Canopy Oaks Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Canopy Oaks Elementary School

3250 POINT VIEW DR, Tallahassee, FL 32303

https://www.leonschools.net/canopyoaks

Demographics

Principal: Staci Mortham

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* 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 Leon 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To provide a physically safe and emotionally healthy learning environment where all involved (children, staff, parents and community) experience success and believe that they are accepted and valued for the individuals they are and will become.

Provide the school's vision statement

To create a continuously growing community of learners experiencing success while becoming conscientious and responsible members of society.

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
Mortham, Staci	Principal	Ms. Mortham is the instructional leader of the school. She tracks data, meets with students, staff and parents, and keeps the lines of communication open with all stakeholders.
Berigan, Mandy	Instructional Coach	Ms. Berigan, our reading coach assists teachers with data collection. She also works with Ms. Mortham to create intervention groups, as well as teaching intervention groups.
Chandler, Cedric	Guidance Counselor	Mr. Chandler is responsible for the MTSS referral process as well as keeping up with our ELL documentation. He also leads our Social Emotional Learning on campus.
Mischler, Paula	Assistant Principal	Ms. Mischler is an instructional leader on our campus. She meets with teachers as well as parents to make sure that students needs are being met in the classrooms.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Staci Mortham

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.*
1

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
33

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
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: B (55%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	90	101	103	95	113	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	594
Attendance below 90 percent	10	6	5	10	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	9	4	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 9/3/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	97	106	96	117	104	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	633
Attendance below 90 percent	12	7	8	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
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	3	15	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Number of students enrolled	97	106	96	117	104	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	633
Attendance below 90 percent	12	7	8	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
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	3	15	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	66%	57%	57%	63%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	54%	58%	51%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	47%	53%	38%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	63%	64%	63%	57%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	50%	63%	62%	41%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	45%	51%	37%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	77%	52%	53%	65%	52%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	76%	61%	15%	58%	18%
	2018	65%	61%	4%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	57%	-4%	58%	-5%
	2018	64%	58%	6%	56%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	68%	56%	12%	56%	12%
	2018	57%	57%	0%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	81%	63%	18%	62%	19%
	2018	62%	64%	-2%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	66%	-14%	64%	-12%
	2018	61%	62%	-1%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	61%	-6%	60%	-5%
	2018	43%	58%	-15%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison	12%					
Cohort Comparison	-6%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	77%	54%	23%	53%	24%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison	13%					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	28	19	6	30	39	26	46				
BLK	43	41	29	45	48	35	55				
HSP	42	45		75	36						
MUL	61	43		65	57						
WHT	77	61	45	68	51	30	86				
FRL	55	47	32	55	50	35	67				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	29	30	28	29	37	39	25				
BLK	47	48	41	40	34	46	46				
HSP	40	25		47	31						
MUL	84			63							
WHT	69	53	36	63	43	36	71				
FRL	54	48	33	43	30	25	43				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
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	384
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	42
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	50
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	57
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	49
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

The lowest performance for the 2019 testing session was the lowest 25th % in the area of math. This group includes our ESE students. While we had made progress in the 2018 season, we dropped from 37% to 35% in 2019.

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

The only area that showed a decline for the 2019 testing session was the lowest 25th % in the area of math. This group includes our ESE students. While we had made progress in the 2018 season, we dropped from 37% to 35% in 2019.

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

The area that showed the greatest gap for COE was the area of science. The state average was 53%, while at Canopy Oaks, we were at 77%. This gap was caused by a

shift in the way we present science to our students. We have a specific teacher to teach science in both 4th and 5th grades, thus providing ample time for quality, hands-on science instruction.

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

Science showed the most improvement in our school. In 2018 we scored 65% proficient. In the 2019 testing season, we were at 77%. This increase was caused by a shift in the way we present science to our students. We have a specific teacher to teach science in both 4th and 5th grades, thus providing ample time for quality, hands-on science instruction.

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

Attendance is our biggest priority this year in the EWS data. With the students missing 5 1/2 months of school due to COVID, it is essential that they be in attendance for learning to take place.

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

1. Attendance
2. ESSA subgroup related to students with disabilities
3. Instruction in Math related to our lowest 25%
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the early warning systems, 7% of our students have attendance that is less than 90%. Since we missed 5 1/2 months of school in the 2019-2020 school year,due to COVID, it is critical that the students be in attendance everyday.
Measureable Outcome:	By May 2021, our student attendance will increase to 95% of our students having 90% attendance or better.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Staci Mortham (morthams@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be utilizing the Leader in Me program to encourage the students to be engaged in school and increase their excitement about being on campus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The attendance of a student determines the success of each student. If a student is not present on campus, or engaged in class, they are not receiving the instruction needed to master benchmarks.

Action Steps to Implement

Attendance will be traced monthly and monitored. Students will be rewarded for attendance participation.

Person Responsible	Staci Mortham (morthams@leonschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will increase the performance of our ESSA subgroup, Students with disabilities. Current data shows a 28% proficiency. We need to increase this to at least 41%.
Measureable Outcome:	Our students with disability proficiency rate will increase from 28% to 35% by May 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mandy Berigan (beriganm@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will increase the interventions that our ESE students receive through Wonders tier 3 materials. We will also increase the amount of time our students spend receiving small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown that small group instruction as well as tier 3 intervention materials provide scaffolding needed to fill the gaps in student learning. This will help us to increase the proficiency of these students.

Action Steps to Implement

The progress of these students will be monitored bi-weekly to ensure growth is taking place.

Person Responsible	Staci Mortham (morthams@leonschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Math lowest 25th percentile component is at 35% proficiency based on the 2019 Math FSA. We need to increase this to at least 40%.
Measureable Outcome:	We will increase from 35% to 40% with our lowest 25th percentile students in the area of Math based on the 2021 Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Staci Mortham (morthams@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will increase the interventions that our lowest quartile students receive through Go Math tier 3 materials. We will also increase the amount of time our students spend receiving small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown that small group instruction as well as tier 3 intervention materials provide scaffolding needed to fill the gaps in student learning. This will help us to increase the proficiency of these students.

Action Steps to Implement

Progress monitoring will be completed bi-weekly to ensure growth is taking place.

Person Responsible	Staci Mortham (morthams@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The only additional need that we found from our data was the lowest quartile in ELA based on the 2019 ELA FSA. This need was not prioritized due to the growth shown from the 2018 to 2019. We will continue to monitor the students in the lowest quartile and monitor the progress bi-weekly. These students will receive interventions and small group instruction based on their need.

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.

At Canopy Oaks, we utilize the Leader in Me program. Through this program, we are empowering our students to take ownership over their school and their learning. Through partnerships with the local university, and community members, we are building a family environment for our students and their families. In addition, we utilize the School Advisory Council to provide support for the school and to address concerns in the areas of safety.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

		Part V: Budget	
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00