

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## **Table of Contents**

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Escambia - 0101 - Bratt Elementary School - 2019-20 SIP

## **Bratt Elementary School**

5721 HIGHWAY 99, Century, FL 32535

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

## **Principal: Amy Mccrory**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2019

2019-20 Status	
(per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
	2018-19: A (66%)
	2017-18: B (57%)
School Grades History	2016-17: A (67%)
	2015-16: B (59%)
	2014-15: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Inf	formation*
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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

#### 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Escambia - 0101 - Bratt Elementary School - 2019-20 SIP

## **Bratt Elementary School**

5721 HIGHWAY 99, Century, FL 32535

#### www.escambiaschools.org

**School Demographics** 

School Type and Gr (per MSID I		2018-19 Title I School	I Disadvant	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Elementary S PK-5	school	Yes		78%
Primary Servic (per MSID F	• •	Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General E	ducation	No		35%
School Grades Histo	ory			
Year Grade	<b>2018-19</b> A	<b>2017-18</b> В	<b>2016-17</b> A	<b>2015-16</b> B
School Board Appro	val			

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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### 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 and position title 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 ensures proper implementation of MTSS.
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 ed, and special area

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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.
Smith, Laura	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. Smith assists in nurturing a love of reading through media visits, AR, and weekly STREAM visits to the Innovation Center.

### Early Warning Systems

#### **Current Year**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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													
indicator	Κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total			
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:

Indiantar		Grade Level													
Indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
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	

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

24

# Date this data was collected or last updated Wednesday 8/21/2019

#### **Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	1	9	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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

Indicator		Grade Level													
Indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	

#### **Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													
indicator	κ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	1	9	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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

Indicator		Grade Level									Total			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

### 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 Grade Component	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%	

School Grade Component		2019		2018			
School Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	
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)								
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	Total		
Number of students enrolled	69 (0)	76 (0)	85 (0)	78 (0)	90 (0)	65 (0)	463 (0)		
Attendance below 90 percent	14 (0)	17 (3)	14 (3)	10 (0)	13 (1)	8 (4)	76 (11)		
One or more suspensions	2 (2)	3 (0)	3 (0)	1 (4)	8 (3)	3 (2)	20 (11)		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (4)	3 (1)	3 (9)	5 (3)	4 (2)	15 (19)		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (7)	21 (17)	9 (14)	34 (38)		

#### Grade Level Data

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

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

			ELA			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
03	2019	60%	56%	4%	58%	2%
	2018	72%	52%	20%	57%	15%
Same Grade C	omparison	-12%				
Cohort Com	parison					
04	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
	2018	59%	51%	8%	56%	3%
Same Grade C	omparison	2%				
Cohort Com	parison	-11%				
05	2019	62%	51%	11%	56%	6%
	2018	38%	44%	-6%	55%	-17%
Same Grade C	omparison	24%			•	
Cohort Com	parison	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 Com						

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
04	2019	83%	58%	25%	64%	19%
	2018	82%	58%	24%	62%	20%
Same Grade C	omparison	1%				
Cohort Com	parison	27%				
05	2019	78%	55%	23%	60%	18%
	2018	64%	52%	12%	61%	3%
Same Grade C	omparison	14%				
Cohort Com	parison	-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 C	Same Grade Comparison											
Cohort Com												

## Subgroup Data

		2019	SCHOO	OL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	SCHOO	OL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	SCHOO	OL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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							

	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
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%	
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%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

#### Analysis

#### **Data Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Although Bratt met last year's goal of increasing ELA learning gains and ELA lowest quartile, we still desire to improve these two areas. Our lowest quartile group improved from 31 to 50% proficiency. We continue to have an influx of out of state students, many of whom arrive below grade level.

# 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 teachers become more familiar with our new science curriculum, they will learn to integrate science content into other areas more easily.

# 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 and using iReady.

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

We had 76 K-5 students whose attendance was below 90% last year. Each of the other EWS categories (2 or more EWS indicators, Math or ELA failure, Level 1 on FSA, and suspension) showed the largest total in fourth grade, demonstrating a need for follow up throughout the year to continue improvement.

# 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
- 4.
- 5.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA lowest quartile
Rationale	Our lowest quartile proficiency increased from 31% to 50%. We would like to see this continue to increase so that all students receive maximum benefit from instruction and achieve academic success.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our target is to increase proficiency for our lowest quartile students by 10% or more.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Entrekin (lentrekin@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence- based Strategy	We have set the stage for student success by outlining expectations for 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, Third Grade Portfolio, STAR 360, and iReady reading data for all students to determine the most appropriate interventions.
Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy	We selected this strategy because it is part of the district ELA initiative as outlined in Florida's K-12 Reading Plan. The Frameworks and Decision Trees guide teachers in identifying students in need of intervention and locating instructional resources.
Action Step	
Description	<ol> <li>Meet with teachers to go over district and school expectations for the frameworks and intervention decision tree.</li> <li>Provide teachers with a list of their lowest quartile ELA students according to STAR 360, iReady, and FSA data.</li> <li>Monitor ongoing use of iReady Reading success.</li> <li>Meet with grade levels to discuss plans for continued improvement.</li> </ol>
Person Responsible	Lisa Entrekin (lentrekin@ecsdfl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA learning gains
Rationale	Our learning gains increased from 43% to 59%. We would like to see this continue to increase so that all students receive maximum benefit from instruction and achieve academic success.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal to increase learning for our students by 10% or more.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Karen Hall (jhall2@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence- based Strategy	We have set the stage for student success by outlining expectations for 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, Third Grade Portfolio, STAR 360, and iReady reading data for all students to determine the most appropriate interventions.
Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy	We selected this strategy because it is part of the district ELA initiative as outlined in Florida's K-12 Reading Plan. The Frameworks and Decision Trees guide teachers in identifying students in need of intervention and locating instructional resources.
Action Step	
Description	<ol> <li>Meet with teachers to go over district and school expectations for the frameworks and intervention decision tree.</li> <li>Provide teachers with a list of their ELA scores according to STAR 360, iReady, and FSA data.</li> <li>Monitor ongoing use of iReady Reading success.</li> <li>Meet with grade levels to discuss plans for continued improvement.</li> </ol>
Person Responsible	Karen Hall (jhall2@ecsdfl.us)

#3	
Title	Students with Disabilities
Rationale	The achievement level of our students with disabilities increased from 21% to 36%. Learning gains went from 23% to 42%. We wish to continue this progress.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We would like to increase by 10% our students with disabilities showing learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Karen Hall (jhall2@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence- based Strategy	We will include this subgroup in the school plans for monitoring achievement through the use of data. Students will be supported by a push-in approach when possible. Students will receive Direct Instruction through either Reading Mastery or Corrective Reading/ Decoding if needed. We plan to use district-purchased Don Johnston learning tools (Snap&Read, Co:Writer, uPAR, etc.).
Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy	This plan will expose students with disabilities to grade level curriculum and provide added reading support through the use of research-based programs.
Action Step	
Description	<ol> <li>Placement test students for Reading Mastery or Corrective Reading; monitor ongoing implementation</li> <li>Monitor in-program assessments of RM and CRP/Decoding</li> <li>Monitor Reading Wonders, STAR 360, and iReady</li> <li>Ask Technology Support to push out extensions for Don Johnston learning tools.</li> <li>Ensure classroom and ESE teachers are familiar with tools in #4.</li> </ol>
Person Responsible	Lisa Entrekin (lentrekin@ecsdfl.us)

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

Although Bratt has an average daily attendance rate of over 95%, 76 students had a rate below 90% last year. Of those 76, 14 had either a course failure or a Level 1 on the FSA. We will utilize resource such as the school website and newsletter to emphasize attendance and will have teachers follow up in classrooms by making phone calls when students are out two consecutive days. We will communicate attendance policies to families and bring students to Child Study if needed. We recognize the value of a sense of class and school community and of communicating the importance of attendance in a positive way.

### Part IV: Title I Requirements

#### Additional Title I Requirements

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

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

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.

#### PFEP Link

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

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

Regarding the social-emotional needs of the overarching population at Bratt Elementary, our guidance counselor provides weekly sessions on social skills which are broadcast over CCTV. Teachers then reinforce these lessons in the classroom. When needed, teachers may ask for a lesson to be presented to her entire classroom or request individual or small group counseling for specific students. We have requested mentors for specific students needing more individualized support; however, due to our distance we depend on the resources we have within the school.

One way Bratt Elementary has renewed our focus on a positive classroom climate is by emphasizing positive relationships among teachers and students. We will use Suite 360 and Sanford Harmony to promote core values and desired behaviors. All teachers will be trained in Youth Mental Health First Aid.

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

Escambia County School District offers pre-k classes on 14 school campuses for students living in a Title I attendance zone. The pre-k program is a full day program established in collaboration with VPK and Head Start. Transition activities are provided to participating families to assist with school readiness for students who will attend kindergarten at our school.

Preschoolers housed at Bratt Elementary participate in school activities. They have Story Time once a week in the library. At the end of the school year, Preschoolers and Headstart students visit the Kindergarten classrooms to allow students to see and experience Kindergarten for a short time. They visit the Media Center and special area classrooms, followed by a trip to the cafeteria to have a snack. Counselors from Bratt Elementary and Ernest Ward Middle School conference and discuss specific needs of students and ways to meet those needs. ESE teachers have transition meetings with Elementary and Middle School discussing transition and needs of their students. Ernest Ward Middle

School comes to Bratt Elementary School to introduce middle schoolers to fifth grade students and allow them to ask questions. Students conference with a middle school person about their schedule preferences and sign up for classes.

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

The School Leadership team meets quarterly to review student progress. Team members review data and link it to instructional decisions. They also review progress monitoring data at the classroom level to identify students who are meeting or exceeding benchmarks and those who are at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team identifies resources required to meet the needs of students in MTSS.

Title I Part A funds are used to supplement and enhance services for students and families. Our technology coordinator is funded through Title I funds. We will be utilizing Title 1 resources to provide after-school tutoring to ELA Level 1and 2 fourth and fifth grade students and those third grade students identified as being at risk for retention. We also use funds for staff development, curriculum support materials, and substitutes so teachers can meet with parents.

At this time, there are no migrant children that attend Bratt Elementary.

Bratt Elementary does not receive Title I, Part D students' resources.

Title II: Professional Development is offered at both the school and district level. Please see each goal area for specific professional learning activities (in-service education).

Services for English Language Learners (ELL) are provided as required by law. All teachers who serve ELL identified students have or are working towards ESOL endorsement on their certificate. Bratt currently has three ESOL students.

The school works with the district's homeless coordinator to provide transportation and resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free appropriate education. This program is overseen by the district Title I office.

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

NA