Suwannee County Schools

Branford 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 | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 20 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 26 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Branford Elementary School

26801 STATE ROAD 247, Branford, FL 32008

bes.suwannee.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Deidre Mcmanaway

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 | 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* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (54%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | ormation* |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | <u>Cassandra Brusca</u> |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For | or more information, click here. |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Suwannee County School Board on 10/26/2021.

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 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| <u> </u> | |
| School Information | 7 |
| | |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| | |
| Planning for Improvement | 20 |
| | |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| | |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Branford Elementary School

26801 STATE ROAD 247, Branford, FL 32008

bes.suwannee.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

| School Type and Gi (per MSID | | 2020-21 Title I Schoo | I Disadvan | Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|------------|--|
| Elementary S PK-5 | school | Yes | | 100% |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 24% |
| School Grades Histo | ry | | | |
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| Grade | | С | С | С |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Suwannee County School Board on 10/26/2021.

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.

Branford Elementary School along with all Suwannee County Schools will educate all students in a safe and supportive learning environment that will develop life-long learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Branford Elementary School along with all Suwannee County Schools will be a district of excellence ensuring all students are prepared for personal success.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| McManaway, Deidre | Principal | Personnel Issues Program Development Teacher Evaluation/Observation Professional Assistance Plan Beginning Teacher Program/Intern Program Finance and Budgeting Teacher Handbook Room Assignments School Improvement Plan Activity (Master) Schedule Student Promotion/Retention Lesson Plans/Gradebooks Data Collection/Progress Monitoring Maintenance and Custodial Events Calendar Parent Conference Copies End of Year Checklist Student Placement Curriculum Issues Testing (iReady, FSA) Textbook Inventory/Ordering Title I Crate Parent Concerns Safety/ Security Issues |
| Ahrens, Melinda | Assistant Principal | Emergency Procedures/Drills Furniture/Equipment Procurement Attendance and Truancy Teacher Observations Teacher/ Staff Evaluation Title I Crate Daily Curriculum Issues Security Student Placement School Safety Issues Lesson Plans/Gradebooks Discipline/Behavior Issues Testing (iReady, FSA) Facilities and Ground Maintenance Duty Schedules Professional Development Report Cards/Progress Reports Safety Committee End of Year Checklist Teacher Handbook Reading Pal Assistant Volunteer Orientation School Advisory Council Agendas School Improvement Plan |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | Personnel Issues Parent Concerns Threat Assessments WIDA Testing Coordinator |
| Williams, Margaret | School Counselor | Counseling ESOL Coordinator WIDA Testing ESE / 504 Documentation ESE Staffings Rti Coordinator FSA, iReady Testing Character Education Threat Assessments Behavioral Plans School Supplies for students in need Clothing/Shoes for students in need Anti-Bullying Awareness Drug and Substance Abuse Prevention |
| Flowers, Lisa | Instructional Coach | Non-evaluative Classroom Observations Teacher Support Curriculum Needs Rti Facilitator Professional Development Needs FSA, iReady assistance -testing/ proctor Data Collection (all subject areas) Writing Curriculum Support AR - Award's S.T.E.M. Day Coordinator Student Support- Small group pull out FLKRS Assessment assistance for Kindergarten |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Deidre Mcmanaway

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.

n

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

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

678

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

3

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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 112 | 107 | 113 | 118 | 93 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 631 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 42 | 31 | 31 | 28 | 34 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 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 | 4 | 10 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 54 | 35 | 22 | 44 | 23 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | (| Grad | le L | .ev | el | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|----|----|------|------|-----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 19 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 11 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 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 9/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | | | | | Gra | de L | .ev | el | | | | | | Total |
|---|----|-----|-----|----|-----|------|-----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 94 | 114 | 103 | 86 | 88 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 573 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 36 | 26 | 20 | 22 | 24 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 10 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | |
| 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 |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled | 94 | 114 | 103 | 86 | 88 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 573 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 36 | 26 | 20 | 22 | 24 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| Indicator | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 10 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| 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).

| Sahaal Grada Component | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | 2018 | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State | |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 59% | 53% | 57% | 58% | 53% | 56% | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 55% | 64% | 58% | 54% | 63% | 55% | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 56% | 50% | 53% | 38% | 38% | 48% | |
| Math Achievement | | | | 61% | 55% | 63% | 62% | 55% | 62% | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 49% | 64% | 62% | 43% | 54% | 59% | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 30% | 31% | 51% | 24% | 22% | 47% | |
| Science Achievement | | | | 52% | 48% | 53% | 58% | 48% | 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 | 72% | 56% | 16% | 58% | 14% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 48% | 5% | 58% | -5% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -72% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 47% | 5% | 56% | -4% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -53% | | | • | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 61% | 9% | 62% | 8% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 50% | 2% | 64% | -12% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -70% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 43% | 17% | 60% | 0% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -52% | | | • | |

| | SCIENCE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 44% | 6% | 53% | -3% | | | | | | | |
| Cohort Con | nparison | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool utilized by Branford Elementary School as well as ALL Suwannee District Schools is iReady Reading and Mathematics from Curriculum Associates. This assessment monitors progress of all students in Grades Kindergarten through Fifth Grade three times per year. In addition to iReady, there is progress monitoring that happens for writing and science through Write Score and Performance Matters respectively.

| | | Grade 1 | | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 26% | 42% | 68% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 21% | 42% | 68% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2% | 17% | 46% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 13% | 56% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 8% | 26% | 64% |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 8% | 26% | 64% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 8% | 46% |
| | English Language Learners | 25% | 13% | 33% |
| | | Grade 2 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | | | | |
| | All Students | 34% | 53% | 70% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 34% 34% | 53% 53% | 70% 70% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With | 34% | 53% | 70% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | 34% 0% | 53% 29% | 70% 63% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | 34% 0% 0% | 53% 29% 14% | 70% 63% 29% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | 34% 0% 0% Fall | 53% 29% 14% Winter | 70% 63% 29% Spring |
| Arts | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | 34% 0% 0% Fall 13% | 53% 29% 14% Winter 37% | 70% 63% 29% Spring 65% |

| | | Grade 3 | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 56% | 81% | 76% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 56% | 81% | 76% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 21% | 59% | 42% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 78% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 11% | 46% | 74% |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 11% | 46% | 74% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11% | 35% | 42% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | | | | |
| | | Grade 4 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Grade 4 Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 43% | Spring 51% |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | . • |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 37% | 43% | 51% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | Fall 37% 37% | 43% 43% | 51% 51% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency | Fall 37% 37% 13% 0% Fall | 43% 43% 14% 0% Winter | 51% 51% 21% 100% Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 37% 37% 13% 0% | 43% 43% 14% 0% | 51% 51% 21% 100% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 37% 37% 13% 0% Fall | 43% 43% 14% 0% Winter | 51% 51% 21% 100% Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 37% 37% 13% 0% Fall 16% | 43% 43% 14% 0% Winter 35% | 51% 51% 21% 100% Spring 56% |

| | | Grade 5 | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 32% | 43% | 48% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 32% | 43% | 48% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 21% | 23% | 25% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 14% | 36% | 51% |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 14% | 36% | 51% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15% | 33% | 37% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 36% | N/A | 71% |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | 36% | N/A | 71% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17% | N/A | 50% |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Subgroup Data Review

| | | 2021 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | 24 | 33 | | 34 | 27 | | 26 | | | | |
| ELL | 40 | | | 40 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 43 | | | 60 | | | 50 | | | | |
| MUL | 33 | | | 42 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 47 | 56 | 64 | 34 | 24 | 61 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 42 | 57 | 52 | 29 | 24 | 52 | | | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 24 | 38 | 43 | 33 | 45 | 28 | 21 | | | | |
| ELL | 57 | 46 | | 43 | 46 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 66 | 55 | | 60 | 55 | | 42 | | | | |
| MUL | 44 | 33 | | 31 | 8 | | | | | | |

| | | 2019 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| WHT | 60 | 57 | 58 | 63 | 52 | 30 | 56 | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 49 | 50 | 56 | 46 | 31 | 40 | | | | |
| | | 2018 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 20 | 35 | 25 | 34 | 30 | 18 | 30 | | | | |
| ELL | 53 | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 53 | | 66 | 47 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 59 | | | 65 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 56 | 40 | 62 | 43 | 22 | 58 | | | | |
| FRL | 54 | 54 | 42 | 57 | 38 | 23 | 51 | | | | |

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 | 46 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 42 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 368 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | | |
|---|-----|--|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 29 | |
| 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 | 41 | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO | |

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 | 49 |
| 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 | 38 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | 44 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| | |

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?

PROGRESS MONITORING:

With consideration to ELA in Grades 1, 2, 4, and 5 it is evident that ALL students as a grade level improved with each diagnostic test. In Grade 3, students as a grade level improved significantly from the first diagnostic to the second diagnostic then took a little dip at the third diagnostic. However, the first improvement from the first to the second diagnostic was impressive (above 80% proficiency) dropping only to 76% in the final diagnostic.

In mathematics, ALL grade levels as a group improved with each diagnostic test. According to the Spring diagnostic, ALL grade levels as a group improved to above 50% proficiency or more in mathematics.

When looking at the ELA and mathematics ELL students, ALL students in Grades 1-4 made improvements. Grade 5 ELL students did not make any progress in either subject. Targeted grade levels to improve ELL students in ELA (below 50%) are Grades 2&5. Targeted grade levels to improve ELL students in mathematics are Grades 1, 2, 3, and 5. Regarding Students With Disabilities (SWD), all grades were below 50% in mathematics. All grades except second grade ELA were below 50% when viewing SWD. Clearly this targeted group needs some improvement. STATE ASSESSEMENT (Spring 2021)

Upon review of the FSA 2021 data, collectively tested grade levels were all above 50% proficiency. However, when disaggregating the grade levels, the area in need of focus is Grade 5 ELA (46%) and mathematics (38%).

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

Since there was no FSA state assessment in 2020, a reflection of the data from 2019 to 2021 is the best way to find the greatest need. Even though there was an increase in mathematics by 6 percentage points in SY18/19, the mathematics achievement remained exactly the same. This is in part by a significant 22 point drop in Grade 5 mathematics that was not predicted on any data monitored at the Spring diagnostic. In addition, ELA achievement dropped 4 percentage points in the most recent FSA data. Again, this is in part by a drop in Grade 5 ELA. Grade 5 is clearly the focus overall this school year for ELA, mathematics, SWD, and ELL.

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

Since Grade 5 is in the most need for improvement, a look at all the changes in that grade level are in order. In SY20/21, there was a personnel change in the area of writing and social studies. In addition, it must be noted that of the five personnel serving that grade level, two teachers and one paraprofessional had deaths in their immediate family while an additional teacher had health issues throughout the year. The teacher attendance was not at it's all time high. There was only one consistent teacher in that grade level and those scores were the highest at 60% proficiency (Science). One strategy used to assist this grade level focuses on SWD. There are two support facilitators who will have intervention groups every day during the scheduled intervention time. This is a 40 minute block of time daily. These teachers will use Reading Horizons in order to close the gap in ELA progress.

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

The data component showing the most improvement when reviewing 2019 state assessment data is 3rd grade ELA. BES 3rd Grade ELA scored 72% in SY18/19. This was an improvement of 13 percentage points from the previous year.

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

Grade 3 in SY18/19 found time inside their daily schedule to schedule small intervention groups and individual groups where needed. The Leadership Team participated in many class visits and noticed the success of this grade level. In SY20/21 the Leadership Team implemented the Buccaneer Block which is a schoolwide grade level intervention time daily.

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

In order to accelerate learning, the process of diagnosing the skill gaps and creating intervention groups seems to be the best strategy for our school so far. Through the designated 40 minute time per grade level each day, students will be instructed on specific skills in small groups for ELA. In addition to that, students are placed inside specific skill groups for mathematics within their grade level using the support paraprofessional. Furthermore, of the 42 instructional teachers on staff, 34 teachers have added reading to their certificate.

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.

Throughout the school year, there are designated professional development days scheduled for teachers and leaders. Each PD Day includes a focus on ELA strategies and planning. Some PD Days will target multidisciplinary strategies, best practices for teaching reading, and opportunities to complete the reading endorsement.

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

Personnel is such a critical aspect to achievement of students. Dynamic teachers must be in place at all critical core subjects for students to find that year's worth of growth they deserve. A service to the students will be the continual collaboration of teachers throughout the school in PLC groups as well as professional development to have teachers available for students in the event a critical teacher needs to be away from the classroom for weeks at a time. In addition, the teachers along with the Leadership Team will monitor the data regularly to find the most present need of the students. One more service to the students is to develop a data notebook with regular data chats in order to gain the input of the students for achievement goals.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to targeted intensive mathematics intervention of students in the lowest quartile.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: While the learning gains for the lowest quartile in mathematics did increase 6 percentage points in SY18/19, BES lowest quartile in mathematics is still 17 percentage points below the state average AND this component is still the lowest performing. It is clear between SY 17/18, SY18/19, SY 19/20, and SY 20/21 teachers shared they had more opportunities within their schedule to work with students in small groups and individually to close the gaps in mathematics. With this trend in mind, the schedule for SY 21/22 has been tailored to provide quality intervention time in mathematics.

Measurable Outcome:

Branford Elementary School will increase learning gains of the lowest quartile in

Mathematics by 20% during the 2022 Spring state-wide testing.

Branford Elementary School uses iReady as a progress monitoring tool. Students will be monitoring: monitored three times per year to check for progress. Any students showing deficiency will be provided into participate that skill area.

be provided intervention in that skill area.

Person responsible for

Deidre McManaway (deidre.mcmanaway@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-based
Strategy:

In mathematics, students must be able to not only know the procedure of math but the concept as well. By organizing small groups, based upon the identification of students who need some extra instruction in the concept being taught, students can gain the knowledge necessary to master the standard of focus.

Rationale

for Evidencebased Strategy: This strategy of explicit small group instruction ensures mastery of standards by every student. Using the Rtl/MTSS process, a teacher will know who is ready with the mathematical understanding of the concept and who needs more instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Targeted intensive intervention in small groups or individually as necessary to meet the needs of the students who have gaps in mathematical concepts.
- 2. i-Ready daily practice pathway (based upon diagnostic testing) will occur.
- 3. IXL (computer math program) for Kindergarten through Fifth Grades provides additional support for procedural skills.
- 4. Teachers will use the i-Ready toolbox as a resource for intervention.
- 5. Teachers initiate parent contact for lowest quartile students to ensure communication from home to school.

Person Responsible

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of
Focus
Description
and
Rationale:

In the 2020 -2021 school year, 5th grade ELA student proficiency decreased significantly lower than previous tested years. BES sets high standards for students and expects that students leave the elementary school level proficient. The 5th grade team is compartmentalized so that teachers can focus on a subject area, however, all teachers push in to provide extra support in reading.

Measurable Outcome: Branford Elementary School will show an increase in 5th grade Reading (ELA) by 5% based upon the 2022 Spring state-wide testing. The 5th grade Reading (ELA) 2021 shows 46% student proficiency. The goal is to increase to 51% or higher. *There are approximately 41 students in 5th grade for the 2021-2022 school year in need of Tier 3 interventions after diagnostic 1.

Monitoring:

Person responsible for

Deidre McManaway (deidre.mcmanaway@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence- Teachers will differentiate their lessons to meet the needs of ALL our learners at BES. Administration will visit regularly to ensure accountability and provide assistance for

Strategy: success.

Rationale for Evidence-

based

Students learn if different ways. BES teachers will differentiate the lessons to meet student needs for learning. Some will learn by talking it out with peers. Some will learn by listening. Some learners are kinesthetic and will need a hands on approach, while others may need to create diagrams or visuals to process literacy concepts. Instruction will be data driven and student led. The teachers will serve as facilitators allowing students to take charge of

Strategy: their own learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers plan and prepare explicit lesson plans to meet the needs of all learning styles within their classroom utilizing multidisciplinary strategies.

Teachers meet weekly as a team to ensure students' reading needs are met on a weekly basis in the intervention groups.

Teachers receive ongoing professional development in reading instruction with a focus on multidisciplinary reading strategies.

Leadership visits classrooms regularly for instructional integrity.

Intervention teachers acquire the reading endorsement and add it to the Florida teaching certificate. Teachers collect monthly intervention data for each student in the Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups. Leadership calls data meetings monthly to review intervention data with teachers and guide instruction based upon this data.

Teachers use formative assessments throughout the year to target student needs in reading.

Teacher's schedules include 40 minutes per day for immediate, intensive intervention with students identified as having Tier 3 needs.

Each teacher has the following intervention tools available for their students:

- •i-Ready daily practice pathway (based upon diagnostic testing)
- •Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMH) reading intervention materials
- •i-Ready Resource Toolbox
- •Reading interventions listed in the Suwannee District Reading Plan
- •Reading Horizons Phonics Program

Person Responsible

No description entered

Person

Responsible

[no one identified]

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of

Focus
Description
and

Students With Disabilities (SWD) that struggle academically have gaps in their academic skills. BES educators will focus on targeted skills through the use of intervention strategies in order to close the gaps for these students.

Rationale:

Measurable Outcome: Branford Elementary School will show 10% increase in the subgroup percent of points for Students With Disabilities (SWD). *Approximately 55 students in the 2021-2022 school year as opposed to approximately 91 in the previous year..

Monitoring:

Person responsible

for monitoring

[no one identified]

Evidencebased

Strategy:

outcome:

Teachers will be scheduled a specific 40 minute block of time in order to provide strategic intensive intervention to Students With Disabilities (SWD). This "Buccaneer Block" will allow support personnel to team up with homeroom teachers and deliver this unique intervention utilizing all personnel in a convenient 40 minute time span.

Rationale for

Creating a unique time in which teachers and support staff can target students for interventions is necessary to allow teachers the opportunity to target these deficiencies. Teachers need the opportunity for small group intense instruction and more one on one intervention time. By targeting a specific group of students and monitoring progress for those students, the success rate will increase.

Evidencebased Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. An intervention block of time consisting of 40 minutes, known as Buccaneer Block, is used for targeted, intensive intervention for Students With (SWD).
- 2. Homeroom teachers use formative assessments throughout the year in order to target specific skills for focus during Buccaneer Block.
- Teachers will be offered professional development to further service Students With Disabilities (SWD).
- 4. Two support facilitators along with a support paraprofessional are available to serve the Students With Disabilities (SWD) throughout Branford Elementary. This support is in addition to the homeroom teacher..

Person Responsible

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial

Area of Focus **Description** and Rationale:

After reviewing data, multiracial students at BES were identified as a subgroup of students who scored less than 40% proficient on the 2021 state-wide assessment. This data is from SY18/19. The 4th and 5th grade students from that year have moved on to the next school since the data is so old. We await more recent data to compare. However, since it was a need at the last data point, teachers will be made aware of their multiracial students for strategic intervention.

Measurable Outcome:

Branford Elementary School will provide Mulitracial Students with specific intervention in reading and math.

Monitoring:

Person responsible

for

Deidre McManaway (deidre.mcmanaway@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased Strategy:

The Branford Elementary School Leadership Team will provide homeroom teachers with a list of multiracial students assigned to their classroom. Monthly data and progress meetings with teachers discussing multiracial students' progress will take place as multiracial students are served in their homerooms.

Rationale for

Evidencebased Strategy:

The rationale behind identification of the Multiracial Students is simply awareness. As teachers receive their new class lists annually, they may not be aware of these students falling into this specific subgroup. Once identified, the monitoring of progress is simply best practice as this specific subgroup is observed.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. The BES Leadership Team provides teachers with a list of Multiracial Students assigned to their classrooms.
- 2. Monthly data and progress meetings with teachers discussing Multiracial Students' progress.

Person Responsible

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of FocusDescription and While only two incidents occurred where substances were used, BES feels that it is important to be proactive and put prevention measures in place.

Measurable Branford Elementary will reduce the number of substance abuse incidents by 50% during the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring:

outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring

Deidre McManaway (deidre.mcmanaway@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Evidencebased Strategy: Research indicates that interactive prevention programs can provide strategies that help students identify ways to remove themselves from the situation at hand, thus

significantly reducing the number incidents.

Rationale for Evidence-

BES strives to be proactive in school safety. Students are being exposed much younger to peer pressure, therefore providing prevention and awareness is key to

based Strategy: helping our elementary students stay safe.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students participate in a drug/substance abuse prevention program provided by the School Resource Officer and Guidance Counselor..

- 2. Students participate in Red Ribbon Week to recognize drug abuse prevention.
- 3. Teachers focus on character traits monthly with students.

Person
Responsible
Deidre McManaway (deidre.mcmanaway@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

School safety is the number one priority when the doors of Branford Elementary School are open to the public. The Emergency Response Plan created specifically for Branford Elementary School will be drilled and practiced frequently and with fidelity throughout the school year. Branford Elementary will have a Positive Behavior and Safety Committee in place which meets monthly to support the school safety initiative for the whole school. In order to include external stakeholders such as parents and community participants, Branford Elementary School will hold the monthly APT meeting to gain input regarding safety from an external perspective.

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.

A positive school culture and environment reflects a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, and people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning. The school culture must demonstrate values of 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.

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

There are many who assist in the strong positive culture of Branford Elementary School. The principal, assistant principal, guidance counselor, and instructional coach drive the positive culture from the leadership vantagepoint.

There are teacher-leaders who extend that positive culture in the grade levels and special areas. In addition, the rest of the teachers, paraprofessionals, and enrichment area teachers promote kindness and positivity throughout the school. The parents and community members make up an organization that frequent our school regularly volunteering time and promoting positivity for staff and students. Finally, there is a committee of teachers who make up the Sunshine Committee for staff only who extend positive gestures, gatherings, and treats for faculty and staff throughout the school year. Students are rewarded regularly and encouraged as well. The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site along with a Parent Resource room with materials available for checkout through the school's parent liaison.