

Escambia County School District

# Pleasant Grove Elementary School



2022-23 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>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Pleasant Grove Elementary School

10789 SORRENTO RD, Pensacola, FL 32507

www.escambiaschools.org

## Demographics

Principal: Nicole Owens Braggs

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2021

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: B (58%)<br>2018-19: B (60%)<br>2017-18: C (49%)   |
| <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>   | ATSI   |
| * 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](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.

---

## 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>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</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<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>KG-5                        | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 53%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B       |         | B       | B       |

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

The mission 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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name                 | Position Title              | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Owens-Braggs, Nicole | Principal                   | To ensure teachers have the resources needed to provide all student growth in reading and math.   |
| Tapparo, Susan       | Assistant Principal         | To assist the principal in providing resources to teachers so all students can grow in reading and math. To monitor and give insight on how we can better meet school-wide and SIP goals. |
| Terrell, Kayleigh    | Teacher, K-12               | Monitor 5th grade data  |
| Corrigan, Anne       | Teacher, ESE                | Monitor the SWD data  |
| Lee, Theresa         | Teacher, K-12               | Monitor 3rd grade data  |
| Wood, Carrie         | Teacher, K-12               | Monitor first grade data  |
| Rabin, Jackie        | Teacher, K-12               | Monitor 4th grade data  |
| Zink, Erica          | Curriculum Resource Teacher | Monitor lower 25% data goals  |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 7/20/2021, Nicole Owens Braggs

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

11

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

40

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

530

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

2

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

2

### Demographic Data

## Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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                              | 93          | 90 | 95 | 79 | 71 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 521   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 9           | 28 | 23 | 19 | 18 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 126   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 3  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 3  | 5  | 3  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 1  | 2  | 2  | 2  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 7  | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 10 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 3  | 5  | 3  | 7  | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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           | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |



Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 9/4/2022

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                              | 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     |

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                              | 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     |

## 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      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 66%    | 51%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 56%    | 53%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 68%    |          |       |        |          |       | 59%    | 55%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 42%    |          |       |        |          |       | 59%    | 52%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 71%    | 46%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 56%    | 57%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 59%    |          |       |        |          |       | 63%    | 60%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 38%    |          |       |        |          |       | 57%    | 52%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 62%    | 52%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 69%    | 54%      | 53%   |

### 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 |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 58%    | 56%      | 2%                         | 58%   | 0%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 56%    | 52%      | 4%                         | 58%   | -2%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -58%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 55%    | 51%      | 4%                         | 56%   | -1%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -56%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 52%    | 55%      | -3%                        | 62%   | -10%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 63%    | 58%      | 5%                         | 64%   | -1%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -52%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 53%    | 55%      | -2%                        | 60%   | -7%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -63%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 65%    | 55%      | 10%                        | 53%   | 12%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 28       | 48     | 43          | 39        | 24      | 13           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 48       | 55     | 23          | 53        | 43      | 40           | 53       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 74       | 83     |             | 84        | 92      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 67       | 63     |             | 70        | 50      |              | 70       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 72       | 75     | 56          | 75        | 62      | 35           | 59       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 57       | 61     | 41          | 63        | 56      | 32           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 59       | 43     |             | 63        | 59      |              | 83       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 60       | 62     | 71          | 66        | 67      | 67           | 81       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 50       | 55     | 55          | 52        | 61      | 55           | 65       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 58   |
| 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                                       | 406  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7    |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 32  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | YES |
| 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                                | 45  |
| 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  | 83  |
| 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   | 64  |
| 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   | 62 |
| 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                                | 51 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### 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?

In the area of ELA, proficiency fluctuated: in 2019 (56%), 2021 (52%), 2022 (66%).

In math proficiency grew: 2019 (56%), 2021 (60%), 2022 (71%).

Gains in ELA fluctuated: 2019 (59%), 2021 (40%), 2022 (68%).

Gains in math fluctuated as well: 2019 (63%), 2021 (53%), 2022 (59%).

Lower 25% in ELA fluctuated: 2019 (59%), 2021 (36%), 2022 (42%)

Lower 25% in math steadily went down 9-10% each recording period.

Science data fluctuated: 2019 at 69% to 48% in 2021 and then to 62% in 2022

SWD in ELA proficiency fluctuated: 2019 (29%), 2021 (32%), and 2022 (28%).

SWD in math proficiency grew from 2019 (24%), 2021 (23%), and 2022 (39%)

Black students ELA proficiency grew over the 41% index in 2022 to 48%; It was at 40% in 2019 and in 2021.

Black students in math grew in proficiency 2019 (33%), 2021 (47%), 2022 (53%)

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The area of learning gains of SWD in math and reading seems to be the greatest need for improvement. The overall index is 32%

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

We will first have to identify students with disabilities that are proficient and close to proficiency in reading, math, and science. After identifying the students, we can offer tutoring to support students to maintain and or grow to proficiency. (Other ideas)

Currently, 5th grade ELA has 5/13=31% students proficient and 1 target student  
4th 1/9= 11% are proficient and 3 students are target students  
3rd 5/13=38% are proficient and 1 student is a target

If fifth grade grows the 1 target student the proficiency would be 6/13= 46%.

If fourth grade holds on to the one proficient student and grows the 3 students, proficiency would be 4/9=44%

If third grade holds on to proficiency and grow the one target the proficiency would be 6/13=46%

Math: 5th-8/13=62% students are proficient

4th: 3/9= 33% students are proficient: zero target students,

3rd: 3/13= 23% are proficient and 4 students are targets.

Fifth grade holds on to proficiency.

Fourth grade will have to hold on to the proficient 3

Third grade will have to hold on to the 3 proficient students and then grow the 4 target students.

The result will be 18/35=51%

SWD science proficiency will have to be monitored to work towards 41% of students making proficiency in comparison to 2021-2022 data of 22%.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Black students proficiency grew in math and reading. In math the proficiency grew by 6%. In reading the proficiency grew by 8%.

Science proficiency grew from 48% to 62% proficiency.

Overall math proficiency grew at its highest to 71% proficiency. ELA proficiency grew at its highest of 66%. ELA learning gains grew at its highest at 68%.

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

Face to face learning

Increased instructional time - dropped iReady assessments

Tutoring - targeted; consistent attendance

Additional teacher assistants Data driven decision making and student grouping

Started with assessment data to plan lessons based on student data needs

Standards based instruction

RTI

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

The RTI process and progress monitoring

RTI coordinator assisting with paperwork

Target WIN Time with target students

3 days reading 2 days math (based on assessment 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.**

ELA Professional Development

Tier 2 Tier 3 Interventions

Accessible Accommodations to grade level materials UDL

Snap and Read

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

Grade level chairs are being trained to analyze data, monitor data, and to give feedback based on the data.

### Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:



**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

SWD continues to be an area that Pleasant Grove Elementary need to improve according to the overall federal index. In 2021 the federal index was 34%. In 2021 the federal index in 2022 was 32%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

SWD Federal index score will improve from 32% to 41% or better.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The CC, ESE teacher leader, and 5th grade leader will monitor maintaining proficiency and target proficiency for students discussed in the needs analysis in the areas of reading, math, and science.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Anne Corrigan (acorrigan@escmabia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

It will be evident 100% of the time that teachers are scaffolding learning expectations for students who need more support to be successful with the learning intent.

Differentiated instruction will be used to support students growth in reading, math, and science.

100% of classrooms will have the learning targets posted and referred to throughout the lessons.

Scaffolding instruction includes connecting learning to students' previous learning. Research shows that in order to advance students' learning you must connect it to what they already know.

\*Teachers giving feedback to students to move learning forward which allows students to build on errors.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Giving students a purpose for learning begins the learning episode. Students know what the intended learning outcome is and they focus on that purpose. Marzano and Hattie research shows that introducing targets and continuously reinforcing what students are intended to learn increases learning for students.

Differentiated instruction based on students' needs as evident in classwork and tests is responsive teaching. Research shows when teachers respond to student's individual needs ensures academic growth at each student's level.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

In July, met with Leadership team to decide on strategies that will be implemented during the 2022-2023 school year.

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

Preplanning, give an overview of the purpose of learning targets and possible ways teacher can present the targets to students.

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

October 10th Markeysa Rhymer will give a training (refresher for some) on UDL.

**Person Responsible** Susan Tapparo (stapparo@ecsdfi.us)

Capture scaffolded instruction in the weekly newsletter that are used throughout the school to illustrate what scaffolded instruction looks like and promote best practices utilized throughout the school.

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

In November, The CC will give a training on technology used to give students' access to grade level expectations such as speech to text and read and snap.

**Person Responsible** Erica Zink (ezink@ecsdfi.us)

Monthly Data meetings with grade levels to discuss progress and next steps towards proficiency goals.

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

Measurements which were chosen by the leadership team will be presented in the weekly newsletter. Findings will be shared with the grade level and school. Individual feedback in the form of improvements or celebrations will be conducted with teachers.

**Person Responsible** Susan Tapparo (stapparo@ecsdfi.us)

## 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

### 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 school culture and environment.

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.