Leon County Schools

Kate Sullivan Elementary School

2018-19 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Kate Sullivan Elementary School

927 MICCOSUKEE RD, Tallahassee, FL 32308

https://www.leonschools.net/sullivan

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (As Reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	68%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	B	C	B*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon 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 Kate Sullivan Elementary is to prepare students to become responsible, respectful independent learners equipped with the critical thinking skills necessary to compete in our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement

Kate Sullivan will be an engaging, safe, respectful learning environment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Bryan, Michael	Principal
Myers, Sylvia	Assistant Principal
Shiver, Randi	Teacher, K-12
Robinson, Beverly	Teacher, ESE
Ash, Sherell	Teacher, K-12
Davis, Lydia	Teacher, K-12
Gallon, Gia	Teacher, K-12
Barton , Abby	Teacher, K-12
Burch, Amy	Teacher, ESE
Maloney, Caitlin	Teacher, K-12

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making

The members of the leadership team serve as liaisons between the teachers and administrators. They provide leadership on their respective teams, coordinate collaborative planning efforts, and facilitate progress monitoring and professional development for their teams and the school. The leadership team works intricately with administration to help make decisions that impact the school community, teacher morale and effectiveness, and student achievement.

Early Warning Systems

Leon - 0031 - Kate Sullivan Elem. School - 2018-19 SIP

Kate Sullivan Elementary School

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	12	7	17	7	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	3	21	34	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	29	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	2	3	24	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	5	11	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected

Monday 9/17/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	30	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	5	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The data component that performed the lowest is the learning gains for the lowest quartile in the area of ELA. There was a 6 point drop in that area. This does not appear to be a trend as last year this area was one of our strongest areas.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data components that showed the greatest decline from the prior year are math proficiency (-8) and learning gains in reading (-8), followed closely by reading proficiency (-7).

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The data component that had the biggest gap when compared to the state average is the ELA Lowest Quartile Gains. We were considerably lower than the state and district averages.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

We showed the greatest improvement in science with a one point gain. The only noticeable trend is that Sullivan has maintained proficiency above 51% for the last 4 years.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area

We continue to provide additional opportunities for students in the area of science by including it in the special area wheel, having a yearly Science Carnival, and progress monitoring the standards.

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	2018			2017		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement	54%	57%	56%	62%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	53%	55%	57%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	46%	48%	52%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	52%	61%	62%	57%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	55%	59%	57%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	40%	47%	39%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	52%	55%	56%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
Attendance below 90 percent	12 (0)	7 (0)	17 (0)	7 (0)	13 (0)	12 (0)	68 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	21 (0)	34 (0)	51 (0)	109 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (13)	29 (17)	49 (18)	82 (48)

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**
03	2018	64%	61%	3%	57%	7%
	2017	68%	62%	6%	58%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	46%	58%	-12%	56%	-10%
	2017	57%	59%	-2%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
05	2018	51%	57%	-6%	55%	-4%
	2017	60%	61%	-1%	53%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	58%	64%	-6%	62%	-4%
	2017	51%	60%	-9%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	50%	62%	-12%	62%	-12%
	2017	50%	64%	-14%	64%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2018	47%	58%	-11%	61%	-14%
	2017	64%	63%	1%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
WHT	68	52	21	71	64	31	68				
BLK	40	35	31	38	44	36	34				
HSP	47			7							
MUL	81	47		71	47						
SWD	30	23	29	27	29	29					
FRL	41	38	30	39	37	23	36				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
WHT	75	65	43	70	68	47	77				
BLK	49	48	51	42	42	34	33				
HSP	50			42							
MUL	76	50		82	80						
SWD	23	44	42	24	41	33	19				
FRL	46	49	42	40	44	28	35				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	ELA Lowest Quartile
Rationale	According to our data from 2017-18, this area is where we demonstrated our greatest decline in points. Reading is also an area where we have struggled with learning gains historically. In improving our learning gains for the lowest quartile, we should also improve our ELA Learning Gains as well.
Intended Outcome	Our intended outcome is to raise the learning gains from 30% to 50% for the 2018-2019 school year.
Point Person	Sylvia Myers (myerss@leonschools.net)

Action Step	
Description	-Re-evaluating the interventions that we are using for students and making sure that they are appropriate and effective. -Using progress monitoring to determine the effectiveness of interventions and provide tiered support -Providing interventions according to the prescribed schedule -Monitoring intervention and differentiated reading group time - Use a benchmark checklist to monitor standard mastery, and provide a plan to reteach standards that students have not acquired - In addition to benchmark checklist, create standards mastery assessments using iReady and Unify -Look at individual and class strands of difficulty and develop a plan to remediate - Plan and provide cognitively complex learning opportunities -Develop and implement a plan to teach writing and provide feedback to students
Person Responsible	Michael Bryan (bryanm@leonschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	-Look at Wonders assessment progress monthly -Meet with 4th and 5th grade teachers monthly to review benchmark tracking sheets for students in the lowest quartile -Quarterly, review STAR (Reading) assessment data for students in the lowest quartile -Use progress monitoring data each nine weeks to tailor support for interventions with students in the lowest quartile -Use iReady Diagnostic data to inform instruction and small group ideas for students in the lowest quartile
Person Responsible	Michael Bryan (bryanm@leonschools.net)

Activity #2	
Title	ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	The ELA Learning Gains for the students dropped significantly in the last year (-8 points). The loss in learning gains has also impacted proficiency numbers, as the greatest drops occurred from 3rd to 4th grade. This also means that there is a large number of students that are in our current 5th grade class that need to show gains this year to avoid a two year slip.
Intended Outcome	Our intended outcome is to raise our ELA Learning Gains percentage from 43% to 50%.
Point Person	Sylvia Myers (myerss@leonschools.net)
Action Step	
Description	-Use progress monitoring data to differentiate reading groups and centers -Monitor the intervention/enrichment reading block -Provide cognitively complex opportunities for all students -Use data to determine gaps in learning and create a remediation plan -Encourage students to read frequently on their independent level -Provide enrichment opportunities for students who demonstrate a need to supplement the core curriculum (based on progress monitoring assessments, FSA, and screenings) -Provide additional opportunities to read outside of the classroom by conducting before school and weekend book clubs -Using a benchmark tracking sheet to monitor the acquisition of grade level standards - Develop a plan to teach writing and provide feedback - Schedule opportunities for extended planning for 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students
Person Responsible	Michael Bryan (bryanm@leonschools.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	-Look at Wonders assessment progress monthly -Quarterly, review STAR (Reading) assessment data for students to monitor the effectiveness of current instruction and supplemental support -Quarterly, look at the STAR scale scores to determine if students are on track to demonstrate growth -Use progress monitoring data each nine weeks to tailor support for interventions and enrichment for students -Use iReady Diagnostic data to inform instruction and small group ideas for students in the lowest quartile
Person Responsible	Michael Bryan (bryanm@leonschools.net)

Activity #3	
Title	ELA Proficiency
Rationale	Our proficiency in ELA dropped 7 points from the 2016-17 school year. This drop impacted ELA Learning Gains as well, especially in 4th grade. We are also below the district and state in reading proficiency in grades 3-5.
Intended Outcome	Our intended outcome is to raise the proficiency percentage from 52% to 63%.
Point Person	Sylvia Myers (myerss@leonschools.net)

Action Step	
Description	-Teach the Wonders curriculum with fidelity - Use progress monitoring data to differentiate the learning experience during the intervention/enrichment time -Use iReady diagnostic data to create a plan for instruction and to develop reading centers -Use a benchmark tracking sheet to determine students' acquisition of standards -Provide students with reading passages on their independent and instructional levels -Provide cognitively complex tasks for all students -Have students to set goals and track their own progress -Monitor the reading block with observations and prompt feedback from administration and the reading coach -Develop a plan to teach writing and provide feedback
Person Responsible	Michael Bryan (bryanm@leonschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	-Look at Wonders assessment progress monthly -Quarterly, review STAR (Reading) assessment data for students to monitor the effectiveness of current instruction and supplemental support -Quarterly, look at the STAR scale scores to determine if students are on track to demonstrate proficiency -Use progress monitoring data each nine weeks to tailor support for interventions and enrichment with students -Use iReady diagnostic to determine if students are on track for proficiency
Person Responsible	Michael Bryan (bryanm@leonschools.net)

Activity #4	
Title	Math Lowest Quartile
Rationale	According to the data from 2017-18, our math gains for the lowest quartile dropped 5 percentage points.
Intended Outcome	In improving our lowest quartile goal from 34% to 50%, we also hope to make our overall Math Learning Gains goal of moving our scores from 51% to 56%.
Point Person	Sylvia Myers (myerss@leonschools.net)

Action Step	
Description	-Provide math professional development, coordinated by the curriculum developer - Unpacking math standards and looking at the cognitive complexity of the standards - Use a benchmark tracking sheet to monitor acquisition of grade level standards - Use benchmark tracking and progress monitoring data to identify strengths and weaknesses to develop a plan for instruction/remediation/enrichment -Encouraging and monitoring the use of differentiated small groups - Frequently monitor progress monitoring (Go Math! Assessment, iReady and formative assessments) for students in the lowest quartile -Encourage students to set goals and track their own progress
Person Responsible	Michael Bryan (bryanm@leonschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	-Classroom observations and timely feedback - Review monthly progress monitoring monitoring data - Use benchmark assessment tools to monitor standards acquisition
Person Responsible	Michael Bryan (bryanm@leonschools.net)

Activity #5	
Title	Math Learning Gains
Rationale	Our plan to focus on math learning gains is driven by the drop in points from 57% to 51% in the 2017-18 school year. When looking at the cohort of students who are now in 5th grade, over 2 years they have struggled in math and hovered around 50% in proficiency and haven't shown significant gains. As a school, we are going to have to work hard to diagnose the deficiency in math with these students and plan accordingly.
Intended Outcome	Our intended outcome by focusing on math learning gains is to have 56% of our students in 4th and 5th grade to demonstrate learning gains. In increasing learning gains, we hope to also move more students to proficiency, increasing our points in that area as well.
Point Person	Sylvia Myers (myerss@leonschools.net)

Action Step	
Description	- Planned professional development based on data -Classroom observations by administration and district math curriculum developer -Monthly progress monitoring meetings for all grade levels -Extended Planning times scheduled for 3-5th grade teachers -Backwards planning for math -Use benchmark checkoff sheets to monitor student standard acquisition -Monitor Go Math! assessment data and plan opportunities to reteach standards not mastered -Create an iReady schedule that provides students with the opportunity for independent level practice -Plan differentiated math learning centers -Provide guided instruction during small group time in math -Supporting students with cognitively challenging tasks -Enrichment in math for selected students -Math Academy (computation practice) for selected 4th graders -Utilizing instructional tools in iReady to tailor instruction for students -Providing tiered interventions for students who consistently score below 70% on assessments, are identified as Tier 2 or 3 students in iReady, and/or students who score below a Level on FSA
Person Responsible	Michael Bryan (bryanm@leonschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	-Use learning progressions and formative assessments frequently to monitor standards mastery -Collecting class Go Math! data -Review benchmark sheets quarterly for all students, monthly for students receiving interventions for math -iReady Diagnostic assessments -Fourth and fifth grade FSA scores
Person Responsible	Michael Bryan (bryanm@leonschools.net)

Activity #6	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	Our rationale for focusing on math proficiency is based on the fact that our points in math proficiency dropped from 57% to 52%. When looking at the data student by student, we have several 4th graders drop from proficiency coming from 3rd grade. We would like to focus on planning, instruction and progress monitoring in all grade levels, but particularly in 4th grade.
Intended Outcome	Our intended outcome is to raise our math proficiency for grades 3-5 from 52% to 57%.
Point Person	Sylvia Myers (myerss@leonschools.net)

Action Step	
Description	-Planned professional development based on data and learning trends -Classroom observations from administration and district curriculum developer -Monthly progress monitoring meetings for all grade levels -Extended Planning times scheduled for 3-5th grade teachers -Backwards planning for math -Use benchmark checkoff sheets to monitor student standard acquisition -Monitor Go Math! assessment data and plan opportunities to reteach standards not mastered -Create an iReady schedule that provides students with the opportunity for independent level practice -Plan differentiated math learning centers -Provide guided instruction during small group time in math -Exposing students to cognitively challenging tasks -Enrichment in math for selected students -Math Academy (computation practice) for selected 4th graders -Utilizing instructional tools in iReady to tailor instruction for students -Providing tiered interventions for students who consistently score below 70% on assessments, are identified as Tier 2 or 3 students in iReady, and/or students who score below a Level on FSA -Following the pacing guides as closely as possible
Person Responsible	Michael Bryan (bryanm@leonschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	--Use learning progressions and formative assessments frequently to monitor standards mastery -Collecting class Go Math! data -Review benchmark sheets quarterly for all students, monthly for students receiving interventions for math -iReady Diagnostic assessments -FSA scores
Person Responsible	Michael Bryan (bryanm@leonschools.net)

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$5,358.43**