

Escambia County School District

R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School

10200 ASHTON BROSNAHAM RD, Pensacola, FL 32534

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Kristen Danley H

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (64%)
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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School

10200 ASHTON BROSNAHAM RD, Pensacola, FL 32534

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	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	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 R.C. Lipscomb Elementary is to encourage students to make the most of their potential; to become independent thinkers and lifelong learners; and to produce self-reliant, productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We envision a school where children are placed first. Our school has a nurturing environment that emphasizes student performance and core values. R.C. Lipscomb Elementary is a place where parents, grandparents, and volunteers from all aspects of the community work toward one common goal of helping children achieve and bring out the best in each child. Learning is fostered through innovative, engaging techniques and ideas. It is a place where we value cross-curricular and technological integration, as well as developmentally appropriate activities. Collaboration with administrators, teachers, and parents help students strive to lead the way in every aspect of the educational program.

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
Sanders, Susan	Principal	Conduct weekly walk throughs. Review school-wide data monthly. Monitor progress of students who are below level. Schedule needs based PD opportunities with district subject area specialists. Schedule teacher-led PD opportunities. Attend monthly grade level meetings. Data talks with RtI Coordinator.
Person, Shona	Assistant Principal	Conduct weekly walk throughs. Review school-wide data monthly. Monitor progress of students who are below level. Schedule needs based PD opportunities with district subject area specialists. Schedule teacher-led PD opportunities. Attend monthly grade level meetings. Data talks with RtI Coordinator.
Feliciano, Katie	Instructional Coach	Meet to analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier II and Tier III interventions derived from the district created decision tree. Meet with teachers every 6 or 9 weeks to review student progress. Provide school-wide professional development regarding the MTSS process and appropriate interventions for each tier. Modeling research-based interventions in a small group setting within the classrooms and a professional development setting.
Terbecki, Alicia	School Counselor	Collaborate quarterly with the RTI coordinator to develop and monitor individualized intervention plans for students below the 10th percentile.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, Kristen Danley 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.*

4

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

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

764

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

12

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

10

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	107	138	117	128	125	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	757
Attendance below 90 percent	7	38	31	31	22	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	3	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	5	19	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	1	11	5	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	21	12	22	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	7	9	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	7	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/2/2021

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	106	128	124	129	143	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	768
Attendance below 90 percent	14	31	21	20	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	2	3	5	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	7	5	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	7	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	2	4	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	16	14	2	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
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	106	128	124	129	143	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	768
Attendance below 90 percent	14	31	21	20	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	2	3	5	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	7	5	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	7	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	2	4	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	16	14	2	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
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				71%	53%	57%	68%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	55%	58%	56%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	52%	53%	38%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				71%	57%	63%	74%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				64%	60%	62%	64%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	52%	51%	55%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				73%	54%	53%	68%	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	77%	56%	21%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	52%	16%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	51%	13%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	71%	55%	16%	62%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	58%	13%	64%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	55%	10%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	71%	55%	16%	53%	18%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

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

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49/43.8	78/66.7	73/60.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/38.2	45/62.5	42/55.3
	Students With Disabilities	6/31.6	10/52.6	9/47.4
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	55/47.8	79/68.1	79/65.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/45.1	46/62.2	43/57.3
	Students With Disabilities	7/36.8	12/63.2	12/63.2
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48/43.6	69/61.6	70/59.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/46	31/59.6	29/53.7
	Students With Disabilities	1/7.1	4/28.6	3/20
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	45/40.5	55/49.1	64/55.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/31.4	21/39.6	23/42.6
	Students With Disabilities	2/15.4	4/28.6	3/21.4
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	57/46.7	78/65	85/72.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/32.1	26/49.1	31/60.8
	Students With Disabilities	3/15.8	10/50	8/40
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/100	1/50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51/41.8	83/69.7	79/69.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/30.4	30/56.6	27/54
	Students With Disabilities	5/26.3	9/45	10/55.6
	English Language Learners	2/100	2/100	2/100

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67/48.2	87/61.7	95/69.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/43.6	28/52.8	30/58.8
	Students With Disabilities	8/38.1	5/25	7/36.8
	English Language Learners	1/100	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	62/45.6	90/63.8	92/67.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/30.9	30/56.6	27/52.9
	Students With Disabilities	8/36.4	9/45	7/36.8
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/100	0/0
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	59/44	63/49.2	62/47.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/33.9	15/30.6	19/37.3
	Students With Disabilities	7/24.1	7/28	6/22.2
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36/26.9	54/42.2	58/45
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/14.5	15/30.6	16/32
	Students With Disabilities	4/13.3	3/12	5/18.5
	English Language Learners	1/25	1/50	1/50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	32/28.8	51/44	64/51.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/22	19/38.8	21/42.9
	Students With Disabilities	2/9.5	2/8	6/22.2
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

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	41	30	25	44	37	43	29				
ASN	50			70							
BLK	44	29	20	54	35		11				
HSP	79			89							
MUL	59	40		59	40		40				
WHT	69	48	27	70	55	53	63				
FRL	55	46	39	56	43	50	43				
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	43	56	46	46	57	34	53				
ASN	100	90		92	90						
BLK	41	45	41	45	53	43	52				
HSP	59	55		82	64						
MUL	69	62		58	60		67				
WHT	78	62	57	77	66	33	77				
FRL	60	58	55	59	59	42	57				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	40	45	35	51	55	41	56				
ASN	79			86							
BLK	43	55	48	49	62	50	33				
HSP	64			93							
MUL	62	69		54	75						
WHT	75	55	26	80	63	58	77				
FRL	60	52	43	67	65	55	58				

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	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	357

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	60
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
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	84
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	48
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	55
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	47
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?

SWD and African American students performed lower than 41% in both reading and math.
 Math Learning Gains: SWD 39%, African American 38%
 ELA Proficiency: SWD 39%
 ELA Learning Gains: SWD 23%, African Americans 25%

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

Math Learning Gains: SWD 2021 39%/ 2019 57%
 Math Learning Gains: African American 2021 38%/ 2019 53%
 ELA Proficiency: SWD 2021 39%/ 2019 43%
 ELA Learning Gains: SWD 2021 23%/ 2019 56%
 ELA Learning Gains: African Americans 2021 25%/ 2019 45%
 When comparing 2019 to 2021 FSA data, it is evident that these subgroups are where we need to focus.

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

The contributing factors were the school closure, frequent quarantined-based absences and the technology barriers that were prevalent with students transitioning between three different learning

models (traditional, remote, virtual).

Students are all in school and teachers are instructing on how to use the computers and frequently used programs. Curriculum alignment and pacing with the new standards. Teachers will use the intervention resources that are embedded in our new HMH curriculum for small group instruction.

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

ELA Proficiency: Hispanic Students 2019 59% / 2021 83%

Math Proficiency: Economically Disadvantaged Students 2019 59% / 2021 69%

Math Proficiency: Hispanic Students 2019 82% / 2021 89%

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

In 2019, our primary goal was to improve the lowest quartile math. Many of our economically disadvantaged students are in the lowest quartile. We tracked data all year, implemented WIN time (What I Need) targeting specific skills for individual students, and implemented iReady.

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

We will implement grade-level data sheets where teams will hold monthly data talks and create action plans to target deficient skills. Teachers will continue to plan small group instruction based on data.

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.

Structured data chats, goal setting, and action planning

Thinking Maps

iReady

Lipscomb Learning Labs-Teacher hosted PD on various topics

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

Student goal setting

Kid Talks-Administrators and counselors meet bi-weekly to discuss student behavior

Admin attendance at grade level meetings

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our 20-21 FSA data revealed that the Black/African American students showed that the overall proficiency in ELA was 26%. This subgroup also showed a decrease in learning gains in math from the previous year. The 20-21 FSA data only showed 38% learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal is to increase the overall proficiency in ELA by at least 15%. We are also aiming to increase learning gains in math by at least 3% or more.
Monitoring:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The school's data team to meet quarterly to disaggregate the data further by teacher and students. - Each grade level will also have a data day to examine data, form small groups, and create reassessment plans.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susan Sanders (ssanders@ecsdfi.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Professional development will be provided by our RTI Coordinator to highlight data driven interventions. - The school will also implement a data sheet where teachers will have access to the students' historical testing data. - The teachers will continually update the data sheet with the unit assessments. This data will be used to create action plans to target deficient skills through small group instruction. - Thinking Maps will also be used to increase the students' critical thinking skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The data sheet and action plans allow for teachers to better analyze the needs of students and plan instruction accordingly. - The RTI Coordinator will train teachers on appropriate research-based tiered interventions to better support their students. - Thinking Maps - It helps the students organize their thoughts through eight different maps and improve their critical thinking skills. This allows the students to make their thinking visible and for the teacher to help them organize and expand their thinking.

Action Steps to Implement

Creation of a school-wide data sheet.

Person Responsible Shona Person (sperson@ecsdfi.us)

Monitor teacher created action plans to monitor student growth.

Person Responsible Susan Sanders (ssanders@ecsdfi.us)

Provide PD on appropriate research-based tiered interventions to better support their students.

Person Responsible Susan Sanders (ssanders@ecsdfi.us)

Thinking Maps PD

Person Responsible Susan Sanders (ssanders@ecsdfi.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our 20-21 FSA data revealed that the students with disabilities showed minimal learning gains in both ELA and Math. Learning gains for SWD in Math - 39%/ ELA 25%
Measurable Outcome:	The goal is to increase the overall learning gains for students with disabilities in ELA by 16% and 5% or more in Math.
Monitoring:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The school's data team to meet quarterly to disaggregate the data further by teacher and students. - Each grade level will also have a data day to examine data, form small groups, and create reassessment plans. - Professional development will be provided by our RTI Coordinator to highlight data driven interventions. - The school will also implement a data sheet where teachers will have access to the students' historical testing data. - The teachers will continually update the data sheet with the unit assessments. This data will be used to create action plans to target deficient skills through small group instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susan Sanders (ssanders@ecsdfi.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Professional development will be provided by our RTI Coordinator to highlight data driven interventions. - The school will also implement a data sheet where teachers will have access to the students' historical testing data. - The teachers will continually update the data sheet with the unit assessments. This data will be used to create action plans to target deficient skills through small group instruction. - Thinking Maps will also be used to increase the students' critical thinking skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The data sheet and action plans allow for teachers to better analyze the needs of students and plan instruction accordingly. - The RTI Coordinator will train teachers on appropriate research-based tiered interventions to better support their students. - Thinking Maps - It helps the students organize their thoughts through eight different maps and improve their critical thinking skills. This allows the students to make their thinking visible and for the teacher to help them organize and expand their thinking.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide PD on appropriate research-based tiered interventions to better support their students.

Person Responsible Susan Sanders (ssanders@ecsdfi.us)

Monitor teacher created action plans to monitor student growth.

Person Responsible Susan Sanders (ssanders@ecsdfi.us)

Thinking Maps PD

Person Responsible Susan Sanders (ssanders@ecsdfi.us)

Create a school-wide data sheet.

Person Responsible Shona Person (sperson@ecsdfl.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.

When looking at our school data in comparison with the state, we have minimal problems compared to those in the state.

Primary concern: Classroom Disruption
Secondary concern: Leaving assigned area

Our behavior coach will conduct quarterly meetings with the school's support team. The team will set behavioral goals and monitor them at the meetings and formulate action steps. The P.A.W.S. program will be implemented to positively reinforce the desired 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 school will utilize our P.A.W.S. (Positive Attitude, Act Responsibly, Work Towards Success, and Show Respect) positive behavior system to promote positive school culture and environment. We will provide professional development around the expectations for the classroom, bathroom, hallway, and on the bus. We will also post visual reminders around the school. The Behavior Coach will reward students with PAWS tickets. Tickets will be drawn weekly, and students will be recognized on the news show, and certificates will be sent home.

Grade level teams meet weekly. During these meetings standards, data, and pacing are discussed. The collaboration fosters strong relationships among the teachers. Each grade level team has a leader who attends a monthly Leadership Team meeting. This meeting encourages collaboration across grade levels.

Parents are encouraged and invited to be involved with their child's education. There are many opportunities for families to attend events: science night, art night, movie night, book fair, grandparent

luncheon, grade level musicals, and the Lipscomb Leader award assemblies are some examples. Lipscomb has a very active and strong PTA that also works closely with the students, families, and teachers.

Daily news program featuring different speakers throughout the week. Encouraging and recognizing students occurs frequently.

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

-Parents - Communicate with the teacher and be involved in child's education. Participate in school events. Providing regarding our school environment and engagement.

- Behavior Coach - Creation of the P.A.W.S. tickets and announce them on the news show

- Principal, Assistant Principal, and Counselor- Review the pillars from the matrix on the news and demonstrate for the students how to behave. Encourage parental and family participation in school events and volunteering.

- All faculty and staff will issue P.A.W.S. tickets to students who are following expectations. All attend and collaborate during weekly meetings.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00