

Escambia County School District

Ferry Pass Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ferry Pass Elementary School

8310 N DAVIS HWY, Pensacola, FL 32514

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Catrena Fieg H

Start Date for this Principal: 8/23/2017

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ferry Pass Elementary School

8310 N DAVIS HWY, Pensacola, FL 32514

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Ferry Pass Elementary School is to develop self-confident, lifelong learners. We recognize that partnerships among schools and parents are critical to guarantee students' success. Our goal is to create a climate of mutual trust and respect that supports substantial parent involvement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to create an environment of collaboration for both students and teachers to increase achievement that promotes student development in all areas.

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
Fieg, Catrena	Principal	
Bryan, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Freeman, Jacob	Instructional Coach	
Burt, Gethia	Instructional Coach	
Horn, Heather	Instructional Media	
Armstrong, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Pippin, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	
Nobles, Christy	Teacher, K-12	
Viron, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Goolsby, Mark	Teacher, K-12	
Nickerson, Dorothy	Instructional Coach	
Hite, Avis	Behavior Specialist	
Rockwell, Patricia	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/23/2017, Catrena Fieg H

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.*

1

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

566

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

5

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

5

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	105	92	80	85	80	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	522
Attendance below 90 percent	18	30	28	28	21	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
One or more suspensions	2	10	4	5	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	5	7	14	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	2	5	9	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	23	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	5	8	10	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	1	8	4	12	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	10	10	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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	97	96	82	106	74	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	530
Attendance below 90 percent	14	35	26	37	26	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	2	8	16	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	14	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	21	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	19	37	31	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

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	3	3	13	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	97	96	82	106	74	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	530
Attendance below 90 percent	14	35	26	37	26	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	2	8	16	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	14	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	21	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	19	37	31	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

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	3	3	13	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	41%	51%	56%				52%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						50%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						43%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	47%	46%	50%				53%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	61%						60%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%						56%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	52%	59%				54%	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	53%	52%	1%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	51%	-3%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

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	54%	55%	-1%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	58%	-5%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2022					
	2019	45%	55%	-10%	60%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	51%	55%	-4%	53%	-2%
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	21	34	25	24	41	50	29				
BLK	25	45	45	36	52	50	28				
HSP	61	64		52	71						
MUL	43	64		43	50						
WHT	55	63	40	60	69		64				
FRL	34	51	45	41	57	59	48				
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	20	65	77	16	59	77	18				
BLK	35	49	46	30	44	67	33				
HSP	62	54		45	43		71				
MUL	40	42		50	45		45				
WHT	51	58		45	41		61				
FRL	42	51	58	38	49	77	52				
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	18	39	31	23	62	64	36				
BLK	39	46	33	36	61	60	39				
HSP	81	47		88	71		73				
MUL	51	50		74	76						
WHT	57	55	50	55	47	40	57				
FRL	46	50	43	48	59	57	46				

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	52
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	364
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
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	59
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	48
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?

Ferry Pass Elementary's overall Proficiency has increased from 51 percent in the 20/21 school year to 52 percent in 21/22. Students increased math proficiency, from 40.7 in 20/21 to 46.8 in 21/22. This is above the district average of 43.9, and slightly below the state average of 53.1. Our science proficiency also went up from 50 to 50.7, which is above the district average of 48.6 and below the state average of 52.7. Proficiency in ELA did drop from 44.9 in 20/21 to 40.8 in 21/22. ELA is below both the district and state average. Third grade ELA proficiency is especially low, going from 43 percent to 32 percent. This is important because third grade ELA is now a stand-alone indicator. When students are unable to read by the end of third grade, their risk of falling behind academically grows exponentially. Achievement levels for students with disabilities and African American students have also dropped significantly. African American students scored 25 percent proficient in ELA, 36 percent in math, and 28 percent in science. Students with disabilities scored at 21 percent for ELA, 24 percent for math, and 29 percent for science. Student learning gains for ELA and math are well above the district and state average, including our lowest quartile.

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

Our overall ELA proficiency is below district and state averages, and demonstrates one of the greatest needs for improvement, especially in 3rd grade. Our overall proficiency for students with disabilities and African American students is also below district and state averages. The federal index for our students with disabilities is 32 percent, which makes 3 consecutive years under 41 percent (TS&I benchmark). The federal index for our African American students fell to 40 percent this year, which makes it our first year under the 41 percent TS&I benchmark.

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 learning model for the 20/21 school year to support safety during the pandemic resulted in many students learning remotely to help keep quarantine rates down. This learning model impacted academic learning in all core classes, and resulted in many students falling behind on pacing and standards. The first semester of last school year many teachers were out due to the pandemic as well. This, paired with

the substitute shortage, resulted in many teachers being out for up to two weeks at a time and ESE teachers covering other classes. This disruption greatly impacted both our general education students and our students with disabilities. The learning gap caused by the pandemic is still affecting our students. A focus on strong Tier 1 instruction and matching effective interventions to student needs will help increase performance in all grades.

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

Math proficiency and learning gains showed the most improvement school wide. Student proficiency increased from 41 percent in 20/21 to 47 percent in 21/22, with math proficiency increasing in the subgroups that dropped in overall points. Student learning gains in math increased from 44 percent in 20/21 to 61 percent in 21/22. Science proficiency also increased, which remains above the district average.

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

School wide proficiency and learning gains in math decreased for both the 2019 and 2020 state assessments. For this reason, two of the main goals on last year's school improvement plan were focused on math. One of the goals was to increase learning gains for students with disabilities, and the other was to increase overall proficiency. The strategies focused on were concrete and effective, contributing to an increase in math proficiency and gains. Focus has been placed on Number Sense and Operations for the last 3 years, which has led to an increase in overall Math proficiency and gains.

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

This year Ferry Pass will focus on increasing the quality and efficacy of our Tier 1 instruction to increase proficiency. Teachers will work in their professional learning communities (PLCs) to plan Tier 1 teaching strategies, differentiation for small groups, and remediation to close learning gaps. Teachers will also plan for student instruction in identifying the standard, learning targets, resources, and discussion techniques. Administrators and school coaches will be part of the PLCs, and the implementation of the strategies and plans discussed in those weekly meetings will be monitored by data reviews, classroom walk-throughs, feedback, and coaching.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will include sessions on the new reading curriculum, evidence-based strategies for the other core content areas, data chats, and student behavior.

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

The school will continue the planning process followed up with classroom walks and feedback provided by the administration on a weekly basis. The administration will continue to conduct data analysis and have data chats with teachers during the 2022-2023 school year and beyond.

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.

Students with disabilities scores decreased from 47 percent of total subgroup points in 20/21, to just 32 percent in 21/22. While these students' proficiency slightly increased in both ELA and math, their learning gains went from 65 and 59 percent to 34 and 41 percent, respectively. The performance results of SWD were below the district and state level. SWD have scored under 41 percent for 3 consecutive years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with disabilities will increase ELA proficiency 20 percentage points from 21 percent in 21/22 to 41 percent on the final FAST assessment of the 22/23 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Schoolnet test data, quarterly iReady diagnostic data, and the FAST Progress monitoring will all be utilized to monitor SWD student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdf.us)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

SWD will receive intensive, systematic instruction on three foundational reading skills in small groups between 3 and 5 times a week. The foundational reading skills focus areas will be fluency with connected text, vocabulary, and comprehension. The What Works Clearinghouse panel has judged the evidence supporting this strategy as strong.

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

The district-adopted reading curriculum addresses the individual components of reading instruction and relates to student needs and developmental levels. The strategy will be implemented up to 5 days a week. Small group instruction allows the ESE teachers to scaffold B.E.S.T. Foundational Benchmarks and provide a high level of feedback with teacher-student interaction.

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.

The school leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss FSA scores from the previous year. The team will also analyze data from STAR, i-Ready, and F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring throughout the school year. Teachers will have quarterly data chats with students to discuss progress and goals.

Person Responsible

Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdf.us)

Professional development will include the following: B.E.S.T. Standards, comprehension strategies, i-Ready, small group instruction, and writing. PD will be provided to teachers from the RTI Coordinator, Subject Area Representatives, and Leadership team members.

Person Responsible Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdf1.us)

Classroom walk throughs will be conducted weekly by the Leadership team to monitor the implementation of PD and the B.E.S.T. Standards. Feedback will be provided to teachers and support will be determined based on data and walk throughs.

Person Responsible Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdf1.us)

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

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

African American subgroup scores decreased from 43 percent of total subgroup points in 20/21, to 40 percent in 21/22. ELA proficiency specifically decreased 10 percentage points, from 35 percent in 20/21 to 25 percent in 21/22. The 21/22 performance results were below the district and state level, and put us under the 41 percent benchmark.

Measurable Outcome:

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

African American students will increase ELA proficiency 16 percentage points from 25 percent in 21/22 to 41 percent on the final FAST assessment of the 22/23 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Schoolnet test data, quarterly iReady diagnostic data, and the FAST Progress monitoring will all be utilized to monitor African American student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1. Build students' decoding skills to foster the reading of complex multisyllabic words (strong evidence)
2. Provide purposeful fluency-building activities to help students read effortlessly (strong evidence)
3. Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text (strong evidence)
4. Provide students with opportunities to practice making sense of stretch text (i.e., challenging text) that will expose them to complex ideas and information (moderate evidence)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

According to Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4–9 from What Works Clearinghouse, strategies 1 and 2 focus on practices to improve students' ability to read words accurately and automatically, while strategies 3 and 4 focus on practices for helping students to understand the text they read. Each of these strategies show a positive impact on student achievement.

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.

The school leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss FSA scores from the previous year. The team will also analyze data from STAR, i-Ready, and F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring throughout the school year. Teachers will have quarterly data chats with students to discuss progress and goals.

Person Responsible

Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdfi.us)

Professional development will include the following: B.E.S.T. Standards, comprehension strategies, i-Ready, small group instruction, and writing. PD will be provided to teachers from the RTI Coordinator, Subject Area Representatives, and Leadership team members.

Person Responsible Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdfi.us)

Classroom walk throughs will be conducted weekly by the Leadership team to monitor the implementation of PD and the B.E.S.T. Standards. Feedback will be provided to teachers and support will be determined based on data and walk throughs.

Person Responsible Catrena Fieg (cfieg@ecsdfi.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

Kindergarten ELA proficiency rate was 80% on the Spring 2022 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

First grade ELA proficiency rate was 49% on the Spring 2022 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

Second grade ELA proficiency rate was 34% on the Spring 2022 STAR Reading Assessment.

Students who score at the 53rd percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading are considered proficient. The number of students who were not considered proficient at the end of 2021-2022 indicates a need to 1) improve core instruction and 2) identify student deficiencies and provide interventions immediately in order to close achievement gaps.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

Third grade ELA proficiency rate was 32% on the 2022 FSA.

Fourth grade ELA proficiency rate was 49% on the 2022 FSA.

Fifth grade ELA proficiency rate was 45% on the 2022 FSA.

Achievement in ELA for grades 3rd - 5th has (not) reached 41% proficiency in all subgroups:
 Students with Disabilities (21%)
 African American (25%)

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

ELA proficiency as determined by those scoring at or above the 53rd percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading 2022 will increase from 80% in K, 49% in 1st grade, and 34% in 2nd grade on STAR AP4 to 50% on FAST-STAR PM3.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

ELA proficiency will increase from 32% in 3rd grade, 49% in 4th grade, and 45 % in 5th grade on the 2022 FSA to 50% or higher in each grade on the 2023 FAST.

The ELA Proficiency for all identified ESSA subgroups will increase to 50% or higher on new 2023 FAST Progress Monitoring assessments by 23-24.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

1.To monitor for desired outcomes, we will collect data, analyze, and track the percent of students scoring satisfactorily each quarter. We will identify students in need of intervention according to the intervention decision tree.

a. Kindergarten: STAR Early Literacy results and percent of students earning satisfactory performance on the standards-based grading rubric.

b. First grade: STAR Early Literacy/Reading results and track the percent of students meeting benchmark on the first grade quarterly decoding probe per classroom.

c. Second grade: STAR Reading results and track the percent of students whose fluency rate is average per the time of year on the Hasbrouck and Tindal fluency norms chart.

d. Grades 3-5: analyze results by classroom of district module assessments.

2 Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to observe delivery of Pre-K to Grade 5 literacy instruction and suggest improvements through the use of the Literacy Practice Profile tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Fieg, Catrena, cfieg@ecsdfl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Ferry Pass uses HMH Into Reading 2022 for its Comprehensive Core Reading/Language Arts Program (CCRP).

The district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan outlines in detail how the various components Into Reading meets Florida's definition of evidence-based. The district ELA Department mapped B.E.S.T. and created curriculum frameworks to ensure that Tier I instruction is standards-aligned.

In order to ensure the measurable outcomes are reached in K-5, our school will 1) focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 CERP and 2) provide intensive, systematic instruction on foundational reading skills according to the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees.

Tier 1 instruction is monitored by the school's administration team through weekly classroom walkthroughs and by being present during collaborative lesson planning. Teachers and RtI teams monitor the effectiveness of interventions with individual students by collecting data and tracking student progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The use of Houghton Mifflin Into Reading 2022 as a Comprehensive Core Language Arts/Reading Program is supported by recommended practices in the The Institute of Education Sciences Practice Guides as described in the K-12 CERP. The core curriculum includes accommodations for students with a disability, and students who are English language learners; provides print-rich explicit and systematic, scaffolded, and differentiated instruction; builds background and content knowledge; incorporates writing in response to reading; and incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning.

A focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) with this comprehensive curriculum will increase the proficiency of our students in

K-5.

Furthermore, following the Institute of Education Sciences recommendations (strong evidence) for interventions, teachers follow the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees to provide interventions in decoding and building fluency, matched to student need during a dedicated intervention period daily.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Action Step 1: Literacy Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Develop a schoolwide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth. -Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. -Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve. 	Freeman, Jacob, jfreeman@ecsdfi.us
<p>Action Step 2: Literacy Coaching-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -District coaches and/or school mentor teachers will facilitate common lesson planning using the district adopted curriculum and pacing guides, including how to effectively deliver instruction of B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, engagement strategies, etc.). -Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support. 	Bryan, Jessica, jbryan@ecsdfi.us
<p>Action Step 3: Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Our school utilizes the MTSS 4-step problem solving process to analyze data and determine need for differentiated instruction/ intervention. -Grade level teams will meet to discuss the use of formative assessment to guide differentiation in the classroom; analyze core reading material assessment results, and use STAR for screening, diagnostics, and progress monitoring. 	Burt, Gethia, gburt@ecsdfi.us
<p>Action Step 4: Professional Learning</p> <p>We will provide training to teachers at our school on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Use of STAR360 reports, core reading program data, and the intervention decision trees -Differentiation during the 90 minute block, and use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the language arts intervention period. -Five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan -The B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the science of reading 	Fieg, Catrena, cfieg@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.

Ferry Pass Elementary sends home a parent/student handbook at the beginning of each school year, which outlines our school's mission and vision statement. Parent Nights and events are also a huge part of the Ferry Pass Elementary culture. Leadership is planning on nights themed around math, science, and reading. Our full-time music instructor has performances planned for each grade level scheduled throughout the year. We are in our third year of implementing the Social Emotional Learning program "Miss Kendra." We have a dedicated staff member for the program and all teachers and staff are trained on how to implement the lessons and activities with the students they interact with. We are also a PBIS (Positive Behavioral Intervention & Supports) school. Students can earn Leopard Loot and spend it in our school store twice a month. Classes also work on earning "spots" for their class leopard during special areas. When their leopard is full they earn a class party.

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

Staff are trained to implement programs such as Miss Kendra and PBIS. Leadership has daily morning news check ins that the entire school watches at the start of their day. Community Partners in Education provide us with school supplies and other resources that improve our culture and environment here at the school for students and staff. Mentors from UWF Pledge Scholars work with individual students on a weekly basis to build relationships that encourage and promote positivity. We have a dedicated group of military volunteers from NAS that have a presence on campus during special events and activities. Students have a community garden located on school property run by the Garden Committee. We spend time involving students in the PBIS program. Our PTA creates a yearbook for students. Parents are encouraged to volunteer at school and partner with their student's teachers via communication folders sent home daily with students.