Brentwood Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Brentwood Elementary School

4820 N PALAFOX ST, Pensacola, FL 32505

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Sewell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	100%
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* Hispanic Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (42%)
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

Brentwood Elementary School

4820 N PALAFOX ST, Pensacola, FL 32505

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

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.

The mission of Brentwood Elementary is to ensure that every student has the self-confidence, desire, knowledge, and skills needed to lead a responsible and satisfied life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In keeping with our district's vision to be a place where students want to learn, teachers want to teach, parents want to send their children, and employees want to work:

It is the desire of Brentwood Faculty and Staff that we capture the heart and mind of students, parents, and our community, by creating an excellent learning environment for all. We strive to promote love of learning through the use of: Cutting-edge teaching and learning tools, encouragement of good citizenship, and providing problem-solving opportunities so that students will flourish in tomorrow's technology infused world.

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
Sewell, Jennifer	Principal	School administrator
Holliday, Meghan	Assistant Principal	Administrator
Prout, Nancy	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Curriculum development and planning with teachers based on data and current research.
Freeman, Betsy	Other	Rti coordinator
Frazier, Karly	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade self contained teacher. District 3-5 ELA representative.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2016, Jennifer Sewell

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.*
1

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

Total number of students enrolled at the school

351

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

7

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

5

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	57	70	47	64	57	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	346
Attendance below 90 percent	9	30	18	17	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	1	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	5	6	10	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	1	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	24	13	17	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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	5	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	6	6	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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

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	29	51	61	68	58	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	337
Attendance below 90 percent	5	11	8	16	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	12	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	8	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	3	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	6	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	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	29	51	61	68	58	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	337
Attendance below 90 percent	5	11	8	16	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	12	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	2	4	8	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	3	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	6	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	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				42%	53%	57%	36%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				45%	55%	58%	32%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67%	52%	53%	35%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				49%	57%	63%	47%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				53%	60%	62%	45%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	52%	51%	35%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	54%	53%	38%	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	49%	56%	-7%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	52%	-14%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	51%	-12%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	57%	55%	2%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	58%	-8%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	55%	-20%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	55%	-6%	53%	-4%
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				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11/22.9	21/43.8	18/36
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/23.1	17/42.5	13/31.7
	Students With Disabilities	2/25	2/28.6	4/50
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/19.6	21/43.8	24/49
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/18.9	15/38.5	20/50
	Students With Disabilities	2/25	2/25	5/62.5
	English Language Learners	na	na	na

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19/35.8	24/45.3	26/45.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/31.8	17/38.6	22/45.8
	Students With Disabilities	1/33.3	1/33.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/26.4	17/32.7	22/38.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/22.7	14/31.8	17/35.4
	Students With Disabilities	1/33.3	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	na	na	na

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/25.5	17/29.3	17/30.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/27.5	14/27.5	15/30.6
	Students With Disabilities	1/14.3	2/33.3	2/33.3
	English Language Learners	1/100	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/21.4	23/39	23/41.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/21.2	20/38.5	21/42
	Students With Disabilities	1/14.3	3/50	1/16.7
	English Language Learners	1/100	1/100	1/00

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21/42.9	23/46.9	24/50
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/39	18/45	18/46.2
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/16.7	2/33.3
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/28.6	15/30.6	16/34
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/24.4	10/25	11/28.9
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	2/33.3
	English Language Learners	na	na	na

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19/28.8	24/37.5	20/32.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/29.2	18/40.9	14/33.3
	Students With Disabilities	1/12.5	1/12.5	1/14.3
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/17.4	24/38.1	24/38.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/14	15/34.1	15/35.7
	Students With Disabilities	1/12.5	4/50	3/42.9
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25/38.5	26/40	27/46.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/41.3	19/39.6	20/51.3
	Students With Disabilities	1/12.5	2/28.6	1/14.3
	English Language Learners	na	na	na

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	10			30							
BLK	33	26	14	32	40	36	31				
MUL	62			57							
WHT	52	47		45	25		53				
FRL	47	40	25	40	41	42	42				
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	17	43	62	42	60	55	35				
BLK	30	45	67	41	52	58	31				
HSP	50	47		59	63						
MUL	52	57		57	50						
WHT	53	43		56	51		76				

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
FRL	41	46	64	48	51	59	52				

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	7	26	39	17	26	29	25				
BLK	23	24	33	35	41	36	23				
HSP	33	43		50	64						
MUL	40	29		57	50						
WHT	56	49		61	46		64				
FRL	34	32	30	46	42	31	37				

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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
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	271
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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	

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%	

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	30
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	60
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	44
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	40
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?

ELA and Math learning gains for African Americans, SWD Economically Disadvantaged Students and African American Students increased from 2018 to 2019. For White students Math LG increased We do not have enough students to calculate LG in many other subgroups. Proficiency in ELA for SWD and MR, and Economically Disadvantaged increased. African American, SWD and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups math proficiency increased. Science proficiency did have a significant change in each subgroup.

When analyzing 2019 as compared to 2021 ESSA group projections;
ELA Achievement decreased for Economically Disadvantaged students from 41% to 36%
ELA Achievement increased for SWD from 17% to 26%
ELA Achievement decreased for African American students from 30% to 25%
ELA Achievement decreased for White students from 53% to 44%
ELA Achievement decreased for African American Lowest Quartile from 67% to 9%

Math Achievement decreased for Economically Disadvantaged students from 48% to 36%.
Math Achievement decreased for SWD from 48% to 32%.
Math Achievement decreased for African American students from 41% to 28%
Math Achievement for White students decreased from 56% to 50%
Math Achievement for African American Lowest Quartile decreased from 58% to 50%

All graded levels were below the state average for proficiency in ELA, Math and Science in 2019

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

Based on the data the following subgroups fall below the 41% target:
ELA achievement for SWD has the greatest need for improvement as their proficiency is 17%.
ELA Achievement for African American was 30%.
African American Science achievement was 31%
SWD Science achievement was 35%.

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

- Lack of targeted small group instruction as modes of learning (remote, traditional, hybrid) changed weekly. Actions: reinstate targeted small group instruction based on data. Due to covid, we were unable to continue many of the research based strategies used in 2019 that helped us make the learning gains and increased proficiency based on progress monitoring data.
-

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

Comparing 2019 to 2021 projections, all Students Lowest 25 math LG increased. from 58 to 67.
Economically disadvantaged math LG for Lowest 25 increased from 59 to 73.

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

- correlated I-Ready placement to STAR data.
- backwards design
- pre-taught end of year standards
- data chats with students by admin and teachers
- behavior problems decreased schoolwide.
- specific, direct instruction of standards in small groups
- concrete - representational - abstract instruction in math
- Eliminated non academic activities schoolwide; extra programs, assemblies, etc
- Eliminated non academic duties for all teachers in order to increase planning time; photocopying support, limited meeting unless absolutely necessary
- Weekly grade level meetings led by grade level chair
- weekly walk throughs with focus based on SIP and data
- continue Rensselaerville (TRI) initiatives that we are trained on on 2018

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

ELA:
- increase amount of individual reading time (AR, Myon)
- Specific and direct instruction of reading strategies in all grade levels in whole and small group
- Researched based phonic intervention (Multi-syllabic routine and Sonday Systems) in grades 2-5.
- Focused RTI interventions based on varying forms of data with consistent monitoring of student progress.
- Backwards design and unit test error analysis
- correlated I-Ready placement to STAR data.
- Guided planning with curriculum coordinator
Math:
- Spiral review of math skills
- Increased use of concrete - representational- abstract
- Increased Math Talks
- correlated I-Ready placement to STAR data.
- Specific and direct instruction of math standards in all grade levels in whole and small group

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.

- Repeated reading strategy for fluency
- Multi-Syllabic Routine
- I-ready data analysis
- ESE accommodation training
- Math Discourse training

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

- modeling small group and Tier I teaching by Reading Intervention Teacher
- Modeling effective math instruction by district math coach
- Modeling effective science instruction by AP
- Additional support to lower grade teachers for science instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Achievement in ELA did not reach 50 % proficiency in 3 subgroups: Economically disadvantaged (36%), Students with Disabilities (26%), African American (25%). Historically (2018 and 2019,), Students with Disabilities and African American did not achieve 50% proficiency. Economically disadvantaged students achieved 41% proficiency in 2019 . In addition, learning gains in all subgroups, with the the exception of SWB (due to a low number of students) were above 41% in 2019. 2021 FSA scores indicate that learning gains in all subgroups with enough students to measure, did not achieve 50%
Measurable Outcome:	1. ELA proficiency overall will increase from 37 % on the 2021 FSA to 50% or higher on the 2022 FSA school wide. African American, Economically Disadvantaged, SWD and ELA learning gains overall will increase from 24% to 50% or higher. 2. 1st grade ELA proficiency will increase form 36% to at least 50% in all subgroups on Spring 2022 STAR assessment. 3. 2nd grade ELA proficiency will increase from 45.6 % to at least 50% in all subgroups on Spring 2022 STAR assessment. 4. The achievement gap in ELA learning gains between African American students overall and the Lowest 25% is significant. African American students learning gains for lowest 25% and African American students overall will increase from 9% on 2021 FSA to 50% or higher in 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	- Rti intervention data monitored monthly by Rti team and interventions will be changed base on data for the lowest 25% This will include research based phonemic awareness, phonics and fluency remediation. - SWD services by the ESE teachers will be scaffolded and targeted based on the individual needs of the students. Some students will be serviced daily while others will be serviced 2 or 3 times a week. Admin will review lesson plans for ESE teachers. - Inclusion classrooms will have a full time ESE Teacher Assistant. - Structured data meetings will be held with teachers bi weekly with Curriculum Coordinator and quarterly with Principal. Adjustments in instructional strategies and groupings will be made based on data. - Unit test scores will be closely reviewed after each assessment to determine common errors and reteach as needed. - I-Ready paths will be adjusted to coincide with STAR for all subgroups. I-Ready usage will be monitored each week by the Principal. - Target of growth, using Scale Score on STAR will be discussed with students and admin with specific areas of focus. - Daily admin walk throughs to look for implementation of standards based instruction and highly effective practices of Tier I instruction, Tier II and Tier III instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)

1. Direct, explicit instruction for students on how to use reading comprehension strategies: (to include Think Aloud) question generation, visualization, text structure, self-monitoring, inference and retelling. (strong evidence) This is defined as intentional mental actions during reading that improve reading comprehension.

2. Provide intensive, systematic instruction of foundational reading, including phonemic awareness and decoding skills in small groups to students who score below the benchmark on universal screening. This will include but not be limited to Repeated Reading Strategy, HMH Foundational Skills, Phonics and Phonemic awareness instruction to include kinesthetic component : Phonics Chip Kits, Multisyllabic Routine, Phonemic Awareness Lessons.

3. Implement Sonday Systems for students scoring below 10% on STAR and test in to the program in grades 2-5 which includes staff shifts to meet the demands dictated by the data. ie: Media Specialist to teach two Sonday Systems groups, Guidance to teach a Special Area in addition to the Rti Intervention teacher and ESE teachers teaching Sonday Systems.

Evidence-based Strategy:

4. Utilize Snap and Read and Myon to allow all students access to above grade level text and vocabulary.

5. Daily Read Alouds with high order questioning

6. Anchor charts created by teachers and students and referred back to while teaching and learning

7. Target Boards with measurable goals. ie: "I Know I have it when" I can complete my exit ticket with 70% accuracy

8. Backwards design planning in all subject areas as well as revisiting after the assessment to look for common errors that can quickly be addressed

9. Utilize whole brain strategies grades K-5

10. I-Ready lessons completed weekly in reading and math (50 minutes with 67% accuracy) with teacher assigned lessons based STAR and CBM data. Paths will be adjusted based on data.

1. Comprehension Rationale:Co mprehension is hindered when a student lacks ability to apply decoding strategies, lacks vocabulary and lacks background knowledge. Furthermore as the text increases in complexity from grades K-3 to grades 4 and 5, students need explicit instruction in reading comprehension strategies such as visualization, questioning, making inferences, and retelling. Embedding instruction in how to use intentional mental actions to improve comprehension will help students navigate the more complicated texts they encounter in grades 4 and 5. The practices selected are based on the recommendations of The What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guides: Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade, and Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade. Fourth and fifth grade students needing intervention in foundational skills and/or comprehension benefit from instruction aligned to the recommendations outlined in these What Works Clearinghouse practice guides for K-3. These strategies align to the Escambia County K-12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan.

2. Foundational Reading Instruction Rationale: These strategies align to the Escambia County K-12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan.

3. Sonday Systems Rationale: These strategies align to the Escambia County K-12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

4. Snap and Read/Myon Rationale: Research has shown that auditory comprehension can be at a higher level than reading comprehension by increasing background knowledge and access to vocabulary. Readers with more background knowledge consistently outperform readers with less (Amy M. Elleman, Reading Comprehenion Research: Implications for Practice and Policy, March 2019. According to 10 Key Reading Practices for All Elementary Schools
© 2016 The University of Texas at Austin/The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk
Students listen to, read, understand, and critically analyze a variety of complex text types of content-specific
(e.g., history) and general (e.g., story about overcoming challenges) topics.
Students are taught, within meaningful contexts, the connections between reading, writing, listening, and
speaking to develop deep knowledge of oral and written language and its structure, meaning, and purpose.
Students are provided opportunities to access a variety of high-interest texts and build motivation to read for
enjoyment and to learn new information.

5. Read Alouds Rationale: Research has shown that read alouds improve comprehension (Duke & Pearson, 2008), vocabulary (Massaro, 2017), and fluency (Trelease, 2001). ...
This liberates the students from having to do the work of decoding and allows them to focus on comprehension, acquisition of new vocabulary, phonemic awareness, etc.Jan 28, 2021

6. Anchor Charts Rationale: Anchor charts build a culture of literacy in the classroom, as

teachers and students make thinking visible by recording content, strategies, processes, cues, and guidelines during the learning process. • Posting anchor charts keeps relevant and current learning accessible to students to remind them of prior learning and to enable them to make connections as new learning happens. • Students refer to the charts and use them as tools as they answer questions, expand ideas, or contribute to discussions and problem-solving in class.
Source: Expeditionary Learning Education

7. Target Boards Rational: According to Marzano's Framework of Lesson Design, The starting place for all effective instruction is designing and communicating clear! earning goals.
Marzano(2009)

8. Backwards Design Planning Rationale: The basic rationale motivating backward design is that starting with the end goal, rather than a starting with the first lesson chronologically delivered during a unit or course, helps teachers design a sequence of lessons, problems, projects, presentations, assignments, and assessments that result in students achieving the academic goals of a course or unit—that is, actually learning what they were expected to learn. Backward design helps teachers create courses and units that are focused on the goal (learning) rather than the process (teaching).
Source: The Glossary of Education Reform

9. Whole Brain Rationale: The research indicates that teachers who are knowledgeable about brain based strategies and who use their understanding of how the brain acquires information to teach their students, are more likely to be able to help their students learn how to think critically and make meaning of information (Hruby & Goswami, 2011; Jensen, 2009; and Smith, 2007).
Research indicates a significant and substantial relationship between engagement and achievement for African-American students when compared to their White peers (Darensbourg & Blake, 2013; Moller, Stearns, Mickelson, Bottia, & Banerjee, 2014).
Source: Journal of Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives in Education
Vol. 8, No. 1 (August 2015) pp. 52 – 56

10. I-Ready Rational: These strategies align to the Escambia County K-12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The leadership team will review student performance in 2021 FSA data, 2021 progress monitoring data, and analysis of their STAR goals for the 2021-2022 school year.

2. The leadership team will meet with teachers to review this data, identify the students in the focus ESSA subgroups and develop goals for students.
3. Teachers and admin will meet with students to develop goals based on student data.
4. The district ELA department will provide professional development on the following areas: Sonday Systems, Phonics Chips, Phonological Awareness and use of HMH materials for instruction and remediation.

5. The Literacy Leadership Team will develop a schoolwide independent reading plan to ensure students read connected text daily.
6. The RtI Coordinator and MTSS team to identify student needs and match them to interventions based on the intervention decision trees.

7. The leadership team will conduct walkthroughs during the literacy block and during intervention periods, and provide feedback to teachers regarding implementation of planning and fidelity of the intervention.

8. The leadership team will analyze data collected from classroom walk-throughs (Kick-Up) and assessments with particular attention to student work samples and ESSA subgroup performance. The leadership team will conduct data chats with teachers around focus areas, and teachers will conduct data chats with students, The data chats with the leadership team and teachers will lead to identifying instructional shifts and design remediation and reteach opportunities.
9. In-depth coaching will be provided to teachers by Curriculum Coordinator based on qualitative and quantitative data points. The coaching will be focused around content knowledge, vocabulary integration, text integration, usage of comprehension strategies, writing within the ELA class, and student discourse.
10. The Rti Coordinator will coach teachers on implementation of research based reading strategies.

Person Responsible Jennifer Sewell (jsewell@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Out of school suspensions are indicated to be high as compared to the other school data as well as compared to state and district levels. The school culture and environment will be monitored using FBA - Pbib data. ......

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.

1. Instructional staff are members of both an Academic and Non-Academic committee. These committees include...Academic - ELA, Math. Science/SS. Non-Academic - PBIS Behavior and Wellness/Hospitality. These groups meet monthly to help improve these areas and have voice in decision-making within our school.

2. When hiring new employees, administration researches all applicants carefully before interviewing. When contacting these possible hires for interviews, we share our motto of "Excellence! No Excuses!" We explain the supports we have in place for all teachers but we also explain that "our school does not accept drama from employees and it is all about children and their academic success or this is not the school for you!" We receive great response about this expectation from new hires and they work hard to not allow "drama" and unprofessional behaviors to happen in our school. Employees tend to hold the others accountable.

3. We provide written job descriptions for all administration and resource staff (ie., principal, assistant principal, curriculum coordinator, behavior coach, school counselor, and technician). These are written and reviewed in the employee handbook for all staff members so everyone is clear on who does what at Brentwood. We want to make sure every teacher is supported from all areas so they have support to do their best work.

4. Our administration team assures that all staff is focused on meeting the needs of our school wide goals. This is done by reducing classroom interruptions and providing a weekly guided planning for all classroom teachers with an experienced instructional leader.

5. Administration communicates with all stakeholders so there is no confusion about what is happening at Brentwood in regards to events, curriculum, safety, procedures, and policies. Brentwood uses our school website, marquis, newsletters, and callouts as a regular part of our communication. Teachers send home daily communication folders in regards to class work and behavior so parents are always aware of their child's day. Teachers also communicate with parents through email, text messages, behavior charts, remind app, class dojo app, notes, weekly positive phone calls, and report card comments.

6. Administrations doors are always open to support teachers, parents, students, and community before, during, and after school.

7. Brentwood holds school advisory committee (SAC) meetings throughout the year to share school news and receive input from parents and community. Volunteers and mentors recruited and utilized to work with our school to support our school goals.

8. Administration and Hospitality offer various staff recognitions throughout the school year such as Shout Outs in the newsletter, Shout Out board in the teacher lounge, Paw Passes for going the extra mile, weekly exercise classes, verbal recognitions, and surprise goodies in mailboxes in teacher lounge.

9. Capturing Kids Hearts Program is a huge part of our school. Teachers greet students at their classroom doors in the morning and utilize the morning meetings to set a positive tone to the day for students.

10. Each year administration surveys teachers on what is going well, what needs tweaking, and any possible solutions. Teachers area also surveyed on their favorite things they enjoy so administration can reward the individually for good works.

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

Students - Our students know that negative behavior at Brentwood is not acceptable. Behaviors are addressed immediately using our school wide behavior plan and processes. Because of our clear steps for a teacher, behavior issues have reduced over the years and effective and highly effective teaching and learning time has increased.

Parents - Parents are regularly notified about their child's academics and behavior. Parents are always made aware of any changes to their childd's instruction, Rti processes, ESE plans, and behavior services. Parents are notified of fundraisers, book fairs, family nights, picture days, and other special events.

Community/Partners in Education - Mentors and volunteers are invited to support learning in the classrooms or school each year. (EXCEPT DURING COVID). We encourage teachers to allow community support to support them where applicable and after Florida Law Enforcement clearance. Partners in Education support our school through various donations and volunteer hours.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$3,840.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	100-Salaries	0111 - Brentwood Elementary School	Other		$3,840.00
			Notes: Funding to pay teachers to stay after school for planning ELA whole and small group based on data.			
					Total:	$3,840.00