary is to ensure that every student has self-confidence, desire, knowledge, and skills needed to lead a responsible, contributing, and satisfied life.

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

It is the goal of Jim Allen School to prepare each child who enters here to function effectively and responsibly in a challenging society by providing learning experiences appropriate to individual needs, interests, aspirations, abilities, and creative potential. We believe that to achieve, to succeed and to accomplish are important goals but not at the expense of the human values that make a community a place that sustains all its members. We therefore strive not only to maintain a positive and supportive atmosphere in which each child can develop into his/her highest potential but also to instill a sense of discipline and responsibility toward self, family, school, community and country.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| coleman, richard | Teacher, K-12 | |
| dorman, susan | Assistant Principal | |
| Helton, Michelle | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Massey, Cheryl | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Smith, Jessica | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Watts, Rachel | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Holley-Lewis, Mary | Teacher, Adult | |
| Sherbrook, Jennifer | Teacher, Adult | |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Sunday 7/1/2007, Shannon Cross L

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

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
49

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**
611

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**
0

**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 | 73 | 87 | 93 | 100 | 113 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 553 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 23 | 17 | 33 | 28 | 34 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 1 | 11 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |

**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 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

**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 | 69 | 93 | 101 | 108 | 75 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 527 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 18 | 22 | 190 | 100 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 355 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

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

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

**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 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 69 | 93 | 101 | 108 | 75 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 527 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 18 | 22 | 190 | 100 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 355 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |

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

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

**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 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 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 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 | | | | 58% | 53% | 57% | 57% | 49% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 58% | 55% | 58% | 43% | 46% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 50% | 52% | 53% | 26% | 40% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 60% | 57% | 63% | 62% | 55% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 64% | 60% | 62% | 67% | 57% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 39% | 52% | 51% | 58% | 48% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 57% | 54% | 53% | 64% | 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 | 59% | 56% | 3% | 58% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 52% | 2% | 58% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -59% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 51% | 8% | 56% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 55% | 0% | 62% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 58% | 0% | 64% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -55% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 67% | 55% | 12% | 60% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -58% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 55% | 4% | 53% | 6% |
| 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 | 38/44.2 | 49/53.8 | 54/58.7 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17/31.5 | 28/46.7 | 28/47.5 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5/27.8 | 10/52.6 | 9/47.4 |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0.0 | 1/100 | 0/0.0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 34/42.0 | 50/56.8 | 53/58.2 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17/34.0 | 26/44.1 | 26/44.1 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6/35.3 | 10/52.6 | 10/52.6 |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0.0 | 0/0.0 | 0/0.0 |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 43/45.3 | 52/54.2 | 59/60.8 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 23/40.4 | 28/48.3 | 32/54.2 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/23.5 | 2/11.8 | 4/23.5 |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0.0 | 0/0.0 | 0/0.0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 27/28.4 | 33/34.7 | 40/43.0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 14/24.6 | 16/28.1 | 19/34.5 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0.0 | 2/11.8 | 3/17.6 |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0.0 | 0/0.0 | 0/0.0 |
| Grade 3 | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 34/32.7 | 49/45.4 | 58/55.2 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17/25.0 | 24/38.1 | 24/39.3 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0.0 | 2/11.1 | 4/21.1 |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 33/31.1 | 46/43.4 | 47/44.8 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 14/20.9 | 23/36.5 | 22/35.5 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/14.3 | 4/22.2 | 3/15.8 |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| **English Language Arts** | All Students | 26/37.1 | 30/40.5 | 39/56.5 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 13/33.3 | 14/41.2 | 19/57.6 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1/7.1 | 1/7.1 | 2/13.3 |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| **Mathematics** | All Students | 23/32.9 | 31/41.9 | 37/55.2 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 10/25.6 | 12/35.3 | 18/56.3 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1/6.7 | 1/7.1 | 1/7.1 |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| **English Language Arts** | All Students | 26/32.1 | 29/38.2 | 28/37.3 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 11/26.2 | 11/29.7 | 11/29.7 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/11.1 | 1/7.1 | 0/0.0 |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| **Mathematics** | All Students | 20/26.0 | 29/38.2 | 34/45.9 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 10/25.6 | 14/37.8 | 12/33.3 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/22.2 | 3/21.4 | 2/13.3 |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| **Science** | All Students | 17/27.9 | 23/30.7 | 31/46.3 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 8/25.0 | 9/23.1 | 10/32.3 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/18.8 | 1/5.6 | 2/15.4 |
| | English Language Learners | NA | NA | NA |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWD | 20 | 31 | 50 | 29 | 75 | 70 | 27 | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 38 | | 36 | 77 | | 23 | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 45 | 55 | 58 | 69 | 70 | 61 | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | 45 | 40 | 46 | 67 | 64 | 40 | | | | |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWD | 19 | 47 | 52 | 20 | 44 | 40 | 13 | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 41 | 43 | 40 | 53 | 35 | 36 | | | | |
| MUL | 64 | 64 | | 71 | 64 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 62 | 55 | 64 | 67 | 43 | 61 | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 51 | 48 | 53 | 60 | 40 | 47 | | | | |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWD | 19 | 16 | 14 | 27 | 51 | 43 | 44 | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | 45 | 18 | 44 | 50 | | 67 | | | | |
| MUL | 73 | | | 82 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 41 | 30 | 66 | 69 | 64 | 61 | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 43 | 27 | 57 | 69 | 63 | 61 | | | | |

## 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 | 56 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 391 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 95% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 43 |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| 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 | 40 |
| 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 | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 59 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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?**

Most school grade components percentage is above the state and district average. MUL is the highest subgroup in both ELA and Math proficiency. SWD have the lowest percentage of proficiency in Math and ELA.

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

Math lowest 25% decreased by 19 points so this is our greatest need for improvement.

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

Our focus during 2019 was the lower quartile students in ELA. The shift in academic school-wide focus may have contributed to the decrease. When looking at the data our SWD subgroup is the lowest for math achievement. We are going to focus on mastery of math facts in 1st through 5th grades. We need to find a good balance between ELA and Math instruction and best practices so we can be successful in both areas.

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

ELA learning gains showed the most improvement. We had an increase of 15% resulting in the same average as the state and 3% above the district average. Our school-wide focus was the ELA lower quartile student group.

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

Our school-wide focus was the ELA lower quartile student group. We had a reading club and each student in the lower 30% received a faculty mentor. The mentor simply encouraged the student to read books and take AR tests.

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

The following strategies will be implemented to accelerate learning:
Small group instruction
TIER II and TIER III strategies implemented with fidelity.
New RtI coordinator
2 remedial resource teachers
Implementation of new reading series
Provide professional development in ELA, Math and Science
Continue the use of iReady and PD for iReady
After School Tutoring (ESSER funds)

**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.**

iReady PD Kindergarten through 5th
Stu Greenburg iReady PD 3rd-5th
Data meetings and PD Kindergarten through 5th
Science PD with district Science personnel 3rd-5th
ELA PD-New Reading Series Kindergarten through 5th
BEST standards PD Kindergarten through 5th
Reflex Math PD 2nd through 5th
School net PD 3rd, 4th and 5th

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

Continue after school tutoring with ESSER funds and/or Title I funds
Continue data meetings
Continue iReady PD
Continue using Title I and SAI funds to purchase remedial/resource teachers
Utilize volunteers and mentors

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

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

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Students in the lower quartile and students with disabilities decreased in math learning gains on the 2018-19 FSA. <br> 2021 FSA-392 points; 56%; School Grade B <br> 3rd grade 58% proficient ELA; 47% proficient math <br> 4th grade 54% proficient ELA; 50% proficient math <br> 5th grade 41% proficient ELA; 64 % proficient math <br> 2021 Spring STAR Score <br> 3rd Grade-All Students- 55.2%; Econ Dis- 39.3%; SWD- 21.1% <br> 4th Grade- All Students- 56.5%, Econ Dis- 57.6%; SWD- 13.3% <br> 5th Grade- All Students- 37.3%, Econ Dis- 29.7%; SWD- 0% |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Jim Allen Elementary School will increase the percentage of students in the lower quartile making learning gains in the component of Math by 10% on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment. |
| **Monitoring:** | STAR data <br> iReady Data <br> School Net Data <br> Multiplication Mastery |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Rachel Watts (rwatts@ecsdfl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | The evidence based-strategy we will implement is from the Math for Elementary 2017 The University of Austin/The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk. We will focus on differentiated instruction at the TIER II and TIER III level during small groups. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Remedial teacher provides differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students. Remedial teacher uses explicit instruction when introducing new math content. Some strategies include modeling, foundational skills practice, guided practice, questioning, corrective feedback and frequent student response. |

| **Action Steps to Implement** |
|---|

Teachers and administration will review student performance data including FSA, STAR and iReady.
iReady individual lessons will be adjusted to meet the needs of students' progress.
iReady professional development will be conducted by Stu Greenberg and the iReady representative.
The Literacy Leadership team will develop a school wide independent reading plan to ensure students read connected text daily.
The RtI Coordinator, administration and MTSS team will identify students needs and match them to interventions based on the intervention decision trees.
Administration:Classroom walkthroughs will include specific look fors including small group instruction and student engagement.

| **Person Responsible** | Rachel Watts (rwatts@ecsdfl.us) |
|---|---|

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Kindergarten ELA Proficiency Spring STAR 65%<br>1st Grade ELA Proficiency Spring STAR 54%<br>2nd Grade ELA Proficiency Spring STAR 62%<br>3rd Grade ELA Proficiency Spring FSA 58%<br>5th Grade ELA Proficiency Spring FSA 54%<br>4th Grade ELA Proficiency Spring FSA 41%** |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Kindergarten through 2nd grade ELA proficiency will be 55% or higher on the Spring 2022 STAR Assessment.<br>3rd through 5th grade ELA proficiency will be 55% or higher on the Spring 2022 FSA Assessment. |
| **Monitoring:** | Data meetings after each assessment period. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Rachel Watts (rwatts@ecsdfl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | The evidence based-strategy we will implement is from the Math for Elementary 2017 The University of Austin/The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk. We will focus on differentiated instruction at the TIER II and TIER III level during small groups. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | SONDAY System, iReady program, Ready workbooks, after school tutoring, small group instruction |

| Action Steps to Implement | |
|---|---|
| Study and discuss data after each testing period. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Rachel Watts (rwatts@ecsdfl.us) |

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](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.

**Jim Allen Elementary School reported 0.2 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools statewide, our school falls into the very low category. We will continue our school wide use of 7 habits of leadership. We will continue encouraging and rewarding good behavior.**

## 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.

The mission of Jim Allen Elementary is to ensure every student has self-confidence, desire, knowledge, and skills needed to lead a responsible, contributing, and satisfied life. Our school vision also states, "We therefore strive not only to maintain a positive and supportive atmosphere in which each child can develop into his/her highest potential but also to instill a sense of discipline and responsibility toward self, family school, community and country." In order to fulfill our mission and vision for our students we involve all stakeholders. Stakeholders include SAC, PTA, Leadership Team, Business Partners, Volunteers, Mentors, Teachers, Staff and Families. We strive to work together to have a positive, encouraging, safe and secure environment for our students. Our stakeholders provide feedback on our school policies and procedures. We rely on the input of others to make changes and additions to our program for the success of all of our students. Volunteers and mentors spend countless hours working with our students both academically and emotionally. Our staff utilizes researched-based educational practices to teach our students of greatest need. Our partners provide supplies, food for the weekend backpack program and funds to purchase education items that promote academic achievement in English Language Arts, Science, and Mathematics. Together, we all make a difference in the lives of all of our students.

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

See part A. for the role of our stakeholders in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

## 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: ELA | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |