Brentwood Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Brentwood Elementary School

4820 N PALAFOX ST, Pensacola, FL 32505

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Sewell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 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

Brentwood Elementary School

4820 N PALAFOX ST, Pensacola, FL 32505

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	D	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 Brentwood Elementary is to ensure that every student has the self-confidence, desire, knowledge, and skills needed to lead a responsible and satisfied life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In keeping with our district's vision to be a place where students want to learn, teachers want to teach, parents want to send their children, and employees want to work:

It is the desire of Brentwood Faculty and Staff that we capture the heart and mind of students, parents, and our community, by creating an excellent learning environment for all. We strive to promote love of learning through the use of: Cutting-edge teaching and learning tools, encouragement of good citizenship, and providing problem-solving opportunities so that students will flourish in tomorrow's technology infused world.

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
Sewell, Jennifer	Principal	The purpose of this position is to provide the leadership necessary to design, develop, implement, and evaluate a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources which establish and maintain a safe, caring, and enriching environment to promote student success.
Evans, Quinn	Assistant Principal	The purpose of this position is to assist the Principal with administrative and instructional functions to meet the educational needs of students and carry out the mission and goals of the school and the District.
Mason, Scotti	Teacher, K-12	To teach students subject matter and/or skills that will contribute to their development as mature, able and responsible men and women.
Wiley, Vera	Instructional Media	To teach students subject matter and/or skills that will contribute to their development as mature, able and responsible men and women.
Prout, Nancy	Instructional Coach	To teach students subject matter and/or skills that will contribute to their development as mature, able and responsible men and women.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Jennifer Sewell

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
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](#).	

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	29	51	61	68	58	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	337
Attendance below 90 percent	5	11	8	16	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	12	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	8	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	2	3	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	6	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/24/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	5	17	23	10	21	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	1	11	17	3	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	11	13	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	9	9	0	16	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	11	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	5	17	23	10	21	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	1	11	17	3	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	11	13	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	9	9	0	16	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	11	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	42%	53%	57%	40%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	55%	58%	49%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	52%	53%	47%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	49%	57%	63%	40%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	60%	62%	40%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	52%	51%	35%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	54%	53%	41%	50%	51%

			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	49%	56%	-7%	58%	-9%	
	2018	37%	52%	-15%	57%	-20%	
Same Grade Comparison		12%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	38%	52%	-14%	58%	-20%	
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	56%	-15%	
Same Grade Comparison		-3%					
Cohort Comparison		1%					
05	2019	39%	51%	-12%	56%	-17%	
	2018	27%	44%	-17%	55%	-28%	
Same Grade Comparison		12%					
Cohort Comparison		-2%					

				MATH			
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	57%	55%	2%	62%	-5%	
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	62%	-13%	
Same Grade Comparison		8%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	50%	58%	-8%	64%	-14%	
	2018	42%	58%	-16%	62%	-20%	
Same Grade Comparison		8%					
Cohort Comparison		1%					
05	2019	35%	55%	-20%	60%	-25%	
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	61%	-19%	
Same Grade Comparison		-7%					
Cohort Comparison		-7%					

				SCIENCE			
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	49%	55%	-6%	53%	-4%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	36%	55%	-19%	55%	-19%
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	43	62	42	60	55	35				
BLK	30	45	67	41	52	58	31				
HSP	50	47		59	63						
MUL	52	57		57	50						
WHT	53	43		56	51		76				
FRL	41	46	64	48	51	59	52				
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	7	26	39	17	26	29	25				
BLK	23	24	33	35	41	36	23				
HSP	33	43		50	64						
MUL	40	29		57	50						
WHT	56	49		61	46		64				
FRL	34	32	30	46	42	31	37				
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
SWD	14	30	44	14	30	20	19				
BLK	29	45	47	29	34	38	23				
HSP	54			46							
MUL	55	62		52	42						
WHT	56	55		58	58		74				
FRL	36	48	49	34	36	33	32				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
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	366
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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
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	46
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	55
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	54
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	56
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	52
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.

SWD ELA achievement was the lowest subgroup at 17% proficiency. We are trending upward from 7% the year prior to 17% this year. We made some instructional shifts to address SWD and how they are served within the classroom.

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

Our WHT in ELA achievement, ELA LG and Math achievement. We believe that the percentage change falls with the standard error of measure for each subgroup. We looked at individual students and will continue to monitor individual scores throughout the year.

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.

5th grade ELA (-28) and Math (-25) were the greatest gap areas as compared to the State average. Due to personnel issues with instructional staff multiple changes had to be made throughout the year.

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

We have three areas that showed 34% growth in our students: SWD in Math LG, BLK bottom quartile LG in ELA, and FRL bottom quartile LG in ELA. To achieve this growth we reallocated staff, dismissed instructional staff, monitored unit tests, retaught missed information immediately, implementing writing assistance with Curriculum Coordinator. We had target students what we focused on for learning, conducted daily walk throughs, eliminated extraneous activities not related to academic success.

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

The two areas of concern for us are the attendance below 90% (93) and our students who scored a Level 1 on the statewide assessments (47). The loss of instructional time is irreplaceable and moving students out of a Level 1 is difficult.

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

1. Increase ELA Proficiency
2. Increase ELA Learning Gains
3. Increase Math Proficiency
4. Increase Math Learning Gains
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA proficiency is 42%. This is below the District average (53%) by 11% as well as the State average (57%) by 15%. In addition, ELA LG is 45%. This is also below the District average (55%) by 10% and the State (58%) by 13%. Student leaning is impacted in all core academic areas.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency will increase from 42% to 47% overall. ELA LG will increase from 45% to 50% overall.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. In analyzing our 2019 FSA data and 2020 progress monitoring, independent use of reading comprehension strategies is a hindrance to student academic performance in ELA as well as other content areas. According to the What Works Clearinghouse, IES Practice Guide, teaching reading comprehension strategies has a strong positive effect on comprehension when measured by standardized tests and researcher-created measures.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Carefully select the text to use when when beginning to teach a reading strategy.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)

2. Show students how to apply the strategies they are learning

Person Responsible	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)

3. Make sure that the text is appropriate fro the instructional reading level of students.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)

4. Use a direct and explicit instructional lesson plan for teaching students how to use comprehension strategies with specific and timely feedback.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)

5. Provide the appropriate amount of guided practice depending on the difficulty level of the strategies that students are learning. Continually spiral the strategies into all content areas.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)

6. Talk about comprehension strategies while teaching them; including modeling and "think aloud"and integrate into all content areas.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In analyzing our data, ELA Proficiency is 42%. This is below the District average by 11% and below the State by 15%. In addition, ELA LG are 45%, also below the District average by 10% and the State average by 10%. Student learning is impacted in all core academic areas.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency for our students in grades 3-5 will increase from 42% to 47%. ELA LG for our students in grades 3-5 will increase from 45% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	2. Provide specific vocabulary instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	2. In analyzing our 2019 FSA data and 2020 progress monitoring, vocabulary acquisition appears to be a hindrance to comprehension. According to the What Works Clearinghouse, IES Practice Guide, explicit vocabulary instruction, both as part of reading, language arts and content areas such as science and social studies, assists students in strengthening their independent skills of constructing the meaning of text.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Dedicate a portion of regular classroom lessons to explicit vocabulary instruction.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)

2. Provide repeated exposure to new words in multiple contexts through discussion, writing and extended reading.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)

3. Provide students strategies to make them independent vocabulary learners. These include direct instruction of word parts and their meaning across all subject areas.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math proficiency is 49%. This is below the District average (57%) by 9% as well as the State average (63%) by 14%. In addition, Math LG is 53%. This is also below the District average (60%) by 7% and the State (62%) by 9%. As a result of these weaknesses, our students struggle to keep up with the pacing as expected by the district and state. Therefore, there are deficits in some standards.
Measurable Outcome:	Student proficiency in math will increase from 49% to 54%. Math LG will increase from 53% to 58%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teach students how to use visual representations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In analyzing our 2019 FSA data and 2020 progress monitoring, according to Jitendra et al. (1998); Xin, Jitendra, and Deatline-Buchman (2005); Jitendra et al.,(2009); Jitendra et al. (2010); Terwel et al. (2009); Selke, Behr, and Voelker (1991) in the What Works Clearinghouse, Educators Practice Guide visual representations help students solve problems by linking the relationships between quantities in the problem with the mathematical operations needed to solve the problem. Students who learn to visually represent the mathematical information in problems prior to writing an equation are more effective at problem solving.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Select visual representations that are appropriate for students and the problems
they are solving.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)

2. Use think-alouds and discussions to teach students how to represent problems visually.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)

3. Show students how to convert the visually represented information into
mathematical notation.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will assess students using STAR 360, iReady, quarter exams, and unit tests that will be used to "look" at the students growth and areas of need. Teachers and admin will meet with individual students throughout the year to discuss their individual data and to assist with any individual needs a student may have.
The school leadership team will monitor the professional learning needs of the staff and work with admin to provide needed trainings and resources to teachers.

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.

Teachers communicate daily and weekly with parents using a behavior form.
School Website is updated regularly with school information.
Principal newsletter sent out to parents every other month.
Class DOJO is used as a PBS tool in all grade levels daily: parents are able to join the app to communicate with the teacher.
Brentwood Facebook page is updated regularly.
Electronic marquis is updated regularly with news and reminders.
Parent call outs through "school messenger" as needed.
Rti meetings and parents conferences are conducted throughout the year.
Full time ESE teacher to support teachers and students with PBS initiatives.

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

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**