

Suwannee County Schools

Branford Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Branford Elementary School

26801 STATE ROAD 247, Branford, FL 32008

bes.suwannee.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Deidre Mcmanaway

Start Date for this Principal: 7/16/2018

| | |
|--|---|
| 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) | 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* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (45%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Suwannee County School Board on 9/22/2020.

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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Branford Elementary School

26801 STATE ROAD 247, Branford, FL 32008

bes.suwannee.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">97%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">22%</p> |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Suwannee County School Board on 9/22/2020.

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.

Branford Elementary School along with all Suwannee County Schools will educate all students in a safe and supportive learning environment that will develop life-long learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Branford Elementary School along with all Suwannee County Schools will be a district of excellence ensuring all students are prepared for personal success.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| McManaway, Deidre | Principal | Personnel Issues Program Development Teacher Evaluation/Observation Professional Assistance Plan Beginning Teacher Program/Intern Program Finance and Budgeting Teacher Handbook Room Assignments School Improvement Plan Activity (Master) Schedule Student Promotion/Retention Lesson Plans/Gradebooks Data Collection/Progress Monitoring Maintenance and Custodial Events Calendar Parent Conference Copies End of Year Checklist Student Placement Curriculum Issues Testing (iReady, FSA) Textbook Inventory/Ordering Title I Crate Parent Concerns Safety/ Security Issues |
| Busch, Stephenie | Assistant Principal | Emergency Procedures/Drills Furniture/Equipment Procurement Attendance and Truancy Teacher Observations Teacher/ Staff Evaluation Title I Crate Daily Curriculum Issues Security Student Placement School Safety Issues Lesson Plans/Gradebooks Discipline/Behavior Issues Testing (iReady, FSA) Facilities and Ground Maintenance Duty Schedules Professional Development Report Cards/Progress Reports Safety Committee End of Year Checklist Teacher Handbook Reading Pal Assistant Volunteer Orientation School Advisory Council Agendas School Improvement Plan |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | Personnel Issues Parent Concerns Threat Assessments WIDA Testing Coordinator |
| Williams, Margaret | School Counselor | Counseling ESOL Coordinator WIDA Testing ESE / 504 Documentation ESE Staffings Rti Coordinator FSA, iReady Testing Character Education Threat Assessments Behavioral Plans School Supplies for students in need Clothing/Shoes for students in need Anti-Bullying Awareness |
| Flowers, Lisa | Instructional Coach | Non-evaluative Classroom Observations Teacher Support Curriculum Needs Rti Facilitator Professional Development Needs FSA, iReady assistance -testing/ proctor Data Collection (all subject areas) Writing Curriculum Support AR - Award's S.T.E.M. Day Coordinator Student Support- Small group pull out FLKRS Assessment assistance for Kindergarten |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/16/2018, Deidre Mcmanaway

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.*

0

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

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) | 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* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (45%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |
| * 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 | 94 | 114 | 103 | 86 | 88 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 573 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 36 | 26 | 20 | 22 | 24 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/24/2020

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 | 100 | 102 | 87 | 93 | 109 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 605 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 27 | 20 | 18 | 8 | 15 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| One or more suspensions | 12 | 11 | 15 | 10 | 11 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 | 23 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 35 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |

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 | 3 | 11 | 4 | 9 | 12 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |

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 | 7 | 16 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 100 | 102 | 87 | 93 | 109 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 605 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 27 | 20 | 18 | 8 | 15 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| One or more suspensions | 12 | 11 | 15 | 10 | 11 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 | 23 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 35 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |

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 | 3 | 11 | 4 | 9 | 12 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |

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 | 7 | 16 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 59% | 53% | 57% | 57% | 50% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 55% | 64% | 58% | 53% | 68% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 56% | 50% | 53% | 51% | 47% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 61% | 55% | 63% | 67% | 57% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 49% | 64% | 62% | 65% | 70% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 30% | 31% | 51% | 52% | 48% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 52% | 48% | 53% | 35% | 34% | 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 | 72% | 56% | 16% | 58% | 14% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 55% | 4% | 57% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 53% | 48% | 5% | 58% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 46% | 13% | 56% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 52% | 47% | 5% | 56% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 55% | 48% | 7% | 55% | 0% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -7% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 70% | 61% | 9% | 62% | 8% |
| | 2018 | 71% | 63% | 8% | 62% | 9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 52% | 50% | 2% | 64% | -12% |
| | 2018 | 58% | 40% | 18% | 62% | -4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -19% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 60% | 43% | 17% | 60% | 0% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 47% | 6% | 61% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 50% | 44% | 6% | 53% | -3% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 54% | 40% | 14% | 55% | -1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 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 | 24 | 38 | 43 | 33 | 45 | 28 | 21 | | | | |
| ELL | 57 | 46 | | 43 | 46 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 66 | 55 | | 60 | 55 | | 42 | | | | |
| MUL | 44 | 33 | | 31 | 8 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 57 | 58 | 63 | 52 | 30 | 56 | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 49 | 50 | 56 | 46 | 31 | 40 | | | | |

| 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 | 20 | 35 | 25 | 34 | 30 | 18 | 30 | | | | |
| ELL | 53 | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 53 | | 66 | 47 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 59 | | | 65 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 56 | 40 | 62 | 43 | 22 | 58 | | | | |
| FRL | 54 | 54 | 42 | 57 | 38 | 23 | 51 | | | | |

| 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 | 29 | 38 | 27 | 49 | 57 | | 18 | | | | |
| BLK | | | | 40 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 54 | 53 | | 75 | 67 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 91 | | | 82 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | 54 | 53 | 66 | 66 | 53 | 37 | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 43 | 50 | 61 | 61 | 48 | 20 | | | | |

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 | 53 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 60 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 422 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|----------------------|--|
|----------------------|--|

| Students With Disabilities | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
|-----------------------------------|--|

| | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 33 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| English Language Learners | |
|----------------------------------|--|
|----------------------------------|--|

| | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 50 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|--|

| | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 57 |
| 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 | 29 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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.

While the learning gains for the lowest quartile in mathematics did increase 6 percentage points in SY18/19, BES lowest quartile in mathematics is still 17 percentage points below the state average AND this component is still the lowest performing. It is clear between SY17/18 and SY18/19 teachers shared they had more opportunities within their schedule to work with students in small groups and individually to close the gaps in mathematics. With this trend in mind, the schedule for SY19/20 has been tailored to implement quality intervention time in mathematics.

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

The most significant decline to note at BES is the collective drop in fourth grade. In ELA as well as mathematics, the drop was 6 percentile points in both subjects. After discussing some pointed facts about that grade level structure in SY18/19, the consensus was definitely student scheduling. There was a very unique teaming strategy among 5 teachers that allowed some students to have two teachers all day and others to have three teachers. With this scheduling challenge, perhaps some students did not get the instructional time necessary in order to close the gaps in learning for both

subjects. In SY19/20, not only has the Leadership Team created optimum instructional time in the schedule for this grade level, but personnel changes to this grade level have been made as well.

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 component with the greatest gap is 3rd grade ELA. The gap is the greatest in a positive direction. BES 3rd Grade ELA scored 72% of students scoring a Level 3, 4, or 5 on FSA ELA while the State Average showed 58%. The BES 3rd Grade team targeted students in need of immediate intensive interventions and delivered skill based instruction to students in small groups daily or individually as necessary.

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

The data component showing the most improvement is 3rd grade ELA. BES 3rd Grade ELA scored 72% of students scoring a Level 3, 4, or 5 on FSA ELA. This is an improvement of 13 percentage points from the previous year. There was one personnel unit change and as stated before some targeted intensive intervention in Reading and Language Arts both in small groups and individually when needed.

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

Initially, an area of main concern is the seemingly never-ending struggle with Kindergarten attendance. Many students in Kindergarten are not of the compulsory age until mid Fall or Winter. Therefore it is difficult to enforce the attendance policy with the teeth it has for children ages 6 - 16. Within the SY18/19 Kindergartners, 26% had attendance less than 90%. During foundation grades such as Kindergarten, students need the daily learning and routine necessary in order to be prepared to move forward. Attendance for the 20/21SY will also be a concern due to managing COVID. Additionally, an area of main concern is the significant increase in the number of students who have two or more EWS as the grade levels increase. While this may be reasoned by simple math and statistics, there seems to be an obvious trend in which BES can focus some energy in order to lessen the number of students who have two or more EWS before fifth grade.

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

1. Safety school-wide
2. Targeted small group intensive intervention in reading AND mathematics in every grade level daily (particularly 4th grade utilizing our intervention block)
3. Student instructional time on task accountable by frequent and regular administrative visits.
4. Improvement of students falling in the ESSA high needs subgroups.

It has been said that if a job in education was easy that everyone would be doing it. The job itself may not be easy, but the plan is simple. When it's all said and done, there are challenges to be faced for children at school, among the community, and even inside the home. In spite of those challenges, educators are flexible and determined to do the best for children. First, the priority is safety within our school. When students come to learn, we owe them a safe atmosphere and a secure knowledge they will return home safe. Second, we all know students come to the starting block called school at many different levels with varieties of background knowledge. The task of BES educators is to even that academic playing field for students by the second grade. Put simply, this can be done by identifying what is missing, and using small group intensive intervention to teach missing skills. Third, there are only six and a half hours students are with us at BES daily. Our task is to use every moment to be sure students are engaged in discussion, tasks, cooperative work, discovery of concepts, and skills

necessary to perform not only for accountability, but life itself. Finally, if students in the lowest quartile, the ones who struggle academically, the ones who have gaps in their academic skills are not present in school we can not help close those gaps. Instead of targeting whole school attendance, BES educators will focus on attendance of those inside the lowest quartile using phone calls, text, email, US Postal Service, DOJO, and any other means by which to contact parents so children may join us in school. In short, our focus is simple and the task ahead is intense. The educators at BES are prepared for the challenge of improvement in the 2019/2020 school year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to targeted intensive mathematics intervention of students in the lowest quartile.

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | While the learning gains for the lowest quartile in mathematics did increase 6 percentage points in SY18/19, BES lowest quartile in mathematics is still 17 percentage points below the state average AND this component is still the lowest performing. It is clear between SY17/18, SY18/19, and SY19/20 teachers shared they had more opportunities within their schedule to work with students in small groups and individually to close the gaps in mathematics. With this trend in mind, the schedule for SY20/21 has been tailored to provide quality intervention time in mathematics. |
|---|--|

Measurable Outcome: Branford Elementary School will increase learning gains of the lowest quartile in Mathematics by 10% during the 2021 Spring state-wide testing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deidre McManaway (deidre.mcmanaway@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: In mathematics, students must be able to not only know the procedure of math but the concept as well. By organizing small groups based upon the identification of students who needs some extra instruction in the concept being taught, students can gain the knowledge necessary to master the standard of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy of explicit small group instruction ensures mastery of standards by every student. Using the RtI/MTSS process, a teacher will know who is ready with the mathematical understanding of the concept and who needs more instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teaching occurs in a whole group.
2. Teaching occurs in small groups based upon students who needs to still master a skill during intervention.
3. Teacher monitors instruction keeping data for students needing intervention
4. Leadership Team meets with teachers monthly to discuss students' progress and challenges faced
5. Teacher plans and prepares the process once more for a new concept or repeats instruction using a different type of instruction.

Person Responsible: Deidre McManaway (deidre.mcmanaway@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student academic time on task- Students come to the starting block in Kindergarten at many different levels with varieties of background knowledge. The task of BES educators is to even that academic playing field for students by the second grade. Beyond second grade it becomes more and more challenging to provide instruction on the grade level standards when students do not have the previous three grades worth of standards mastered.

Measurable Outcome: Branford Elementary School will show an increase in ELA and Mathematics learning achievement by 5 percentage points or more respectively.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deidre McManaway (deidre.mcmanaway@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will differentiate their lessons to meet the needs of ALL our learners at BES. Administration will visit regularly to ensure accountability and provide assistance for success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students learn in different ways. BES teachers will differentiate the lessons to meet those student needs for learning. Some will learn by talking it out with peers. Some will learn by listening. Some will have to touch and experience a concept in math, while others may need to create diagrams or visuals to process literacy concepts. Lessons will not simply be a lecture or delivery. BES teachers will facilitate learning more than they pass along knowledge as has been the tradition.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers' lesson planning and preparation will reflect differentiation for ALL learners
2. Teachers will facilitate lessons to meet students' different learning styles
3. Administration will support teachers as they meet those needs with class visits and regular conversations for success.

Person Responsible: Deidre McManaway (deidre.mcmanaway@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Students With Disabilities (SWD) that struggle academically are the ones who have gaps in their academic skills. BES educators will focus on targeted skills through the use of intervention strategies in order to close the gaps for these students.

Measurable Outcome: Branford Elementary School will show 10% increase in the subgroup percent of points for Students With Disabilities (SWD)
 *Approximately 91 students in the 2020.2021 school year

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deidre McManaway (deidre.mcmanaway@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will be scheduled a specific 40 minute block of time in order to provide strategic intensive intervention to Students With Disabilities (SWD). This "Buccaneer Block" will allow support personnel to team up with homeroom teachers and deliver this unique intervention utilizing all personnel in a convenient 40 minute time span.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Creating a unique time in which teachers and support staff can target students for interventions seems evident. Teachers need the opportunity for small group intense instruction and more one on one intervention time. By targeting a specific group of students and monitoring progress for those students, the success rate will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

1. An intervention block of time, known as Buccaneer Block, is used for targeted, intensive intervention for Students With Disabilities (SWD)
2. Homeroom teachers use formative assessments throughout the year in order to target specific skills for focus during Buccaneer Block.
3. Teachers will be offered professional development to further service Students With Disabilities(SWD)
4. Two support facilitators along with a support paraprofessional are available to serve the Students With Disabilities (SWD) throughout Branford Elementary. This support is in addition to the homeroom teacher.

Person Responsible Deidre McManaway (deidre.mcmanaway@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome: Branford Elementary School will provide Multiracial Students with specific intervention in reading and mathematics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deidre McManaway (deidre.mcmanaway@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Branford Elementary School Leadership Team will provide homeroom teachers with a list of Multiracial Students assigned to their classroom. Monthly data and progress meetings with teachers discussing Multiracial Students' progress will take place as Multiracial Students are served in their homerooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale behind identification of the Multiracial Students is simply awareness. As teachers receive their new class lists annually, they may not be aware of these students falling into this specific subgroup. Once identified, the monitoring of progress is simply best practice as this specific subgroup is observed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Multiracial Students will be identified by administration for homeroom teachers.
2. After instruction, Multiracial Students' progress will be monitored monthly for improvement.

Person Responsible: Deidre McManaway (deidre.mcmanaway@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School safety is the number one priority when the doors of Branford Elementary School are open to the public. The Emergency Response Plan created specifically for Branford Elementary School will be drilled and practiced frequently and with fidelity throughout the school year. Branford Elementary will have a Positive Behavior and Safety Committee in place which meets monthly to support the school safety initiative for the whole school.

In order to include external stakeholders such as parents and community participants, Branford Elementary School will hold the monthly School Advisory Council to gain input regarding safety from an external perspective.

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.

Branford Elementary School in spite of recent health safety concerns has opened for the 2020-2021 school year with a positive learning environment. All staff is delighted to be back at school with students. Students and parents clearly expressed how excited they were to have school available once more after being gone since March 13, 2020.

Leadership at BES has gathered with teachers prior to school opening to gain a positive team atmosphere. Once teachers received students, they used team building skills to establish a positive classroom culture. A schedule change and move in personnel has occurred to allow students to experience physical education at the same time. This allows students to see their friends each day at PE no matter who their homeroom teacher is. The Music Room, Media Center, Computer Lab, and STEAM Lab are available to all students on rotation. The impressive collaborative efforts of teachers and students has likely come from the absence of social interaction throughout these unique times of health safety. However, with constant cleaning of specific high traffic areas, students are able to not only maintain the distance but cooperate, collaborate, while creating ideas and projects in the learning process. Perhaps it is the perspective of not having something so available on a regular basis such as school being open, but the culture and environment of Branford Elementary School has indeed been positive.

As the year continues, leadership, faculty, and staff will continue proactive strategies to keep the positive environment. Kindness and anti-bullying will be the focus along with the monthly character education. Projects such as STEAM Lab inventions, ideas in writing, art, computer code, along with successes in academics, shout outs to good choices will all continue to keep Branford Elementary School's culture obviously positive.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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