Escambia County School District

Bratt Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bratt Elementary School

5721 HIGHWAY 99, Century, FL 32535

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Amy Mccrory

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Bratt Elementary School

5721 HIGHWAY 99, Century, FL 32535

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	90%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Bratt Elementary School supports the Escambia County School District's mission to provide equal access to quality education that embraces the uniqueness and potential of each student.
We believe the education of each child is a shared responsibility of the parents, teachers, staff, and community. Our school provides opportunities which encourage parents to be actively involved in the education of their child. Bratt Elementary is committed to building stronger links between school, home, and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Bratt Elementary School we are united for every student to succeed.
We strive to provide a stimulating learning environment where students are actively engaged in the learning process and equipped with the necessary tools to become life-long learners and productive community members.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McCrory, Amy	Principal	Our Leadership Team collaborates to oversee all functions within the school. Each member considers input and feedback from teachers and staff regarding ways to maximize student learning and further our mission and vision. Having administration, guidance, regular ed, special ed, and special area represented allows Bratt to represent all areas of student learning. As Principal and head of our Leadership Team, Mrs. McCrory communicates state and district expectations and leads our team through shared decision making.
Entrekin, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Our Leadership Team collaborates to oversee all functions within the school. Each member considers input and feedback from teachers and staff regarding ways to maximize student learning and further our mission and vision. Having administration, guidance, regular ed, special ed, and special area represented allows Bratt to represent all areas of student learning. As Assistant Principal, Mrs. Entrekin helps to communicate state and district expectations and lead our team through shared decision making.
Cloud, Jessica	School Counselor	Our Leadership Team collaborates to oversee all functions within the school. Each member considers input and feedback from teachers and staff regarding ways to maximize student learning and further our mission and vision. Having administration, guidance, regular ed, special ed, and special area represented allows Bratt to represent all areas of student learning. As Guidance Counselor, Mrs. Cloud works with staff and our RtI Coordinator to ensure proper implementation of MTSS, monitor early warning system data, and coordinate mentors and volunteers. She works with classes, small groups, and individuals as needed to ensure social, emotional, and behavioral success.
Keenan, Cyndi	Other	Our Leadership Team collaborates to oversee all functions within the school. Each member considers input and feedback from teachers and staff regarding ways to maximize student learning and further our mission and vision. Having administration, guidance, regular ed, special ed, and special area represented allows Bratt to represent all areas of student learning. As RtI Coordinator, Mrs. Keenan works with administration, guidance, and instructional staff to ensure proper implementation of MTSS, analyze data, and monitor early warning system data.
Gilmore, Shonna	Instructional Media	Our Leadership Team collaborates to oversee all functions within the school. Each member considers input and feedback from teachers and staff regarding ways to maximize student learning and further our mission and vision. Having administration, guidance, regular ed, special ed, and special area represented allows Bratt to represent all areas of student learning. As Media Specialist, Mrs. Gilmore nurtures a love of reading through media visits and AR. She collaborates with classroom teachers to enhance instruction by providing resources and helping students locate information to assist with classroom projects. She serves as our Title 1 Parent liaison and oversees the school reading plan.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rackard, Mary	Teacher, PreK	Our grade chairs provide classroom level input on the academic and behavioral success/needs of students as well as the success/needs of teachers regarding professional development and curriculum.
Emmons, Frances	Teacher, K-12	Our grade chairs provide classroom level input on the academic and behavioral success/needs of students as well as the success/needs of teachers regarding professional development and curriculum.
Foster, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	Our grade chairs provide classroom level input on the academic and behavioral success/needs of students as well as the success/needs of teachers regarding professional development and curriculum.
Estes, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	Our grade chairs provide classroom level input on the academic and behavioral success/needs of students as well as the success/needs of teachers regarding professional development and curriculum.
Morales, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	Our grade chairs provide classroom level input on the academic and behavioral success/needs of students as well as the success/needs of teachers regarding professional development and curriculum.
Hammac, Robbie	Teacher, K-12	Our grade chairs provide classroom level input on the academic and behavioral success/needs of students as well as the success/needs of teachers regarding professional development and curriculum.
Carter, Mandi	Teacher, K-12	Our grade chairs provide classroom level input on the academic and behavioral success/needs of students as well as the success/needs of teachers regarding professional development and curriculum.
Sanders, Kim	Teacher, ESE	As an ESE teacher, Mrs. Sanders provides input and guidance as to the best way to reach students with disabilities and communicates how our ESE and general education teachers work together to provide information on core and remedial instruction, data collection, and effective delivery of content at all levels. She communicates with District ESE staff to ensure expectations are followed with regard to procedures and curriculum.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Amy Mccrory

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
34

Total number of students enrolled at the school
495

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	75	81	84	77	67	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	461
Attendance below 90 percent	10	19	24	25	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	6	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	6	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	12	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/21/2022

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	6	6	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	11	4	6	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	6	6	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	11	4	6	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	51%	56%				63%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%						59%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						50%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	59%	46%	50%				76%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	59%						79%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						76%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	52%	59%				58%	54%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	60%	56%	4%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	62%	55%	7%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	83%	58%	25%	64%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	78%	55%	23%	60%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	58%	55%	3%	53%	5%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	23	36		27	73						
AMI	83	60		92	70						
BLK	21	40	29	37	52	47	21				
MUL	73			64							
WHT	61	59	61	64	62	58	64				
FRL	46	46	40	56	55	56	43				

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

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	36	42	40	61	79	73					
AMI	73			100							
BLK	43	48	36	51	72	82	29				
MUL	90			70							
WHT	67	58	55	81	81	72	68				
FRL	52	49	40	68	78	81	49				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	377
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	76
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	69
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

The data for ELA Achievement held steady from 2021 to 2022 with a proficiency of 54%. ELA Learning Gains improved from 37% to 55%. However the proficiency for the lowest 25 percentile dropped from 55% to 42%. In Math, the achievement proficiency dropped slightly from 65% to 59%. Math Learning Gains improved from 47% to 59%. The Math proficiency for the lowest 25 percentile improved from 26% to 57%. Math Learning Gains for SWD was 73% which was a great gain. Science proficiency improved slightly by 2% to 51%. The subgroups for SWD and Black students continues to be an area of concern as we work to improve proifciency in these subgroups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Data for 2022 subgroups indicates that our greatest areas of need are SWD and African American students. These subgroups fall below 41% proficiency. Subgroup data review indicates ELA achievement at 23 for SWD and 21 for BLK; Math achievement at 27 for SWD and 37 for BLK.

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

Teachers worked diligently last year to learn a new reading program aligned to new reading standards. The challenges that accompany the implementation of a new reading program were a factor in our instructional process last school year. Professional learning opportunities and time to study the components of the new program have created a better understanding of the program and how to meet the needs of students with it. We are also continuing to address learning gaps caused by missed instruction during the pandemic. Providing tiered and layered intervention and additional support by a Title I funded aide are strategies used to address these needs.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The ELA learning gains improved from 37% in 2021 to 55% in 2022. In Math, learning gains were improved for the lowest quartile of students from 26% to 57%. There was growth in 73% of 3rd - 5th students in Math between AP2 and AP3 last year.

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

The teachers, RtI Coordinator, and administrators monitored students data and learning gains through out the school year. The teachers used the data to make plans for intervention with individual students and to monitor the methods used to address deficits. We also worked as a school to set and monitor wildly important goals (WIGS).

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

We have begun the year with a renewed focus on attendance, curriculum, assessment, and behavior. Grade levels are competing for perfect attendance. We continue to utilize the district frameworks to ensure standards are covered and learning targets are met, assessing learning and growth through curriculum-based assessments, STAR/FAST, and iReady. Examining data closely will allow us to target weak or missing standards and accelerate learning. Our RtI Coordinator assists by working closely with grade levels to monitor achievement and interventions. We recognize student behavior by celebrating students of the month as well as most improved students.

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

Our professional development will focus on maximizing use of iReady to monitor achievement of grade level standards and effectively deliver literacy instruction through our reading series. Support is provided throughout the year by iReady staff to utilize data to inform personalized instruction and set learning goals. Teachers continue to receive school-based PD in the new reading series and components of reading. We are implementing Thinking Maps across grade levels and content areas to provide common cognitive vocabulary. Our RtI Coordinator works closely with teachers to examine data and select effective interventions. We are conducting a Disrupting Poverty book study. Subject area representatives are given time at faculty meetings to train and share needed information.

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

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

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	We are proud of our increase in ELA learning gains from 37% to 55%. As stated in our data analysis, our overall ELA proficiency is 54%. Our lowest quartile, however, dropped from 55% to 42% proficiency. We will focus on our two subgroups below 41%: students with disabilities (40%) and African American students (35%).
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Students with disabilities will increase their federal index by 5 percentage points going from a federal index of 40% for 2022 to 45% on the 2023 FAST. African American students will increase their federal index by 10 percentage points going from a federal index of 35% for 2022 to 45% on the 2023 FAST.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	School administrators will conduct a minimum of 12 weekly walkthroughs as measured by a school-based walkthrough form and will review school wide data monthly. Administration, teachers, and the RtI Coordinator will monitor the progress of all students, particularly those receiving intervention. Administration will seek district coaching support to recommend adjustments to interventions and/or to provide professional development to improve the effectiveness of intervention. The RtI Coordinator and MTSS team will meet to analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for individual students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy McCrory (amccrory@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will examine STAR/FAST, iReady, and HMH Into Reading data throughout the year to monitor progress of all students. We will provide intensive, systematic instruction in small groups to all students four to five times per week for 40 minutes. We will emphasize strong TIer 1 instruction in whole group utilizing the district curriculum frameworks and decision trees. This implementation will be overseen by administration and monitored by classroom teachers. We will implement the use of Thinking Maps in all grade levels to provide a consistent use of visual patterns and cognitive vocabulary in all subject areas. A Title 1 funded aide will provide additional support for students who need intervention.

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

Action Steps to Implement

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.

Ensure all teachers are initially trained in the use of curriculum materials and district-provided frameworks. Provide ongoing training as needed throughout the year.

Person Responsible	Lisa Entrekin (lentrekin@ecsdfl.us)

Utilize iReady weekly personalized instruction data to monitor growth and target areas of need.

Person Responsible	Amy McCrory (amccrory@ecsdfl.us)

Administration will conduct a minimum of 12 walkthroughs each week (recorded by a school-based Google form) to monitor classroom look fors.

Person Responsible	Amy McCrory (amccrory@ecsdfl.us)

Implement the use of Thinking Maps across all grades and subject areas. Ongoing use will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible	Lisa Entrekin (lentrekin@ecsdfl.us)

Examine STAR, iReady, and curricular data to ensure that students receive needed intervention and Tier instruction.

Person Responsible	Cyndi Keenan (ckeenan@ecsdfl.us)

Departmentalize ESE teachers for grades 3-5 reading and math.

Person Responsible	Lisa Entrekin (lentrekin@ecsdfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Achievement in Math has not reached 41% proficiency in all sub groups: Students with disabilities (27%), African American (37%).
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Math proficiency will increase from 27% to 42% for students with disabilities and from 37% to 42% for African American students
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Data from STAR360 and core instructional materials will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed and broken down by teacher and ESSA groups. School administrators will conduct weekly walkthroughs and will review school-wide data regularly. They will monitor the progress of students receiving intervention and share findings with teachers. Administration will seek district coaching support to recommend adjustments to interventions and/or to provide professional development needs to help improve the effectiveness of intervention. The RtI Coordinator and MTSS team will meet to analyze data and determine the effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for individual students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy McCrory (amccrory@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	We will monitor ongoing curricular, STAR, and iReady data throughout the year. Math fluency and vocabulary will be emphasized for all students using Reflex and other instructional program. We will teach clear and concise mathematical language and support students' use of the language to help students effectively communicate their understanding of mathematical concepts. Teachers will regularly include timed activities as one way to build students' fluency in mathematics.

implemented for this Area of Focus.	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	According to Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades, published by What Works Clearinghouse, focusing on language as well as fluency has strong evidence in improving performance. By providing instruction on mathematical language, teachers support students' learning of subtle and complex mathematical ideas. Focusing on mathematical language during intervention also helps students access the language used during core instruction. Teachers and students can communicate more clearly during class when they are both using mathematical language. As teachers use and model correct mathematical language, their students hear how the words fit with the mathematics they are learning and begin to integrate this language into their own explanations of the mathematics. Automatic retrieval of math facts gives students more mental energy to understand relatively complex mathematical tasks and execute multistep mathematical procedures. Thus, building automatic fact retrieval in students is an important goals of intervention

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.

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

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

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

Encourage and motivate students to work hard by having them chart their progress and monitor their wildly important goals.

Person Responsible	Amy McCrory (amccrory@ecsdfl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The following data was used to determine the critical need:
Kindergarten ELA proficiency rate was 71% on the Spring 2022 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.
First grade ELA proficiency rate was 61% on the Spring 2022 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.
Second grade ELA proficiency rate was 56% on the Spring 2022 STAR Reading Assessment.

Students who score at the 53rd percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading are considered proficient. The number of students who were not considered proficient at the end of 2021-2022 indicates a need to 1) improve core instruction and 2) identify student deficiencies and provide interventions immediately in order to close achievement gaps.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The following data was used to determine the critical need:
Third grade ELA proficiency rate was 47% on the 2022 FSA.
Fourth grade ELA proficiency rate was 56% on the 2022 FSA.
Fifth grade ELA proficiency rate was 60% on the 2022 FSA.
Achievement in ELA for grades 3rd - 5th has (not) reached 41% proficiency in all subgroups:
Students with Disabilities (24%)
African American (21%)

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- ◦ Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- ◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- ◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

ELA proficiency as determined by those scoring at or above the 53rd percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading 2022 will increase from 71% in K, 61% in 1st grade, and 56% in 2nd grade on STAR AP4 to at least 50% on FAST-STAR PM3.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

ELA proficiency will increase from 47% in 3rd grade, 56% in 4th grade, and 60 % in 5th grade on the 2022 FSA to 50% or higher in each grade on the 2023 FAST.

The ELA Proficiency for all identified ESSA subgroups will increase to 50% or higher on new 2023 FAST Progress Monitoring assessments by 23-24.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

To monitor for desired outcomes, we will collect data, analyze, and track the percent of students scoring satisfactorily each quarter. We will identify students in need of intervention according to the intervention decision tree.
a. Kindergarten: STAR Early Literacy results and percent of students earning satisfactory performance on the standards-based grading rubric.
b. First grade: STAR Early Literacy/Reading results and track the percent of students meeting benchmark on the first grade quarterly decoding probe per classroom.
c. Second grade: STAR Reading results and track the percent of students whose fluency rate is average per the time of year on the Hasbrouck and Tindal fluency norms chart.
d. Grades 3-5: analyze results by classroom of district module assessments.
2. Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to observe delivery of Pre-K to Grade 5 literacy instruction and suggest improvements through the use of the Literacy Practice Profile tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

McCrory, Amy, amccrory@ecsdfl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Bratt Elementary uses HMH Into Reading 2022 for its Comprehensive Core Reading/Language Arts Program (CCRP)
The district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan outlines in detail how the various components Into Reading meets Florida' s definition of evidence-based.The district ELA Department

mapped B.E.S.T. and created curriculum frameworks to ensure that Tier I instruction is standards-aligned. In order to ensure the measurable outcomes are reached in K-5, our school will 1) focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 CERP and 2) provide intensive, systematic instruction on foundational reading skills according to the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees.
Tier 1 instruction is monitored by the school's administration team through weekly classroom walkthroughs and by being present during collaborative lesson planning. Teachers and RtI teams monitor the effectiveness of interventions with individual students by collecting data and tracking student progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The use of Houghton Mifflin Into Reading 2022 as a Comprehensive Core Language Arts/Reading Program is supported by recommended practices in the The Institute of Education Sciences Practice Guides as described in the K-12 CERP. The core curriculum includes accommodations for students with a disability, and students who are English language learners; provides print-rich explicit and systematic, scaffolded, and differentiated instruction; builds background and content knowledge; incorporates writing in response to reading; and incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning.
A focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) with this comprehensive curriculum will increase the proficiency of our students in K-5.
Furthermore, following the Institute of Education Sciences recommendations (strong evidence) for interventions, teachers follow the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees to provide interventions in decoding and building fluency, matched to student need during a dedicated intervention period daily.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Action Step 1: Literacy Leadership- Develop a schoolwide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth. Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve.	Entrekin, Lisa, lentrekin@ecsdfl.us
Action Step 2: Literacy Coaching- District coaches and/or school mentor teachers will facilitate common lesson planning using the district adopted curriculum and pacing guides, including how to effectively deliver instruction of B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, engagement strategies, etc.). Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support.	McCrory, Amy, amccrory@ecsdfl.us
Action Step 3: Assessment Our school utilizes the MTSS 4-step problem solving process to analyze data and determine need for differentiated instruction/ intervention. Grade level teams will meet to discuss the use of formative assessment to guide differentiation in the classroom; analyze core reading material assessment results, and use STAR for screening, diagnostics, and progress monitoring.	Entrekin, Lisa, lentrekin@ecsdfl.us
Action Step 4: Professional Learning - We will provide training to teachers at our school on the following: Use of STAR360 reports, core reading program data, and the intervention decision trees Differentiation during the 90 minute block, and use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the language arts intervention period. Five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan The B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the science of reading	McCrory, Amy, amccrory@ecsdfl.us

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Bratt Elementary receives Title I, Part A funds and is developing a written Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) that establishes our expectations for parent and family engagement. This plan will describe

how we will carry out the programs, activities, and procedures. Our stakeholders play a key role in providing feedback to our administration. The stakeholders include the School Advisory Counsel, the PTA organization, business partners, volunteers and families. We strive to build rapport and effective communication with the stakeholders in order

to build a positive, safe, and productive learning environment for our students. A Family School Compact is developed jointly with parents and other stakeholders each year to ensure the collaboration of all stakeholders in the education of our students.

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

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