Frank E. Brigham Academy

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Frank E. Brigham Academy

601 AVENUE C SE, Winter Haven, FL 33880

http://schools.polk-fl.net/brighamacademy

Demographics

Principal: Lynn Boland

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2019

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)	78%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (63%) 2014-15: A (73%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Polk 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

Frank E. Brigham Academy

601 AVENUE C SE, Winter Haven, FL 33880

http://schools.polk-fl.net/brighamacademy

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	51%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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 Brigham Academy is to ensure rigorous, relevant learning experiences that result in high achievement for all students. Students will excel in all areas of academic learning by utilizing cooperative teaching strategies, and a project-based learning approach, while focusing on high expectations and critical thinking skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is our vision at Brigham Academy to develop each child to his or her fullest potential through both academic and personal achievement. We stress individual responsibility and citizenship, to develop tomorrow's leaders in an ever-changing global society through the promotion of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM).

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Boland, Lynn	Principal	
May, Lori	Assistant Principal	
Harper, Scott	Instructional Technology	
Negley, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	
Bailey, Ashley	Other	
Parrish, Renee	Instructional Coach	
Almaraz, Maria	School Counselor	

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	104	84	87	86	87	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	535
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	2	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	2	3	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
29

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/20/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	7	8	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	4	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	7	8	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	4	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	78%	51%	57%	75%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	51%	58%	60%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	49%	53%	42%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	85%	57%	63%	82%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	79%	56%	62%	75%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	47%	51%	67%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	70%	47%	53%	79%	46%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	104 (0)	84 (0)	87 (0)	86 (0)	87 (0)	87 (0)	535 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	4 (8)	4 (7)	2 (8)	3 (5)	2 (6)	2 (5)	17 (39)
One or more suspensions	2 (4)	3 (1)	0 (0)	2 (2)	0 (3)	2 (0)	9 (10)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 (2)	2 (4)	3 (1)	1 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (8)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (4)	9 (5)	10 (7)	23 (16)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	81%	52%	29%	58%	23%
	2018	83%	51%	32%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	48%	35%	58%	25%
	2018	66%	48%	18%	56%	10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	70%	47%	23%	56%	14%
	2018	71%	50%	21%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	92%	56%	36%	62%	30%
	2018	77%	56%	21%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	56%	27%	64%	19%
	2018	70%	57%	13%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	81%	51%	30%	60%	21%
	2018	88%	56%	32%	61%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	70%	45%	25%	53%	17%
	2018	76%	51%	25%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	33			64							
BLK	59	55	40	75	63	43	55				
HSP	79	67	50	79	75	45	63				
MUL	75			92							
WHT	88	64	67	92	85	93	82				
FRL	63	61	48	73	71	56	46				

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
SWD	40			30							
ELL	36			43							
ASN	90			90							
BLK	51	46	44	66	73	69	53				
HSP	79	59		73	67	60	76				
WHT	79	48	28	85	67	63	82				
FRL	67	49	44	70	67	65	61				
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
ASN	79	60		86	90						
BLK	57	59	53	73	62	60	62				
HSP	78	50		85	73		75				
WHT	82	63	44	85	79	62	88				
FRL	64	53	37	73	72	65	68				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	84
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	82
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Our lowest performance was in ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. Although we have made improvement, this was our lowest area last year too.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was Science. Some possible factors that contributed to this decline was new curriculum with limited professional development and a general misconception of achievement level descriptions.

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 only area we scored below the state average was in ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. A factor that may have contributed to this gap is an inconsistent system of monitoring students ranking in the bottom 25.

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

The data component reflecting the most improvement was ELA Learning Gains. Actions that contributed to this growth was the implementation of Reader's Workshop and increasing time students engage in independent reading.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The greatest area of concern is students scoring a Level 1 on the statewide assessment.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
2. Increase in the number of discipline referrals
3. Math Lowest 25th Percentile
4. Science Proficiency Levels

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	We selected this area because FSA data reflected performance below the state average.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	On the Spring 2020 FSA ELA Assessment, 60% of students identified within ELA's lowest 25th percentile will make learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lynn Boland (lynn.boland@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	The leadership team will partner with 4th and 5th grade teachers to develop a researched-based action plan for each student within the bottom 25th percentile of English Language Arts. In addition, we will implement a system to monitor student performance on a monthly basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale driving this strategy is the need for individualized instruction and reinforcement of approaches to learning (formally transdisciplinary skills). As a team we will review student data (evidence of learning) to accurately identify and remediate areas of weakness while also building upon student's thinking skills. Resources: FSA Data and reports, STAR Data and reports, Power Hour resources, student surveys, Making the PYP Happen, The Reading Strategy Book and Action Plan template.

Action Step	
Description	1. Cross reference beginning of year data with the 2019 FSA data to identify students within the bottom 25th percentile. 2. Analyze testing data and student input to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses. 3. Refer to texts such as "The Reading Strategy Book" and "Making PYP Happen" as tools to develop an individualized action plan. 4. Work with students to implement, monitor and reflect on the action plan. 5. Revise as needed
Person Responsible	Renee Parrish (renee.parrish@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Conditions within the Learning Environment
Rationale	Our data reflects an increase in the amount of referrals.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2019- 2020 school year, we will decrease the amount of referrals by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lori May (lori.may@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will spend 10 minutes a day working on Sanford Harmony lessons to reinforce the Learner Profile and Essential Agreements.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy is because Harmony lessons are designed foster communication, connection, and community both in and outside the classroom, and develop boys and girls into compassionate and caring adults.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will receive training on Sanford Harmony. 2. Teachers will receive Harmony Kits and work with students to create Essential Agreements and build on the Learner Profile. 3. Guidance Counselor will model lessons and work with teachers to schedule lesson times. 4. Leadership team will monitor implementation and provide feedback. 5. Review and reflect on discipline data during PBIS Meetings and Data Chats 6. Revise plan as needed
Person Responsible	Maria Almaraz (maria.almaraz@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Brigham Academy uses a variety of means to communicate with families. We have a school website and utilize social media to continuously updated and notify parents of current events. A monthly schoolwide newsletter is distributed and placed on the school's website. The principal uses the School Messenger phone system to inform parents of important information on an as needed basis. Grade levels and individual teachers send newsletters, e-mails, and communicate through agendas and phone calls.

Some use online communication such as Remind and Class Dojo. Parents are provided access to their child's academic records through an online parent portal. Evening events are held throughout the year to highlight academics, showcase global cultures, promote literacy, and celebrate our STEM and I.B. focus. In addition, to spotlight the arts program, the Art and Music department host performances throughout the school year.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Brigham Academy promotes and encourages the development of positive behavior traits by focusing on the International Baccalaureate Learner Profile. Within each transdisciplinary unit, students explore and discuss the learner profile attributes. Students whom exhibit the attribute are rewarded with a certificate and recognized at award assemblies.

The guidance counselor provides counseling to students in need when requested by parents and/or school personnel. Students with a previous record of poor attendance are monitored by the guidance counselor and school social worker. Intervention meetings are held with parents to promote improved attendance. Students with improved attendance are rewarded with a special lunch with the school guidance counselor.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

All members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule. Collaboration occurs across grade levels and content areas. Staff members implement a formal process that promotes productive discussion about student learning. School personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The leadership team is developing a sustainability plan, in order to facilitate and continue the STEM program while balancing it with the requirements of International Baccalaureate (I.B.). Grade levels will complete a needs assessment to provide the leadership team with items in need of sustaining the STEM program while working towards becoming an I.B. School . Items needed must meet a set criteria by the principal, in order to yield the highest student impact.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Conditions within the Learning Environment	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**