Escambia County School District

Bratt Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bratt Elementary School

5721 HIGHWAY 99, Century, FL 32535

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Amy Mccrory

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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

Bratt Elementary School

5721 HIGHWAY 99, Century, FL 32535

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 PK-5	Yes	71%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	A

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.

Bratt Elementary School supports the Escambia County School District's mission to provide an environment that creates opportunities for all students to achieve their highest potential while building a foundation for continuous learning.
We believe the education of each child is a shared responsibility of the parents, teachers, staff, and community. Our school provides opportunities which encourage parents to be actively involved in the education of their child. Bratt Elementary is committed to building stronger links between school, home, and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bratt Elementary School reinforces the Escambia County School District's vision to create a school district where parents want to send their children, students want to learn, and teachers want to teach. We strive to provide a stimulating learning environment where students are actively engaged in the learning process and equipped with the necessary tools to become life-long learners and productive community members.

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
Hall, Karen	Principal	Our Leadership Team collaborates to oversee all functions within the school. Each member considers input and feedback from teachers and staff regarding ways to maximize student learning and further our mission and vision. Having administration, guidance, regular ed, special ed, and special area represented allows Bratt to represent all areas of student learning. As our Principal and the head of our Leadership Team, Mrs. Hall communicates state and district expectations and leads our team through shared decision making.
Entrekin, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Our Leadership Team collaborates to oversee all functions within the school. Each member considers input and feedback from teachers and staff regarding ways to maximize student learning and further our mission and vision. Having administration, guidance, regular ed, special ed, and special area represented allows Bratt to represent all areas of student learning. As the Assistant Principal, Mrs. Entrekin communicates state and district expectations and helps to lead our team through shared decision making.
Bryan, Sheila	School Counselor	Our Leadership Team collaborates to oversee all functions within the school. Each member considers input and feedback from teachers and staff regarding ways to maximize student learning and further our mission and vision. Having administration, guidance, regular ed, special ed, and special area represented allows Bratt to represent all areas of student learning. As our Guidance Counselor, Mrs. Bryan helps ensure proper implementation of the MTSS and RtI process.
Kite, Sharon	Teacher, ESE	Our Leadership Team collaborates to oversee all functions within the school. Each member considers input and feedback from teachers and staff regarding ways to maximize student learning and further our mission and vision. Having administration, guidance, regular ed, special ed, and special area represented allows Bratt to represent all areas of student learning. As an ESE teacher, Mrs. Kite provides input and guidance as to the best way to reach students with disabilities and communicates how our ESE and general education teachers work together to provide information about core and remedial instruction, data collection,and effective delivery of content at all levels.
Gilman, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Our Leadership Team collaborates to oversee all functions within the school. Each member considers input and feedback from teachers and staff regarding ways to maximize student learning and further our mission and vision. Having administration, guidance, regular ed, special

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		ed, and special area represented allows Bratt to represent all areas of student learning. As a regular education teacher, Mrs. Gilman provides input and guidance as to effective instructional methods and communicates how our ESE and general education teachers work together to provide information about core and remedial instruction, data collection,and effective delivery of content at all levels.
Gilmore, Shonna	Instructional Media	Our Leadership Team collaborates to oversee all functions within the school. Each member considers input and feedback from teachers and staff regarding ways to maximize student learning and further our mission and vision. Having administration, guidance, regular ed, special ed, and special area represented allows Bratt to represent all areas of student learning. As our media specialist, Mrs. Gilmore assists in nurturing a love of reading through media visits, AR, and weekly STREAM visits to the Innovation Center.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2010, Amy Mccrory

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.*
5

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.*
9

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 PK-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)	90%
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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (59%)

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	61	67	83	80	77	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	464
Attendance below 90 percent	11	23	15	8	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	4	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	4	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/23/2020

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	69	76	85	78	90	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	463
Attendance below 90 percent	14	17	14	10	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	2	3	3	1	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	3	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	21	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	2	1	4	3	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	2	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	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	
Number of students enrolled	69	76	85	78	90	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	463
Attendance below 90 percent	14	17	14	10	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	2	3	3	1	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	3	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	21	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	2	1	4	3	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	2	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	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	63%	53%	57%	62%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	55%	58%	58%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	52%	53%	48%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	76%	57%	63%	78%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	79%	60%	62%	78%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	76%	52%	51%	75%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	54%	53%	68%	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	60%	56%	4%	58%	2%
	2018	72%	52%	20%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
	2018	59%	51%	8%	56%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	62%	51%	11%	56%	6%
	2018	38%	44%	-6%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	55%	7%	62%	0%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	58%	25%	64%	19%
	2018	82%	58%	24%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		27%				
05	2019	78%	55%	23%	60%	18%
	2018	64%	52%	12%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	58%	55%	3%	53%	5%
	2018	58%	55%	3%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	36	42	40	61	79	73					
AMI	73			100							
BLK	43	48	36	51	72	82	29				
MUL	90			70							
WHT	67	58	55	81	81	72	68				
FRL	52	49	40	68	78	81	49				

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	21	23	21	36	55	54	27				
AMI	38			54							
BLK	32	35	31	53	50	58	13				
MUL	70			60							
WHT	63	46	29	76	73	71	78				
FRL	48	38	24	66	64	59	59				

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	16	24	27	42	62	64	20				
AMI	36			64							
BLK	32	50	33	70	79	83	33				
WHT	71	59	57	81	80	72	81				
FRL	52	53	43	73	78	71	54				

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	66
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	461
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
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	87
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	52
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	80
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	69
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	60
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.

We continue to make improvements in the performance of our lowest quartile ELAstudents and desire to maintain that progression.

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

Our Science proficiency decreased from 60% to 58%. We do not believe that this is a trend, as we have historically performed very well in Science. As teachers become more familiar with our new science curriculum, they will be able to more easily use the materials and integrate science content into other subject areas.

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.

Our ELA lowest quartile students had the largest gap when compared to the state average, with the state average being 53% and Bratt's being 50%. The students in this quartile often exhibit multiple EWS indicators.

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

Ironically, our ELA lowest quartile actually made the most improvement, going from 31% to 50%. We focused on differentiating instruction through monitoring and examination of data such as iReady, STAR, etc.

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

One area of concern is the number of students (85) exhibiting attendance below 90%. Included in this number are 23 incoming first graders and 17 incoming fifth graders. There are 12 ELA Level 1 students and 15 Math Level 1 students in fifth grade.

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

1. ELA lowest quartile proficiency
2. ELA learning gains
3. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Although we have increased the proficiency of our lowest quartile students from 31 to 50%, we wish to continue that increase so that all students receive maximum benefit from instruction and achieve academic success. We also wish to continue increasing our learning gains, as we have improved them from 43% to 59%.
Measurable Outcome:	Our desired outcome is to increase proficiency for our lowest quartile students by 10% or more and to increase learning gains by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Entrekin (lentrekin@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will screen all students for potential reading problems at the beginning and middle of the year and regularly monitor progress of all students. We will provide intensive, systematic instruction in small groups to all students four to five times per week for 40 minutes. We have set the stage for success by utilizing the ELA frameworks and decision trees. This implementation will be overseen by administration and monitored by classroom teachers. We will examine assessment data such as Reading Wonders Assessments, STAR 360 performance, and iReady data to determine the most appropriate interventions. Students will be grouped accordingly, and we will implement a daily walk and read model to best meet student needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We selected this strategy because reading achievement for all students is a state, district, and school area of focus; for the ability to read is the foundation of academic success. According to "Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades", published by What Works Clearinghouse, screening students for potential reading problems at the beginning and middle of the year and monitoring the progress of students has a moderate level of evidence in predicting reading performance. Providing intensive, systematic reading instruction for all students based on assessments of current reading levels has a strong level of evidence.

Action Steps to Implement

Train teachers in the use of ELA frameworks and Decision Trees.
Examine data listed above to determine needs and provide differentiation/intervention.
Appropriately group students for differentiation/intervention
Implement walk and read model
Begin training on the B.E.S.T. standards

Person Responsible	Lisa Entrekin (lentrekin@ecsdfl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have 85 students exhibiting attendance below 90%. Of these 85, there are 23 incoming first graders and 17 incoming fifth graders. There are 12 ELA Level 1 students and 15 Math Level 1 students in fifth grade with attendance below 90%. Students must be present and actively engaged to benefit from instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	We would like to decrease by 10% or more the number of students exhibiting attendance below 90%. We would also like to decrease the number of Level 1 students by 10% or more.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karen Hall (jhall2@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Along with an emphasis on intervention, we will have daily time to focus on Tier 1 behavior instruction/character development for all students. We will emphasize attendance in multiple ways to increase attendance rate in all grades. We will teach and reinforce new skills to increase appropriate behavior and preserve a positive classroom climate.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to "Reducing Behavior Problems in the Elementary School Classroom", published by What Works Clearinghouse", actively teaching socially and behaviorally appropriate skills to replace problem behaviors using strategies focused on both individual students and the whole classroom has a strong level of evidence in decreasing inappropriate behaviors and increasing academic engagement. Improving on task behavior will have an impact on attendance and enable teachers and students to develop relationships as they collaborate on learning. Consistent attendance allows students to benefit more fully from instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule common time for behavior/character development instruction.
Provide curriculum/resources for staff.
Support behavior instruction through CCTV with Guidance Counselor.
Walkthrough visits by admin to support and maintain implementation
Have teachers log two positive phone calls per week in Google Drive.
Emphasize attendance through resources such as school website and newsletter.
Ensure teachers make phone calls when students are out two consecutive days.
Communicate attendance policies to families and bring students to Child Study if needed.

Person Responsible	Sheila Bryan (sbryan@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will have quarterly leadership team meetings to discuss progress towards our identified goals and will communicate and meet regularly with instructional staff to analyze data and make adjustments as needed.

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.

Bratt Elementary receives TITLE 1, Part A funds and is developing a written Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) that establishes our expectations for parent and family engagement. This plan will describe how we will carry out the programs, activities, and procedures in accordance with the definitions in Section 8101 of ESEA. This plan is developed jointly and agreed upon with the families of children participating in TITLE 1, Part A programs.
A Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is written in collaboration with parents, community stakeholders, and school personnel responsible for implementing the plan. The PFEP will assess the previous year's PFEP results and current needs. The plan will outline goals, strategies and activities to better communicate with families and will focus on building the capacity of parents to address the needs of all students, in particular those most at-risk of not meeting challenging State academic standards. The PFEP will be reviewed by the district Title I office and the approved plan will be disseminated to parents and stakeholders. A Family-School Compact will also be developed jointly with parents and other stakeholders. The school's Title I budget will directly support the PFEP.

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: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**