Taylor County Primary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Taylor County Primary School

1000 HOWARD ST, Perry, FL 32347

https://www.edline.net/pages/perry_primary_school

Demographics

Principal: Misty Smrynios

Start Date for this Principal: 9/22/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-2
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Taylor County School Board on 10/20/2020.

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

Taylor County Primary School

1000 HOWARD ST, Perry, FL 32347

https://www.edline.net/pages/perry_primary_school

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-2	Yes	%

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

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Taylor County School Board on 10/20/2020.

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.

Taylor County Primary School is committed to providing all students with a safe, positive and challenging learning environment that enables all learners to become well-prepared, productive and contributing citizens in the 21st century.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Taylor County Primary School will assist all students with the recognition and development of individuality, self-growth and responsibility while using a variety of strategies and cooperative efforts throughout the school, home and community.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Morgan, Melanie	Other	
Cantrell, Kay	Instructional Coach	
Brannen, Kelli	Principal	
Gray, Laura	Assistant Principal	
Curry, Jesika	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 9/22/2020, Misty Smrynios

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.*
0

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-2
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	225	168	191	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	584
Attendance below 90 percent	36	13	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	10	2	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in Math	10	2	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	36	13	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	43	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/22/2020

Prior Year - 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	186	213	194	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	593
Attendance below 90 percent	33	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	23	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	19	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	11	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - 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	186	213	194	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	593
Attendance below 90 percent	33	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	23	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	19	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	11	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
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
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	73%	57%	0%	47%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	75%	58%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	53%	0%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	78%	63%	0%	47%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	78%	62%	0%	49%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	51%	0%	34%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	53%	53%	0%	50%	51%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	K	**1**	**2**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Grade Level Data
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

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

Subgroup Data

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	39	49	57	52	62	61	41				
BLK	43	55	56	56	59	54	33				
HSP	50	46		61	62		50				
MUL	55	62		63	86		50				
WHT	58	58	58	69	62	55	59				
FRL	51	55	53	63	60	55	51				
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
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

DUE to COVID, using data from 2018-2019 school year. ELA is the largest concern. Based on the feeder schools FSA scores, the lowest quartile students are struggling and ELA is the area of concern.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

DUE to COVID, using data from 2018-2019 school year. The students in the lowest 25% of math students had the largest gap.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

DUE to COVID, using data from 2018-2019 school year. Reading had the greatest gap based on our feeders schools scores.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

DUE to COVID, using data from 2018-2019 school year. Our bottom quartile math make the most improvement based on our feeder schools data.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Reading as a whole is a large concern for our school.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Reading
2. Math
3. Interventions
4. Behavior
5. Attitude

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have set up collaborative planning for all of our grade levels. This will allow teacher teams to plan and collaborate together. Administration will be a part of these meetings to ensure that planning is intentional which will impact student learning.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome will be growth for our students from AP1-AP3 on iReady.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelli Brannen (kelli.brannen@taylor.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tier 1 data data shows that tier 1 instruction needs to be enhanced and more rigorous. The strategy is using intentional planning to meet specific areas of need.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have selected this strategy to help support teachers planning. Sign in sheets, notes, presences of administration and walkthroughs will be used to ensure growth.

Action Steps to Implement

Bi-Weekly Collaborative planning,
Monthly administration walk throughs
Instructional Coach Supports
MTSS Coordinator Support.

Person Responsible	Kelli Brannen (kelli.brannen@taylor.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The focus will be in the area of Tier 2 interventions in the classroom. Tier 2 intervention data has shown that our students are not making growth. This will impact student learning because we will enhance Tier 2 interventions.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome will be growth for our students from AP1-AP3 on iReady.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelli Brannen (kelli.brannen@taylor.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tier 1 data data shows that our students receiving tier 2 interventions are not making growth as quickly as we would like. Interventions need to be enhanced and more rigorous. The strategy is to enhance tier 2 interventions to meet specific areas of need.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have selected this strategy to enhance tier 2 interventions. Intervention data points, administration walkthroughs will be used to ensure growth.

Action Steps to Implement

Bi-Weekly MTSS Tier 2 intervention fidelity checks.
Monthly administration walk throughs
Instructional Coach Supports
MTSS Coordinator Support.

Person Responsible	Kelli Brannen (kelli.brannen@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We plan to have professional development trainings planned throughout the year to help support in the areas of reading and math. We will have iReady and K12 Lift trainings to help teachers to better read and understand that data so they can implement supports in their classrooms.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

To support the social and emotional needs of our students we have implemented Stanford Harmonary school wide through special area during media through our new guidance counselor. We have also implemented the PATHS program in small groups to help support our high needs students.

The administration leadership team mentors high need students and works collaboratively with parents and teachers to meet the needs of all students. Mentoring is on going throughout the year at TCPS. The administrative team also communicates Paul Peavey the districts mental health coordinator.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**