Blue Angels Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Blue Angels Elementary School

1551 DOG TRACK RD, Pensacola, FL 32506

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Jayne Murphy P

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2018

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
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 (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (65%)
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

Blue Angels Elementary School

1551 DOG TRACK RD, Pensacola, FL 32506

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	No	49%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

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.

Our mission at Blue Angels Elementary School is to promote joy in learning in a safe, child-centered environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to meet the academic needs of each student at Blue Angels Elementary School while helping to develop well rounded citizens.

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
Murphy, Jayne	Principal	Instructional Leader
Henry-Slater, Michel	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader
Tanton, Lauren	Curriculum Resource Teacher	RTI Coordinator
Griffin, Vanessa	School Counselor	
Southworth, Gary	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/2/2018, Jayne Murphy P

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.*
9

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
57

Total number of students enrolled at the school
745

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

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	138	126	119	120	106	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	738
Attendance below 90 percent	12	34	17	25	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	8	4	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	3	1	3	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	16	14	15	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	3	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	17	12	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
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 9/13/2021

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	94	144	131	114	133	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	751
Attendance below 90 percent	11	26	16	8	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	4	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	9	4	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	94	144	131	114	133	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	751
Attendance below 90 percent	11	26	16	8	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	4	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
					Grade Level									
Retained Students: Current Year	7	9	4	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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				68%	53%	57%	62%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	55%	58%	57%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	52%	53%	42%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				70%	57%	63%	67%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				81%	60%	62%	69%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66%	52%	51%	63%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				69%	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	74%	56%	18%	58%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	52%	10%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	51%	13%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	61%	55%	6%	62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	71%	58%	13%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	72%	55%	17%	60%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	69%	55%	14%	53%	16%
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	62/51.2%	79/66.4%	84/65.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36/50.7%	44/65.7$	48/64.9%
	Students With Disabilities	6/37.5%%	4/30.8%	9/50%
	English Language Learners	0/0.0%	1/100%	0/0.0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	63/52.5%	74/60.7%	95/74.8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39/55.7%	40/58.0%	55/76.4%
	Students With Disabilities	7/50.0%	7/53.8%	8/50.0%
	English Language Learners	0/0.0%	1/100%	1/100%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52/46.8%	68/61.3%	78/67.8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/44.6%	33/60.0%	35/64.8%
	Students With Disabilities	6/33.3%	7/41.2%	7/38.9%
	English Language Learners	1/50.0%	2/100.0%	2/100.0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47/42.7%	54/57.4%	57/50.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/36.4%	25/54.3%	28/50.9%
	Students With Disabilities	5/27.8%	3/21.4%	4/22.2%
	English Language Learners	1/50.0%	1/50.0%	1/50.0%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51/53.7%	58/59.2%	59/66.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/50.0%	29/58.0%	32/69.6%
	Students With Disabilities	3/16.7%	6/40.0%	7/46.7%
	English Language Learners	0/0.0%	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44/46.3%	66/68.0%	57/62.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/32.7%	30/61.2%	26/56.5%
	Students With Disabilities	4/22.2%	7/50.0%	7/46.7%
	English Language Learners	0/0.0%	N/A	N/A

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67/57.8%	67/56.8%	72/63.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31/48.4%	31/49.2%	28/46.7%
	Students With Disabilities	3/18.8%	3/18.8%	8/53.3%
	English Language Learners	1/33.3%	3/100.0%	2/66.7%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	50/43.1%	62/53.4%	76/66.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/31.3%	22/35.5	34/55.7%
	Students With Disabilities	3/17.6%	2/12.5%	9/56.3%
	English Language Learners	2/66.7%	2/66.7%	2/66.7%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	56/45.9%	62/52.1%	63/56.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/30.8%	29/50.0%	26/46.4%
	Students With Disabilities	5/18.5%	11/44.0%	8/34.8%
	English Language Learners	0/0.0%	0/0.0%	0/0.0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44/63.4%	56/46.7%	57/50.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/26.6%	23/39.0%	23/41.1%
	Students With Disabilities	5/18.5%	6/23.1%	5/20.0%
	English Language Learners	0/0.0%	0/0.0%	1/50.0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	1/50.0%	69/65.1%	63/58.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/50.0%	27/50.9%	26/49.1%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	8/40.0%	10/45.5%
	English Language Learners	N/A	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	38	38	31	35	45	25	41				
ASN	92			92							
BLK	61	42		50	33		42				
HSP	63	42		69	75		64				
MUL	67	53		62	76		56				
WHT	63	50	42	58	64	38	57				
FRL	55	43	40	51	54	35	47				

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	35	40	26	35	71	69	43				
ASN	77	62		95	92						
BLK	47	41	36	55	65	46	41				
HSP	72	63		70	68		43				
MUL	75	74		67	93		80				
WHT	71	63	41	73	83	68	78				
FRL	58	51	38	61	80	72	59				

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	32	33	35	32	51	57	48				
ASN	78	58		78	75						
BLK	43	48	44	52	60	64	50				
HSP	53	50		63	75	80	83				
MUL	70	68		81	84		77				
WHT	65	57	42	68	65	58	64				
FRL	54	54	36	57	64	56	66				

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	54
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	377

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

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	92
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	46
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	63
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	63
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	53
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	46
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?

Per STAR Data, we have demonstrated an increase in the number of students with low growth in ELA:
2020-2021: 30.9%
2021-2022: 34.1% (AP1)

Per STAR Data, we have demonstrated a decrease in the number of students with low growth in Math :
2020-2021: 31.5%
2021-2022: 26.4% (AP1)

Per STAR Data, we have demonstrated an increase in the percentage in our Africa American subgroup showing low growth in ELA:
2020-2021: 33%
2021-2022: 41.7 % (AP1)

Per STAR Reading Data, the trend in the African American subgroup shows an increase in the percentage of students identified with low growth.
2020-2021: 33%
2021-2022: 41.7% (AP1)

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the 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?

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

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

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

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.

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

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.

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

<div style="background-color:#2b3a67;color:#fff;text-align:center;font-weight:bold;">Part V: Budget</div>

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

Total:	**$0.00**