

Manatee County Public Schools

Braden River Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Braden River Elementary School

6125 RIVER CLUB BLVD, Bradenton, FL 34202

<https://www.manateeschools.net/bradenriverel>

Demographics

Principal: Josh Bennett

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	42%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Manatee County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Braden River Elementary School

6125 RIVER CLUB BLVD, Bradenton, FL 34202

<https://www.manateeschools.net/bradenriverel>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	32%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sparking Innovative Leaders and Thinkers!

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bennett, Joshua	Principal	Oversee all aspects of leading Braden River Elementary School. Responsible for providing a safe learning environment that is focused on high quality instruction of the Florida State Standards.
Stancil, Tina	Assistant Principal	Support the principal in leading all aspects of the school.
Jones, Michele	Other	
Walker, Courtney	Other	
Adams, Teresa	Paraprofessional	
Askew, Shelly	Teacher, K-12	
Stilson, Penny	Teacher, K-12	
Tabb, Pam	Teacher, K-12	
Pippins, Katie	Teacher, K-12	
Durfree, Jodie	Teacher, ESE	
Cochran, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
Woodworth, Candice	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Josh Bennett

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

6

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

538

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.

9

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	74	106	76	75	87	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Thursday 8/26/2021

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	96	77	69	89	79	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	96	77	69	89	79	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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%	52%	57%	62%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	57%	58%	61%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	55%	53%	40%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				75%	63%	63%	71%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				80%	68%	62%	80%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66%	53%	51%	61%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				69%	48%	53%	75%	49%	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	64%	51%	13%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	56%	8%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	52%	12%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	79%	65%	14%	64%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	60%	13%	60%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	69%	48%	21%	53%	16%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA and Math: iReady Diagnostic- fall, winter, spring

Science District Benchmark Assessment October and February

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35/97-36%	81/98- 83%	94/99- 95%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	5/18-28%	13/18- 73%	14/18- 78%
	English Language Learners	2/7- 29%	4/6- 66%	6/6- 100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31/97-23%	64/98- 65%	74/99- 75%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/11- 18%	13/18- 73%	14/18- 78%
	English Language Learners	1/7- 14%	4/6- 66%	6/6- 100%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23/81- 28%	41/82-50%	49/80- 61%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/18- 11%	2/17- 12%	4/15- 27%
	English Language Learners	3/6- 50%	2/6- 33%	3/6- 50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16/80- 20%	35/82- 43%	42/80- 53%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/17- 6%	3/17- 17%	3/15- 20%
	English Language Learners	1/6- 17%	0/6- 0%	2/6- 33%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26/72- 36%	46/68- 68%	56/69- 81%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/14- 14%	8/13- 62%	9/13- 69%
	English Language Learners	0/3- 0%	1/3- 33%	1/3- 33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22/71- 31%	38/69- 55%	46/69- 67%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/14- 29%	6/13- 46%	5/13- 39%
	English Language Learners	0/3- 0%	1/3- 33%	1/3- 33%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54/94- 57%	72/92- 78%	65/76- 86%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/20- 20%	9/20- 45%	10/17- 59%
	English Language Learners	5/9- 56%	7/8- 88%	4/6- 67%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18/93- 19%	53/91- 58%	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/19- 16%	6/21- 29%	N/A
	English Language Learners	3/9- 33%	6/7- 86%	N/A

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38/89- 43%	56/85- 66%	54/74- 73%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/13- 31%	1/8- 13%	1/4- 25%
	English Language Learners	2/9- 22%	3/6- 50%	5/6- 83%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31/73- 43%	63/89- 71%	66/74- 89%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/11- 0%	2/12- 17%	1/4- 25%
	English Language Learners	1/4- 25%	4/7- 57%	5/6- 83%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41/91- 45%		43/90- 48%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/13- 15%		2/12- 12%
	English Language Learners	4/13- 31%		2/14- 14%

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	25	33		37	50		14				
ELL	55			65							
BLK	55			50							
HSP	50	45		59	40		32				
MUL	35			53							
WHT	70	52		87	64		67				
FRL	51	65		63	61	70	48				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	39	35	40	66	63	35				
ELL	36	54	61	49	71	72	38				
BLK	60	82		53	73						

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
HSP	44	55	40	60	71	60	44				
MUL	67			75							
WHT	71	64	50	83	85	75	80				
FRL	44	53	45	56	72	65	49				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	19	28	12	29	62	58	29				
ELL	17	38	25	25	52	45					
ASN	73			73							
BLK	31			31							
HSP	39	45	26	48	66	55	54				
MUL	83			83							
WHT	72	69	54	82	89	86	85				
FRL	41	44	33	52	69	53	64				

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	474
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	68
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	44
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	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data 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?

Learning gains in the lowest quartile for reading are lagging in every grade level and subgroup. Using iReady data from 2020-2021, the percentage of students proficient who are English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities did not increase in reading or math in second grade; math in third grade; Students with disabilities in math for grade four.

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

The lowest quartile in reading shows the greatest need for improvement.

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

Prior SIP documents indicate a lack of continuous identification of students in this subgroup, lack of systematic instruction for these students, and tracking of results. For the 2021-2022 school year, there are grade level TLCs with administration and instructional coach to discuss MTSS data to include the lowest quartile. In addition, there is a 30-min block of time each day to devote to this group of students who will be ability grouped and supported by a teacher with a reading endorsement using a District supported reading resource.

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

The most improvement came in the area of mathematics when comparing 2018-2019 FSA scores. All areas of math (achievement, learning gains, and LQ gains) showed improvement ranging from 11-12 percentage points.

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

The contributing factor is the use of Acaletics math materials to ability group students for 30 minutes each day.

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

Ability grouping students for 30 minutes in reading and 30 minutes in math using relevant and rigorous materials will accelerate learning.

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.

Grade level teams will meet with administration and the instructional coach to review student data and make decisions regarding grouping and instructional resources. Job embedded PD will take place during these meetings. Additionally, there will be quarterly grade level planning with the school's instructional coach.

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

30 minutes of remediation/acceleration based on student data to ability group students using District supported resources.

30 minutes of ability grouped math instruction using Acaletics math materials and FSA test spec materials.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The greatest area of need based on prior years' data is ELA learning gains for the lowest quartile. This will be improved through systematic instruction, data collection, and review to meet the needs of the identified students.
Measurable Outcome:	Learning gains for students in the lowest quartile for ELA will be a minimum of 60% of student making gains according to District Benchmark Assessments and the 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Students in the lowest quartile will be monitored as part of MTSS on a bi-weekly basis. Grade level teams will meet monthly to discuss the data and adjust as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joshua Bennett (bennettj@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	BRE will implement a specific intervention/remediation time for each grade level. Students in the lowest quartile will be tracked to ensure that instruction matches the students' needs. The majority of students will be provided Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) instruction. The school will progress monitor these specific students to ensure they are making gains.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The school leadership team reviewed the reading data and cross referenced the need with the scope and sequence of LLI. This program is research-based and District approved.

Action Steps to Implement

Grade level teams will meet on a monthly basis to review grade level data of common assessments in ELA. Grouping students according to need will be done as part of these data meetings.

Person Responsible Joshua Bennett (bennettj@manateeschools.net)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: There has been a transformation of staff in the past three years. It is vital that the new staff members are acclimated to the climate, culture, and expectations at BRE. It is through a strong leadership team that the focus will be understood by all staff members.

Measurable Outcome: All students will demonstrate a year's worth of growth utilizing end of year assessments.

Monitoring: This area will be monitored through semi-monthly instructional leadership teams that will focus on school wide data. In addition there are semi-monthly grade level team meeting with administration focused on planning and data of grade level assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joshua Bennett (bennettj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Regular meetings using District roadmaps, resources, and assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy is selected because these resources are available to all stakeholders and guide our work.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Professional learning communities will be pivotal to the success of all students at BRE. We want all students to be provided the same rich opportunities for learning regardless of the assigned teacher. There are 6 teachers who are new to the profession or new to BRE. These teachers will need the support and collaboration of their team.

Measurable Outcome: Teachers will work collaboratively to create common end of unit assessments for ELA and math. These assessments will be used to drive common planning for instruction.

Monitoring: This area will be monitored through scheduled TLCs with administration and the school's instructional coach. In addition there are quarterly grade level planning meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joshua Bennett (bennettj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Share with each team the school's vision for collaborative planning and the role for each participant.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research states that teachers need to know and understand the direction of the school and how they are a relevant participant in the success.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Nothing was available on the site 8/31/21

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.

BRE has a variety of school based groups that contribute to creating a positive school culture and environment. The school's leadership team sets the tone by being positive, active staff members that problem solve and lead by example. We have sub committees that provide focused work in defined areas as they relate to our vision and mission of the school.

The yearly calendar includes dates for quarterly grade level teacher planning and collaboration; monthly school-wide professional development sessions, monthly grade level data meetings, and weekly grade level planning and collaboration meetings. During each of these meetings, administration and the school's instructional coach are present to reinforce the school's focus areas and to be of support.

There are 6 new instructional staff members this school year. Each of these BRE staff members were provided a day with the school's principal to learn about the culture and climate of the school and the school's procedures. Additionally, these new staff members are paired with a mentor who is an established staff member at BRE.

A positive culture and environment for students is addressed in several ways. First, BRE utilizes the District's Character Strong monthly character trait program. Each staff member has a set of 10 colored beads. Each colored bead represents a character trait. When a staff member sees a student exemplifying a trait, that student will receive the colored bead to match the character trait. Students collect the character trait beads on a ring.

The second significant way culture and environment is address is with organizing intermediate students among "houses". These houses complete activities and challenges together to earn points. The points lead to a school-wide trophy on display for the "house". The final way that a positive culture and environment is addressed is with School spirit days. The entire staff works together to Redesign the school setting for this spirit day. All learning for the day keeps the theme of the day at it's center.

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

Joshua Bennett- Principal
 Tina Stancil- Assistant Principal
 Michele Jones- Student Support Specialist
 Courtney Walker- Media Specialist/ Instructional Coach

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: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00