

Escambia County School District

Bratt Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Bratt Elementary School

5721 HIGHWAY 99, Century, FL 32535

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Amy Mccrory

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Bratt Elementary School

5721 HIGHWAY 99, Century, FL 32535

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>81%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>35%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Bratt Elementary School supports the Escambia County School District's mission to provide an environment that creates opportunities for all students to achieve their highest potential while building a foundation for continuous learning.

We believe the education of each child is a shared responsibility of the parents, teachers, staff, and community. Our school provides opportunities which encourage parents to be actively involved in the education of their child. Bratt Elementary is committed to building stronger links between school, home, and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bratt Elementary School reinforces the Escambia County School District's vision to create a school district where parents want to send their children, students want to learn, teachers want to teach, and employees want to work.

We strive to provide a stimulating learning environment where students are actively engaged in the learning process and equipped with the necessary tools to become life-long learners and productive community members.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McCrory, Amy	Principal	<p>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 Principal and head of our Leadership Team, Mrs. McCrory communicates state and district expectations and leads our team through shared decision making.</p>
Entrekin, Lisa	Assistant Principal	<p>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 Assistant Principal, Mrs. Entrekin helps to communicate state and district expectations and lead our team through shared decision making.</p>
Cloud, Jessica	School Counselor	<p>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. Cloud works with staff and our Rtl Coordinator to ensure proper implementation of MTSS, monitor early warning system data, and coordinate mentors and volunteers.</p>
Keenan, Cyndi	Other	<p>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 Rtl Coordinator, Mrs. Keenan works with administration, guidance, and instructional staff to ensure proper implementation of MTSS, analyze data, and monitor early warning system data.</p>
Gilmore, Shonna	Instructional Media	<p>Our Leadership Team collaborates to oversee all functions within the school. Each member considers input and feedback from teachers and staff regarding ways to maximize student learning and further our mission and vision. Having administration, guidance, regular ed, special ed, and special area represented allows Bratt to represent all areas of student learning. As our media specialist, Mrs. Gilmore assists in nurturing a love of reading through media visits and AR. She collaborates with classroom teachers to enhance instruction by providing resources and helping students locate information to assist with classroom projects.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kite, Sharon	Teacher, ESE	<p>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.</p> <p>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 on core and remedial instruction, data collection, and effective delivery of content at all levels. She communicates with District ESE staff to ensure expectations are followed with regard to procedures and curriculum.</p>
Stabler, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	<p>Stephanie Stabler and the other grade level chairs communicate with our Leadership Team to address behavior, academic strengths and weaknesses of students, needs of teachers with regard to professional development and instructional resources/supplies.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/26/2021, Amy Mccrory

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

505

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22**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	82	79	75	81	80	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	473
Attendance below 90 percent	17	30	29	32	23	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	2	8	8	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	3	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	1	5	13	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	3	6	6	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	11	4	6	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/17/2021

2020-21 - 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	61	67	83	80	77	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	464
Attendance below 90 percent	11	23	15	8	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	4	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

2020-21 - 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	61	67	83	80	77	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	464
Attendance below 90 percent	11	23	15	8	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	4	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				63%	53%	57%	56%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	55%	58%	43%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	52%	53%	31%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				76%	57%	63%	71%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				79%	60%	62%	69%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				76%	52%	51%	66%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				58%	54%	53%	60%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	60%	56%	4%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	62%	55%	7%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	83%	58%	25%	64%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	78%	55%	23%	60%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	58%	55%	3%	53%	5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

STAR was utilized for Fall, Winter, and Spring ELA and Math progress monitoring. The science district quarterly assessment was used for science progress monitoring. The numbers reflect the membership, students tied to the school during both survey 2 and 3.

		Grade 1			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		20/31.3%	40/61.5%	37/56.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged		7/25%	14/48.3%	10/32.3%
	Students With Disabilities		2/22.2%	5/55.6%	4/36.4%
	English Language Learners		n/a	n/a	n/a
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		29/46.8%	38/59.4%	44/66.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged		10/38.5%	12/42.9%	18/58.1%
	Students With Disabilities		9/11.1%	2/22.2%	4/36.4%
	English Language Learners		n/a	n/a	n/a
		Grade 2			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		24/34.3%	35/44.3%	39/48.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged		12/35.3%	16/43.2%	18/47.4%
	Students With Disabilities		2/25%	2/22.2%	2/22.2%
	English Language Learners		n/a	n/a	n/a
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		18/24.7%	29/37.2%	31/39.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged		7/20%	13/36.1%	16/44.4%
	Students With Disabilities		0/0%	2/22.2%	3/33.3%
	English Language Learners		n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25/33.8%	35/46.7%	37/48.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/11.4%	7/21.9%	9/27.3%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/25%	1/25%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/50%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28/37.8%	46/63%	48/64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/22.9%	16/50%	15/45.5%
	Students With Disabilities	1/20%	2/50%	2/50%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/50%	1/50%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29/39.7%	43/57.3%	37/50.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/31.4%	19/54.3%	15/45.5%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/25%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21/28%	49/64.5%	39/58.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/17.1%	20/55.6%	15/51.7%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	2/50%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		22/26.2%	29/32.6%	29/35.8%
	Economically Disadvantaged		6/15.4%	6/15.4%	6/17.1%
	Students With Disabilities		1/7.7%	3/20%	3/23.1%
	English Language Learners		1/100%	1/50%	1/50%
			Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students		22/26.2%	37/41.6%	33/41.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged		5/12.8%	10/25.6%	9/25.7%
	Students With Disabilities		0/0%	0/0%	1/8.3%
	English Language Learners		1/100%	1/50%	1/50%
			Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Science	All Students		30/39.5%	34/43%	38/49.4%
	Economically Disadvantaged		10/30.3%	12/36.4%	11/34.4%
	Students With Disabilities		1/10%	2/15.4%	2/18.2%
	English Language Learners		1/50%	1/50%	1/50%
			Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	19	21		35	43		31				
AMI	73			80							
BLK	15	29		31	29	17	15				
MUL	64			79							
WHT	63	39	58	72	53		62				
FRL	41	38	62	51	31	15	31				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	36	42	40	61	79	73					
AMI	73			100							
BLK	43	48	36	51	72	82	29				
MUL	90			70							

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
WHT	67	58	55	81	81	72	68				
FRL	52	49	40	68	78	81	49				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	23	21	36	55	54	27				
AMI	38			54							
BLK	32	35	31	53	50	58	13				
MUL	70			60							
WHT	63	46	29	76	73	71	78				
FRL	48	38	24	66	64	59	59				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	333
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	77
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
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	23
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	72
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	58
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Subgroup data continues to improve but is not where we want it to be. There are still gaps between our subgroups and the overall population. STAR Spring ELA data indicate that 47.7% of first through fifth grade students are proficient, with EconDis at 33.0% and SWD at 21.3%. STAR Spring Math data indicate that 53.9% of first through fifth grade students are proficient, with EconDis at 45.1% and SWD at 25.8%. Spring FSA data indicate higher proficiency ratings of 55.7% for ELA and 64.6% for math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

2019 Subgroup Data indicate that ELA learning gains for our lowest quartile is our area of greatest need. While we did improve, our subgroups still fall below 41 in SWD, BLK and FRL.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The pandemic affected every classroom through excessive absences and a lack of familiarity with remote/virtual learning platforms. Although teachers continued to conduct whole group and small group instruction, the interruptions in routines and daily instruction resulted in decreased learning gains.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Progress monitoring shows ELA growth in all Kindergarten students in from AP1 39.6% proficient to AP 3 59.1 % proficient. ELA first grade students grew from 31% proficient AP1 to 56.1 % AP3. In Math, Kindergarten SWD grew from 0% AP1 to 43% AP3. Spring proficiency for all students in first grade was nearly 70%. Econ Dis grew from 38% to 58% in first grade math. Third grade grew from 38% proficient in Math to 64% proficient. FSA data for our multiracial students shows a 69% proficiency.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We renewed our focus on data and small group instruction using iReady and STAR. Our media specialist enhanced literacy instruction by focusing on standards during weekly visits. After school tutoring was provided to students to focus on closing achievement gaps.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Our new RtI Coordinator works closely with all grade levels to monitor achievement and interventions. Souday system will be implemented, along with additional Tier 3 resources. We will track AR goals for students, monitor iReady and STAR reports, monitor math fluency, and provide tutoring.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Our professional development will focus on maximizing use of iReady to monitor achievement of grade level standards and effectively delivering literacy instruction through our new reading series. Support is provided throughout the year by iReady staff to utilize data to inform personalized instruction and set learning goals. Teachers receive ongoing PD in the new reading series through online HMH-provided staff as well as district ELA staff by grade levels. Our staff will also participate in the book study for Do You Know Enough about Me to Teach Me in order to improve the learning of all students with a specific focus on our subgroups who are not meeting learning goals.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Our Leadership Team will meet quarterly to review data and monitor improvement. Grade level chairs and subject area reps will take a larger role in communicating information. We will continue to monitor data by having grade level meetings and student data chats.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Achievement in ELA has not reached 41% proficiency in all sub groups: Economically Disadvantaged (30%), Students with disabilities (20%), African American (9%). Kindergarten ELA Proficiency was 39/59.1% on the 2021 STAR district progress monitoring. First Grade ELA Proficiency was 37/56.1% on the 2021 STAR district progress monitoring. Second Grade ELA Proficiency was 39/48.1 % on the 2021 STAR district progress monitoring. Third Grade ELA Proficiency was 59% on the 2021 FSA. Fourth Grade ELA Proficiency was 64% on the 2021 FSA. Fifth Grade ELA Proficiency was 44% on the 2021 FSA.

Measurable Outcome:

ELA proficiency for K-2 will be 50% or higher on the Spring 2022 STAR district progress monitoring. ELA proficiency for 3-5 will be 50% or higher on the Spring 2022 FSA. ELA proficiency will go from 30% on the 2021 FSA to 41% or higher on the 2022 FSA for Economically Disadvantaged students. We will close the achievement gap between all students and those with disabilities by increasing the achievement of SWD from 20% to 35% or higher. Proficiency of African American students will increase from 9% to 25%.

Monitoring:

Data from STAR360 and core language arts instructional materials will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed and broken down by teacher and ESSA groups. School administrators will conduct weekly walkthroughs and will review school wide data twice a month. They will monitor the progress of students receiving intervention and share findings with teachers. Administration will seek district coaching support to recommend adjustments to interventions and/or to provide professional development needs to help improve the effectiveness of intervention. The Rtl Coordinator and MTSS team will meet to analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for individual students

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy McCrory (amccrory@ecsdf.l.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will examine STAR, iReady, and HMH Into Reading data throughout the year to monitor progress of all students. We will provide intensive, systematic instruction in small groups to all students four to five times per week for 40 minutes. We will emphasize strong Tier 1 instruction in whole group utilizing the district curriculum frameworks and decision trees. This implementation will be overseen by administration and monitored by classroom teachers. Students will be grouped accordingly, and we will implement a daily walk and read model to best meet student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

We selected this strategy because reading achievement for all students is a state, district, and school area of focus; for the ability to read is the foundation of academic success. According to "Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades", published by What Works Clearinghouse, screening students for potential reading problems and the beginning and middle of the year and monitoring the progress of students has a moderate level of evidence in predicting reading performance. Providing intensive, systematic reading instruction for all students based on assessments of current reading levels has a strong level of evidence.

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule ongoing training in iReady
 Meet with grade levels and teachers to determine instructional needs and implement a MTSS
 Emphasize use of the ELA frameworks and Decision Trees

Regularly examine curricular, iReady, and STAR data
Appropriately group students for differentiation/intervention
Implement walk and read model

Person
Responsible Lisa Entrekin (lentrekin@ecsdfi.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Achievement in Math has not reached 41% proficiency in all sub groups: Students with disabilities (16%), African American (29%).

Measurable Outcome:

Math proficiency will increase from 16% to 35% for students with disabilities and from 29% to 45% for African American students.

Data from STAR360 and core instructional materials will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed and broken down by teacher and ESSA groups.

Monitoring:

School administrators will conduct weekly walkthroughs and will review school wide data regularly. They will monitor the progress of students receiving intervention and share findings with teachers. Administration will seek district coaching support to recommend adjustments to interventions and/or to provide professional development needs to help improve the effectiveness of intervention.

The Rtl Coordinator and MTSS team will meet to analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for individual students

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy McCrory (amccrory@ecsdf.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will monitor ongoing curricular, STAR, and iReady data throughout the year. Math fluency and vocabulary will be emphasized for all students. We will teach clear and concise mathematical language and support students' use of the language to help students effectively communicate their understanding of mathematical concepts. Teachers will regularly include timed activities as one way to build students' fluency in mathematics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

According to *Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades*, published by What Works Clearinghouse, focusing on language as well as fluency has strong evidence in improving performance. By providing instruction on mathematical language, teachers support students' learning of subtle and complex mathematical ideas. Focusing on mathematical language during intervention also helps students access the language used during core instruction. Teachers and students can communicate more clearly during class when they are both using mathematical language. As teachers use and model correct mathematical language, their students hear how the words fit with the mathematics they are learning and begin to integrate this language into their own explanations of the mathematics.

Automatic retrieval of math facts gives students more mental energy to understand relatively complex mathematical tasks and execute multistep mathematical procedures. Thus, building automatic fact retrieval in students is an important goal of intervention

Action Steps to Implement

Vocabulary: Routinely teach mathematical vocabulary to build students' understanding of the mathematics they are learning

Support students in using mathematically precise language during their verbal and written explanations of their problem solving.

Fluency: Identify already-learned topics for activities to support fluency and create a timeline.

Encourage and motivate students to work hard by having them chart their progress.

Person Responsible Amy McCrory (amccrory@ecsdfi.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The data for Bratt Elementary was not found on the Safe Schools for Alex website. However, we reviewed our EWS data and determined that we have a minimal number of serious discipline referrals. We will continue to strive to maintain a safe and child-centered school environment.

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.

Bratt Elementary receives Title I, 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. Our stakeholders play a key role in providing feedback to our administration. The stakeholders include the School Advisory Counsel, the PTA organization, business partners, volunteers and families. We strive to build rapport and effective communication with the stakeholders in order to build a positive, safe, and productive learning environment for our students. A Family-School Compact is developed jointly with parents and other stakeholders each year to ensure the collaboration of all stakeholders in the education of our students.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our stakeholders are our faculty and staff, SAC, PTA, Leadership Team, Literacy Leadership Team, Mathematics Committee, Business Partners, volunteers, mentors, families, and our community. All of these stakeholders play an important role such as providing feedback to our administration, building relationships, promoting safety, and addressing academic and emotional needs of our individual students.

Part V: Budget

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

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