Taylor County School District

Taylor County Primary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Jenoor Demograpines	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	12
Positive Culture & Environment	13
Budget to Support Goals	14

Taylor County Primary School

1000 HOWARD ST, Perry, FL 32347

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

Demographics

Principal: Kelli Brannen 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	[Data Not Available]
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White 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	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	<u>Jeff Sewell</u>
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* A C	

^{*} As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click</u> <u>here</u>.

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.

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.

Last Modified: 10/29/2020 https://www.floridacims.org Page 4 of 14

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, Kelli Brannen

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
-----------------------------------	--------

Last Modified: 10/29/2020 https://www.floridacims.org Page 5 of 14

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-2
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	[Data Not Available]
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
	2018-19: No Grade
	2017-18: No Grade
School Grades History	2016-17: No Grade
	2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement	(SI) Information*
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	<u>Jeff Sewell</u>
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Admini click here.	strative Code. For more information,

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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					Gı	rad	le	Le	vel					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	IOLAI
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													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
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														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
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						Gra	ade	e L	ev	el				Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	IOLAI
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														
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total		
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														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
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
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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 Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	73%	57%	0%	43%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	75%	58%	0%	38%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	53%	0%	39%	48%
Math Achievement	0%	78%	63%	0%	44%	62%
Math Learning Gains	0%	78%	62%	0%	31%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	51%	0%	30%	47%
Science Achievement	0%	53%	53%	0%	53%	55%

Last Modified: 10/29/2020 https://www.floridacims.org Page 8 of 14

EWS Inc	dicators as Inp	out Earlier in t	the Survey	
Indicator	Grade Lev	vel (prior year	reported)	Total
mulcator	K	1	2	iotai
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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										
Gra	ade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison				

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

	2	019 S	СНОО	L GRAD	E COM	PONE	NTS BY	SUB	GROUPS	5	
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17

	2	018 S	CHOO	L GRAD	E COM	PONE	NTS BY	SUB	GROUPS	5	
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 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

ESSA Federal Index	
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
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

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					
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.

Last Modified: 10/29/2020 https://www.floridacims.org Page 11 of 14

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

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.

Rationale:

Measureable

The measurable outcome will be growth for our students from AP1-AP3 on iReady.

Outcome: Person

responsible

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

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-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

Strategy: areas of need.

Rationale for Evidencebased

We have selected this strategy to help support teachers planning. Sign in sheets, notes, presences of administration and walkthroughs will be used to

Strategy: 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)

Last Modified: 10/29/2020 https://www.floridacims.org Page 12 of 14

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of

and

Focus Description 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.

Rationale:

Measureable The measurable outcome will be growth for our students from AP1-AP3 on

Outcome: iReady.

Person

responsible

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

monitoring outcome:

Evidence- 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

Strategy: enhanced and more rigorous. The strategy is to enhance tier 2 interventions

to meet specific areas of need.

Rationale

for

Evidencebased 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.

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