Byrneville Elementary School, Inc.

2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Byrneville Elementary School, Inc.

1600 BYRNEVILLE RD, Century, FL 32535

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Ashley Trawick

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	
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)	85%
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 Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Byrneville Elementary School is committed to the constant improvement of skills and knowledge to provide an appropriate and safe learning environment in which students can develop their academic, emotional, physical and social abilities to their fullest extent.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Byrneville Elementary School is for our students to have success today, be prepared for success in secondary education, and to flourish as a responsible citizen.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

Byrneville Elementary is a Kindergarten through Fifth grade public Charter school located in Byrneville, FL.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Trawick, Ashley	Principal	Instructional Leader
Thornton, Candi	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Teacher
Weaver, Deana	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Teacher
Johnston, Jacke'	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Teacher
Slade, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Teacher

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Ashley Trawick

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

11

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

12

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

162

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

1

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

1

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	30	26	23	25	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
Attendance below 90 percent	3	10	9	10	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	5	3	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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 - 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	31	29	27	37	32	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	1	1	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	2	6	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	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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 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				70%	53%	57%	63%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	55%	58%	55%	46%	55%

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	52%	53%	50%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				65%	57%	63%	58%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	60%	62%	36%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	52%	51%	12%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				59%	54%	53%	58%	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	74%	56%	18%	58%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	52%	10%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	51%	20%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	68%	55%	13%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	58%	11%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	55%	2%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	61%	55%	6%	53%	8%
Cohort Comparison						

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	50			50							
MUL	55			50							
WHT	76	76		71	71		83				
FRL	51	53		49	47		59				

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
MUL	50			70							
WHT	78	52		73	62		59				
FRL	57	58		52	58	50	45				

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
BLK	29	27		21	18						
WHT	68	61	46	65	41		64				
FRL	55	53	43	45	38	20	52				

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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	328
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	53
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	75
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

The Area of Focus from the previous school year was learning gains of the black subgroup in ELA on the FSA. This need was identified using 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 FSA data. 40% of the black subgroup made learning gains in ELA on the FSA 2019. 27% of the black subgroup made learning gains in ELA on the FSA 2018. The measurable outcome was that 41% of the black subgroup would make learning gains in ELA on the 2019-2020 FSA.

Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

No 2019-2020 data was available for review due to the pandemic. However, 2019 subgroup data does show an increase in learning gains in Math. The school continues to implement the identified strategies and will review data from the 2020-2021 school year.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

A review of the 2019 data, shows the greatest need for improvement is in ELA learning gains. Data shows the school with 55% in ELA learning gains. The state average for ELA learning gains is 58%.

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

One identifiable trend related to our greatest area of needs lies in the white subgroup. Based on 2018 subgroup data, the white subgroup show 61% in ELA Learning Gains. That number decreased with the 2019 subgroup data to 52% in ELA Learning Gains. This 9% decrease contributes to our overall ELA learning gains falling below the state average.

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

In order to increase ELA Learning Gains, the focus will be on implementing the new ELA curriculum to fidelity and focusing on providing strong Tier I instruction for all students, Tier II instruction with an emphasis on differentiation of Tier I rather than remediation, and Tier III with a focus on remediation and addressing student learning loss.

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.

Teachers will need professional development support in the implementation of the Into Reading Florida curriculum in order to teach it to fidelity and to have strong Tier I instruction. Teachers will

participate in professional development related to differentiation of instruction in order to strengthen Tier II instruction.

Finally, teachers will participate in an RTI training update to support effective Tier III instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to White

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The area of focus will be ELA learning gains. Based on 2018 subgroup data, the white subgroup show 61% in ELA Learning Gains. That number decreased with the 2019 subgroup data to 52% in ELA Learning Gains. This 9% decrease contributes to our overall ELA learning gains falling below the state average.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	58% of the white subgroup will show learning gains on the 2021-2022 FSA ELA.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The administrator will conduct weekly walkthroughs to to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide data after each assessment period. The team will met with teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashley Trawick (atrawick@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies. (strong evidence)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	According to What Works Clearinghouse, Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade, teaching students how to use reading comprehension strategies shows a strong positive impact on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teach HMH Into Reading Foundational Skills and Word Study Studio to fidelity.
iReady Assigned Lessons and Tools for Instruction will be used weekly in every classroom.
Direct instruction in the application of comprehension strategies will be indicated on teacher lesson plans and evident during administrator walk throughs.

Person Responsible	Ashley Trawick (atrawick@ecsdfl.us)
Monitoring ESSA Impact: If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.	

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.

Byrneville Elementary School strives daily to create a supportive and positive learning environment for students and a welcoming environment for families and visitors. It is also our goal to exhibit transparency and invite cooperation with our community stakeholders and Board of Directors. Our Braves Code encourages students to strive to do their best socially, behaviorally and academically each day. We welcome parent, community and stakeholder involvement to achieve the highest standards.

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

Our primary stakeholders are teachers, students, parents, families, community members and our school Board of Directors. Our teachers play a vital role in promoting a positive culture and environment for the school. They are the leaders in creating a welcoming environment and for holding students to our high expectations. Students are expected to follow our Braves code and to be positive contributors to our healthy school environment. Parents and families are encouraged to become actively engaged in our school and their child's education. Opportunities for parent and community involvement are outlined in our Parent/Family Engagement Plan. Our Board of Directors meets monthly to manage school decisions and finances.