

Escambia County School District

# Pleasant Grove 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>23</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Pleasant Grove Elementary School

10789 SORRENTO RD, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

## Demographics

Principal: Nicole Owens Braggs

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2021

<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: B (60%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (44%)
<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>

## Pleasant Grove Elementary School

10789 SORRENTO RD, Pensacola, FL 32507

[www.escambiaschools.org](http://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	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

### School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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 at Pleasant Grove Elementary is to encourage learning and creativity that will prepare students for success and lifelong learning.

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

The vision at Pleasant Grove is to promote the recognition of positive behaviors and academic success that aligns with the school-wide expectation to create a positive learning environment encouraging students, teachers, staff, and parents to exhibit school and community pride.

### 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
Owens-Braggs, Nicole	Principal	Monitor, reflect, and act on the SIP plan.
Tindell, Sunday	Assistant Principal	
Paul, Deanna	Teacher, K-12	
Lee, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	
Lee, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	
Rabin, Jackie	Teacher, K-12	
Blackburn, Matthew	Teacher, K-12	
Larsen, Carol	Teacher, K-12	
Cheney, Elizabeth	Teacher, ESE	
Downs, Alice	Teacher, K-12	
Kashur, Lafawn	School Counselor	
Foote, Aaron	Other	Monitoring Positive Culture and Environment related to student and family climate

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 7/11/2021, Nicole Owens Braggs

**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.*

8

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

35

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

464

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

**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	58	80	75	68	91	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454
Attendance below 90 percent	5	19	23	16	27	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	7	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	7	13	10	12	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

**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	2	5	0	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	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

Monday 8/2/2021

## 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	74	71	91	82	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	464
Attendance below 90 percent	4	10	10	14	6	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	2	6	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

**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	2	1	1	0	7	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	7	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

## 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	74	71	91	82	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	464
Attendance below 90 percent	4	10	10	14	6	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	2	6	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

#### 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	2	1	1	0	7	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	7	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

## 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				56%	53%	57%	52%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	55%	58%	44%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	52%	53%	29%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				56%	57%	63%	56%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	60%	62%	54%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	52%	51%	44%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				69%	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	58%	56%	2%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	51%	4%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	52%	55%	-3%	62%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	58%	5%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	55%	-2%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	65%	55%	10%	53%	12%
Cohort Comparison						

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Kindergarten-Fifth Grade used STAR360 to monitor proficiency. Fifth grade used the district's science assessment to monitor proficiency in science.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66/39.4%	69/65.2%	73/56.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44/38.6%	44/63.6%	47/46.8%
	Students With Disabilities	9/44.4%	9/55.6%	10/30%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	68/47.1%	69/55.1%	73/63
	Economically Disadvantaged	45/53.3%	44/54.5%	47/61.7%
	Students With Disabilities	10/40%	9/44.4%	10/60%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	59/27.1%	63/41.3%	67/52.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35/17.1%	39/30.8%	39/38.5%
	Students With Disabilities	4/0%	6/0%	6/0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	61/23%	61/42.6%	67/55.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/18.9%	37/35.1%	39/43.6%
	Students With Disabilities	4/0%	6/16.7%	6/16.7%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	85/40%	86/47.7%	81/66.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45/31.1%	40/42.5%	40/62.5%
	Students With Disabilities	11/9.1%	9/22.2%	8/50%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	85/41.2%	86/53.5%	82/70.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45/40%	40/45%	40/62.5%
	Students With Disabilities	11/18.2%	9/33.3%	9/44.4%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76/35.5%	79/38%	75/54.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42/21.4%	43/25.6%	40/40%
	Students With Disabilities	16/12.5%	12/0%	12/33.3%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75/33.3%	78/39.7%	73/58.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/22%	41/29.3%	38/47.4%
	Students With Disabilities	12/16.7%	12/16.7%	11/18.2%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	86/23.3%	94/25.5%	84/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56/14.3%	60/13.3%	51/19.6%
	Students With Disabilities	19/0%	18/0%	17/11.8%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/0%	1/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	86/23.3%	95/26.3%	84/28.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56/17.9%	60/20%	51/21.6%
	Students With Disabilities	19/0%	18/5.6%	17/5.9%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/0%	2/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	82/39%	81/42%	82/47.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	55/30.9%	57/31.6%	52/42.3%
	Students With Disabilities	16/12.5%	16/12.5%	17/23.5%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/0%	2/0%

## 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	32	45	50	23	36	31	22				
BLK	40	42		47	50		41				
HSP	58			58			70				
MUL	66			76							
WHT	56	38		62	54		46				
FRL	46	39	31	52	52	44	42				
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	29	53	53	24	64	55	25				
ASN	64			64	80						
BLK	40	56	36	33	52	63	46				
HSP	71	67		57	67		58				

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	59	43		63	59		83				
WHT	60	62	71	66	67	67	81				
FRL	50	55	55	52	61	55	65				
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	29	29	13	30	38	24					
ASN	55			58							
BLK	34	40	30	31	45	41	50				
HSP	50	47		67	60						
MUL	71	58		77	63						
WHT	58	46	19	64	57	50	74				
FRL	46	42	32	53	52	41	64				

### 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	48
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	337
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	
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	44
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	62
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	71
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	44
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?**

The lowest quartile in ELA and math fluctuated in the past three years. We showed strong growth in all areas in 19/20. We went down in all areas 20/21.

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

Students with disabilities in ELA and math proficiency, and African American students in ELA gains.

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

Closure due to Covid contributed to the decline in growth once experienced during the '18-'19 school year. Awareness of the subgroups we serve is the first step to address the areas in need. Also, data meetings in which data is broken down by each sub-group is needed to understand how instruction and interventions are helping to grow in the areas indicated above.

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

African American students grew considerably in math proficiency. Math proficiency over all has held steady despite the closures and unforeseen hybrid teaching during the 2020-2021 school year.

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

Daily walkthroughs were conducted.

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

Daily walkthroughs will continue. We will now include leaving actionable feedback based on students' learning, teachers' instruction, and progress monitoring data. Students will become aware of their individual goals through one on one data meetings with administration and data conversations with teachers as they work towards their unit and module goals, progress monitoring goals, and end of the year summative goals.

#### **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.**

Professional development on research related reading components which supports students growth and working with students with disabilities

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

Monthly data meetings to monitor progress data and grade level planning sessions

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

**Description and Rationale:** Students with disabilities continue to perform below other subgroups.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Math learning gains will increase 3 percentage points, from 38% on the 2021 FSA to 41% or higher, on the 2022 FSA school wide within the subgroup of SWD.

**Monitoring:**

1. Classroom and SWD subgroup STAR 360 data will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed by classroom teachers and admin during quarterly data meetings. Team will use the 5 step problem solving process to develop action plan.
2. School administrators will conduct weekly walkthroughs with specific "Look Fors" and provide feedback to teachers.
3. School administrators will review school wide unit assessment data, monthly. They will meet with grade levels monthly to monitor the progress of SWD and follow the 5 step problem solving process to develop action plan.
3. The RTI Coordinator and MTSS team will meet to analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for SWD.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sunday Tindell (stindell@ecsdfl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

CRA is a sequential three level strategy promoting overall conceptual understanding, procedural accuracy and fluency by employing multi-sensory instructional techniques when introducing the new concepts. Each level builds on the concepts previously taught. It consists of three phases: Concrete. Representational. Abstract.

When students are allowed to first develop a concrete understanding of the math concept/skill, then they are better prepared to perform that math skill, further connect at the representational stage, and truly understand math concepts at the abstract level.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

CRA employs multi-sensory instructional techniques through manipulatives. Manipulatives allow students to experience contextual situations prior to transitioning knowledge to representational and abstract stages.

Strategy 1: CRA - Concrete, Representational, abstract representations will be utilized with SWD.

Strategy 2: Math Fluency will be an area of focus which students should interact with on a daily basis. (Reflex and Frac)

Strategy 3: Teach students academic Math vocabulary by reviewing them daily. Individual anchor charts/individual visual supports will be provided for SWD.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will receive training on the CRA model first semester. Teachers will use CRA model of instruction for math. Admin will conduct walkthroughs to monitor implementation and provide feedback. August:

\*Leadership team will review student 2021 FSA performance data, 2021 progress monitoring data, and analysis of their STAR goals for the 2021-2022 school year.

\*Leadership team will meet with teachers to review SWD subgroup data and develop goals for students.

\*Teachers will meet with students to set goals based on student data and input.

\*The RTI/MTSS team will meet to identify student needs and match them to interventions based on the intervention decision tree.

\*Walkthroughs will begin with specific look-fors.

October:

\*Teachers will receive CRA training

August- April: Monthly grade level data meetings to analyze unit assessment/module data and develop action plans.

October, December, February- Quarterly data meetings to analyze STAR benchmark data and develop action plan.

**Person  
Responsible** Sunday Tindell (stindell@ecsdfi.us)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American****Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** ELA proficiency is at 37% which is below the federal index benchmark of 41%.

ELA proficiency will increase from 38% to 41% or higher on the 2022 FSA for Black/African American students.

Students in grades K - 5th have a proficiency goal of:

**Measurable Outcome:**

K-60%  
1st- 60%  
2nd - 60%  
3rd - 59%  
4th- 79%  
5th - 59%

**Monitoring:**

Data from STAR 360 will be collected, analyzed, reviewed and broken down by teacher and ESSA groups.

The RTI Coordinator/MTSS team will meet to analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions for individual students.

We will hold monthly data meetings and analyze unit assessments by overall achievement and by subgroups.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Nicole Owens-Braggs (nowens-braggs@ecsdfi.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Using the multi-tiered system to give students grade level learning opportunities, remediate based on not meeting grade level expectations, and filling in gaps for students who continue to struggle to be successful at grade level.
2. Teach students academic language skills by having discussions and writing opportunities using academic vocabulary.
3. Teach students to summarize their learning using Thinking Maps.
4. Model fluency and give students opportunities for practicing fluency.
5. Teach students to decode and encode words, analyze word parts and recognize word meaning using morphemes.
6. Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.
7. Incorporate metacognition as a comprehension strategy throughout content areas.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. RTI is a proven strategy where students receive evidence-based instruction in an accumulative progression based on the needs of students.
2. Teach students academic language skills. Vocabulary is a key component to reading comprehension.
3. Teach students to summarize their learning using Thinking Maps. Summarization allows for students to integrate meaning within their thinking and thus are able to use basic knowledge to make inferences about what a text is saying.
4. Model fluency and give students opportunities for practicing fluency. When students are able to read with fluency they are able to free up cognitive demand and focus more on comprehension.
5. Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts and recognize words. Language is essential to students understanding and comprehending written text.
6. Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading

accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. Students who are not stretched to apply skills to grade level text do not grow beyond their current abilities.

7. When students are aware of learning goals, they monitor their achievement towards the goal and initiate strategies to support their learning objectives.

### Action Steps to Implement

August

Identify students in sub-groups.

Create proficiency goals for classrooms. Identify school's proficiency goals. Identify tier three students.

Gather baseline data on students by assessing present needs. Provide interventions.

September

Implement Interventions

Within six weeks, meet with team to discuss students' progress and modify plan if needed

October-January

Professional development on evidence based strategies listed in the SIP

Monthly, continue to use a problem solving process to determine next steps for students not moving towards goals and for teachers who need more support to meet class goals.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Nicole Owens-Braggs (nowens-braggs@ecsdfi.us)

### 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.

**Based on the 2019-2020 data on the SSFA website, our school had a very high incident of violent crimes of 1.52 per 100 students. Our state wide is #1165 out of #1395.**

**Our suspension rates during the 2019-2020 school year data on the SSFA website stated that we had a 12.1% suspension rate compared to the statewide 3.9%.**

**We will work on a school-wide progression of how discipline concerns are handled by the behavior team. When suspension is considered, a committee will meet to decide if other interventions or consequences can be implemented instead.**

## 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 school will implement the program Capturing Kids Hearts to build a positive and inclusive school culture and environment. The faculty, staff, volunteers, and students will invest in each other by creating positive relationships that will show that everyone is valued and respected through Capturing Kids Hearts. This program will promote success in the way teachers and students relationships are developed in the school culture and environment. Through the program students and teachers learn how to interact with others during normal and challenging situations by following the developed social contract and using the hand signals.

Monthly meetings will occur where the major purpose of the meetings will be to celebrate staff achievements throughout the previous month and to recharge and realign our school-wide purpose and mission for the upcoming month.

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

The school will also host family engagement activities to support families in supporting their students to reach behavioral and academic goals.

The PTA will be active and inclusive in supporting a team relationship between families, the community and the school.

Stakeholders are parents, community members, and business owners that are located near or within the community of the school. The stakeholders can also engage in the positive environment by becoming engaged in creating a positive environment in the community and within the school. This could involve taking part in developing and agreeing to follow school and classroom social contracts developed through the Capturing Kids Hearts program.

## 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: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00

	<b>Total:</b> <b>\$0.00</b>
--	-----------------------------