Braden River Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Braden River Elementary School

6125 RIVER CLUB BLVD, Bradenton, FL 34202

https://www.manateeschools.net/bradenriverel

Demographics

Principal: Josh Bennett

Start Date for this Principal: 9/11/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	42%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Manatee 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

Braden River Elementary School

6125 RIVER CLUB BLVD, Bradenton, FL 34202

https://www.manateeschools.net/bradenriverel

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	No	26%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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.

Our mission at Braden River Elementary School is to engage our school community with innovative ways of learning to best prepare for an ever-changing world. By promoting leadership, collaboration and inquiry, we will foster and strengthen Social-Emotional and Problem Based Learning opportunities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sparking Innovative Leaders and Thinkers!

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
Bennett, Joshua	Principal	Principal
Bertsch, Alison	Teacher, K-12	
Francies, Krista	Assistant Principal	
Benton, Ginger	Instructional Coach	
Collins, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	
Daughtry, Krisha	School Counselor	
Jones, Michele	Dean	
Stilson, Penny	Teacher, K-12	
Tabb, Pam	Teacher, K-12	
Askew, Shelly	Teacher, K-12	
Wilkinson, Casey	Teacher, K-12	
Durfree, Joadie	Teacher, K-12	
Adams, Teresa	Other	
Kendzior, Alison	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 9/11/2020, Josh Bennett

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.*
1

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	42%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	96	77	69	89	79	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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
Friday 9/11/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	88	72	94	99	90	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	544
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	63%	52%	57%	65%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	57%	58%	66%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	55%	53%	62%	53%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	75%	63%	63%	70%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	80%	68%	62%	72%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	53%	51%	56%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	48%	53%	61%	42%	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	64%	51%	13%	58%	6%
	2018	55%	49%	6%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	56%	8%	58%	6%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	64%	52%	12%	56%	8%
	2018	73%	52%	21%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	65%	14%	64%	15%
	2018	77%	61%	16%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		24%				
05	2019	73%	60%	13%	60%	13%
	2018	81%	58%	23%	61%	20%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
Same Grade Comparison		-8%					
Cohort Comparison		-4%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	69%	48%	21%	53%	16%	
	2018	74%	49%	25%	55%	19%	
Same Grade Comparison		-5%					
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	16	39	35	40	66	63	35				
ELL	36	54	61	49	71	72	38				
BLK	60	82		53	73						
HSP	44	55	40	60	71	60	44				
MUL	67			75							
WHT	71	64	50	83	85	75	80				
FRL	44	53	45	56	72	65	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	19	28	12	29	62	58	29				
ELL	17	38	25	25	52	45					
ASN	73			73							
BLK	31			31							
HSP	39	45	26	48	66	55	54				
MUL	83			83							
WHT	72	69	54	82	89	86	85				
FRL	41	44	33	52	69	53	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
SWD	34	52	54	39	60	48	29				
ELL	30	62	67	40	38	25	18				
ASN	87			93							
BLK	50			8							
HSP	44	63	61	51	56	37	47				

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
WHT	73	69	68	80	79	71	67				
FRL	48	62	58	50	61	42	40				

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	68
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	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	57
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	67
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	56
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	71
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	73
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	58
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.

The data that showed the lowest performance is the ELA lowest 25%, that scored at 48% overall. I believe the issue and trend of lower performance in this area can be from lack of continuous identification the students in this subgroup. The consistent follow up and tracking of this specific set of students. The lack of systematic instruction for these students within the core and tiered instruction.

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

The area that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is Science. The 2017-2018 students scored 75% and last year 2018-2019 students scored 69% a drop of 6%. I see the drop of students score could be a number of different factors, one being that it is comparing two different sets of students.

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 ELA lowest 25% illustrates the biggest gap between BRE's data and the state average. The state lowest 25% scored at 53%, compared to 48% of BRE's lowest 25% in ELA.

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

The lowest 25% in Mathematics showed the biggest improvement last year. This subgroup moved from 61% making gains to 66%, and increase of 5% over the previous school year. The action the school took was to use Athletics with the lowest students in 3rd grade, which would include all retained students.

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

I see a potential area of concern with the number of students that fall within the category of having two or more early warning indicators. These students with multiple early warning indicators just have additional barriers to overcome.

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

1. ELA lowest 25%
2. 5th grade Science
2.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	BRE's lowest 25%, learning gains in ELA were 48% which is 5% lower then the state average for this area.
Measurable Outcome:	BRE's lowest 25%, ELA learning gains will increase 10% as measured by the 2021 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joshua Bennett (bennettj@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The school will implement a specific intervention/remediation time for each grade level. Students in the lowest 25% will be tracked to ensure that instruction matches the students needs. The majority of students will be provided Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) instruction. The school will progress monitor these specific students to ensure they are making gains.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The school looked at all the reading data and also the resources that were on site to use. The Leveled Literacy Intervention program was selected for it is district approved and research based.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify the lowest 25% of students in ELA for 3rd and 5th grade.
2. Data chats to ensure that each team understands who is in the lowest 25%, and what homeroom the students are rostered.
3. Data charts will be made to track these students ensure we are on track for gains.
4. Teams will adhere to enrichment/remediation times, and ensure that students have small group intervention time.
5. Core instruction will utilize differentiated instructional techniques that ensure all students are engaged.

Person Responsible   Joshua Bennett (bennettj@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The overall science achievement dropped from 75% to 69%, a decrease of 6%. This is not an upward trend that the school wants to focus on for this school year.
Measurable Outcome:	The Science Achievement will increase 6%, to and overall score of 75% as measured on the FSA science assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joshua Bennett (bennettj@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize the core science series, Houghton Mifflin, and the district curriculum maps. In conjunction with the science series teachers will also implement the use of science notebooks for each student incorprating writing across content. This standard based instructional approach will narrow the instruction to focused standards for the grade level.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for a standard based instructional approach is for the teachers to keep the teaching narrow and go deeper. The teachers will go back and recover in spiral instruction to reteach the science standards in 3rd and 4th grade.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Team planning for teachers to focus on standard based instruction.
2. Teachers will plan to create focus units on reteaching of 3rd and 4th grade standards.
3. Administering of the Science Benchmark Assessments.....following the district calendar and then create reteaching for standards that are in need after analysis for the assessment.
4. Utilizing the science interactive notebooks within daily instruction.
5. Utilizing the core materials and curriculum maps to cover the standards throughout the year.

Person Responsible	Joshua Bennett (bennettj@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will monitor other core instruction to ensure that BRE stays above the state average in the other subject areas. We will monitor i-ready, district assessments, and other data to ensure that BRE is on track to stay above the state averages.

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.

Our school utilizes a variety of groups that reflects upon our positive school culture. Our school leadership team sets the tone by being positive, active staff members that problem solve and lead by example. We have sub committees that work providing focused work in defined areas as they relate to our vision and mission of the school. Our school also has two very active parent organizations that support the ongoing work the school does with students. Our School Advisory Council meets regularly and discusses measure related to school improvement, and school safety. Our Parent Teacher Organization also meets regularly and discusses community based events that support our ongoing focus of being a community based school. Our last important committee is our Sunshine Committee that meets and provides a number or school based events for our staff. This lifts our staff moral and allows the school to operate and act as a family.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.