

Bradford County School District

Bradford Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	28

Bradford Elementary School

3856 SE 144TH ST, Starke, FL 32091

bradfordschools.org/bes

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bradford County School Board on 10/9/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

It is the mission of the faculty, staff, parents, community, and stakeholders of Bradford Elementary to create empowered students who will be successful and productive citizens with the ability to solve real world problems, while accepting ownership of their learning through collaboration and critical thinking. We believe that every child deserves the same- a top quality, rigorous education that will prepare them for success in their future educational endeavors.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through implementing Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS) with fidelity, providing rigorous instruction for our students, offering applicable professional development for faculty and staff, and providing extended planning time; an increase in learning gains in reading, math and science will occur.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Melvin, Cassie	Principal	Oversee implementation of new curriculum: HMH, UFLI, Big Ideas, intervention programs if needed for supplementation. Oversee the daily operations of the school functioning. Make changes to intervention and master schedule if modifications are needed.
Morgan, Lauren	Assistant Principal	Oversee all implementation.
Adams, Tammy	Reading Coach	Oversee implementation of ELA curriculum, literacy, interventions and supports for teachers.
	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Oversee data collections, MTSS and curriculum needs for teachers.
Eison, Heather	Math Coach	Oversee implementation of new math curriculum and supports for teachers.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Presentation to the staff for their requests or suggestions for the school improvement plan. It is also presented to our SAC committee once finalized to determine any additional needs.

Names: Tammy Adams, Laurén Morgan, Cassandra Melvin, Amelia Griffis, Rex Mitchell, Stacy Dyal, Heather Eison, and Lindsay Detweiler were in attendance.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Bradford Elementary's SIP is a continuously used document, especially within turnaround status. We meet monthly with our state representative to determine the implementation effectiveness of the goals of the SIP.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	43%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: D 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	49	33	20	30	35	32	0	0	0	199	
One or more suspensions	16	6	11	40	44	33	0	0	0	150	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	36	15	11	19	10	17	0	0	0	108	
Course failure in Math	28	8	12	28	20	18	0	0	0	114	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	30	40	28	0	0	0	98	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	35	29	0	0	0	72	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	25	11	26	32	27	14	0	0	0	135	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	43	21	18	47	46	44	0	0	0	219

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	16	6	6	11	7	0	0	0	0	46
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	4	7	0	0	0	14

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	40	34	31	37	34	30	0	0	0	206	
One or more suspensions	10	15	10	9	15	30	0	0	0	89	
Course failure in ELA	28	22	16	32	14	25	0	0	0	137	
Course failure in Math	15	20	21	39	17	27	0	0	0	139	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	35	37	0	0	0	108	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	55	35	41	0	0	0	131	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	20	26	26	37	12	20	0	0	0	141	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	31	29	29	58	42	44	0	0	0	233

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	13	7	5	6	7	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	40	34	31	37	34	30	0	0	0	206	
One or more suspensions	10	15	10	9	15	30	0	0	0	89	
Course failure in ELA	28	22	16	32	14	25	0	0	0	137	
Course failure in Math	15	20	21	39	17	27	0	0	0	139	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	35	37	0	0	0	108	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	55	35	41	0	0	0	131	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	20	26	26	37	12	20	0	0	0	141	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	31	29	29	58	42	44	0	0	0	233

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	13	7	5	6	7	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	43	46	53	37	45	56	37		
ELA Learning Gains				44			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			36		
Math Achievement*	51	56	59	37	49	50	30		
Math Learning Gains				56			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			27		
Science Achievement*	36	34	54	23	46	59	22		
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					38	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress			59						

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	184
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	280
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	30	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	4	
HSP	50			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	41			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	3	
HSP				
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	42			
FRL	38	Yes	2	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	43			51			36					
SWD	29			38			19				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			43			19				4	
HSP	53			47							2	
MUL	63			44							3	
PAC												
WHT	45			56			42				4	
FRL	39			43			36				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	37	44	45	37	56	38	23					
SWD	31	46	38	30	48	36	29					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	51	57	30	56	29	16					
HSP												
MUL	60	64		40	45							
PAC												
WHT	42	39	43	40	57	48	26					
FRL	32	44	52	32	52	35	20					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	37	40	36	30	35	27	22					
SWD	29	24		23	38		31					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	26		17	32		21					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	49	57		41	38		21					
FRL	34	31		23	26		21					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	45%	1%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	50%	-11%	58%	-19%
03	2023 - Spring	52%	53%	-1%	50%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	51%	-8%	59%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	62%	-14%	61%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	69%	63%	6%	55%	14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	37%	34%	3%	51%	-14%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

- Based on the 2023 state science assessment, 37% of students met proficiency in grade 5.
- Students lacked a background in foundational science content.
- Reading proficiency school-wide went from 36% to 46% in 2023 but is still lower than the state average.
- Instructional gaps for students in grades 3rd through 5th due to effects of Covid-19 pandemic.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

- We did not experience a decline in any tested area for the 2022-2023 school-year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

- Based on the average scale score for FAST ELA, grade 4, PM3 the state average was a 313 and our school's was a 301.
- 38% were level 1
- 23% were level 2
- 22% were level 3

- 13% were level 4
- 4% were level 4
- Fourth grade experienced high teacher turnover over the course of the school-year.
- Fourth grade had the greatest number of students with exceptionalities campus-wide.
- Fourth grade had the highest number of office disciplinary referrals campus-wide.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

- Based on the average scale score for FAST Math in grade 5 on PM3, the state average was 321 and Southside's was 326.
- 17% were level 1
- 14% were level 2
- 35% were level 3
- 26% were level 4
- 8% were level 5
- FAST proficiency improved from 30% in 2022 to 68% in 2023.
- Southside developed a school-wide intervention model that proved to be effective.
- Instructional staff were paid additional hours weekly for collaborative planning.
- Instructional staff participated in bi-weekly common task analysis that identified strengths and weaknesses of grade-level standards taught.
- Content area assessments were reevaluated and modified to ensure increased rigor.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

- Students missing 10% or more of the school-year is an area of concern.
- Students with reading deficiencies is an area of concern.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

- Increase science proficiency on state assessment in grade 5.
- Increase proficiency in the area of ELA on state-wide assessment school-wide.
- Increase student attendance.
- Increase teacher retention.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

-Based on previous year's data, students in grade 5 were 37% proficient on the state science assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

-Given the 2023-2024 science state-wide assessment in grade 5, students will increase proficiency from 37% to 45%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

- Grade 5 science performance will be monitored by rigorous, standards-based classroom assessments.
- Students scoring below 70% will receive additional supports and interventions in the area of science.
- Support personnel hired to monitor instructional practices and student performance for science in grades 3 through 6.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cassie Melvin (melvin.cassie@mybradford.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

- When researching evidence-based interventions for science on www.evidenceofessa.org it states "coming soon."
- PENDA science has been purchased as a supplemental resource for science in grades 3 through 6.
- IXL science was purchased as a supplemental support for grade 5.
- Rigorous standards-based assessments in the area of science for progress monitoring purposes through SchoolCity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- Science interventions will be targeted to standards by utilizing these programs.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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.

- Implementation of targeted standards-based interventions in the area of science.

Person Responsible: Cassie Melvin (melvin.cassie@mybradford.us)

By When: -Implementation starts first day of school. -Progress monitoring will begin following PM1 to measure effectiveness.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

-Based on the 2022-2023 ELA data from FAST PM3, grade 4 performed below the state's average proficiency.

-This cohort of students will be in grade 5 for the 2023-2024 school-year an area of focus.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

-When given the FAST ELA assessment for the 2023-2024 school-year, students who were in grade 4 in the 2022-2023 school-year will increase from 39% to 50% proficiency.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

-Progress will be monitored through district and state-wide assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cassie Melvin (melvin.cassie@mybradford.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

-Professional development opportunity offered to instructional personnel on the Science of Reading.

-LLI Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention will be implemented for students needing support in the areas of comprehension and vocabulary.

-Renaissance Star CBM will be used as a progress monitoring tool for students receiving tier 3 intervention.

-Programs including but not limited to SRA Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading, SIPPS, Learning Dynamics, Heggerty, Edmark, UFLI, Great Leaps, and FCRR student centers will be utilized for tiered levels of instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

-Based on ESSA evidence-based interventions, programs listed above have high level of success.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

-Interventions implemented daily.

-Frequent progress monitoring required tier 2 and tier 3 levels of instruction using H2 forms that will be collected each 9 week period.

-Professional development opportunities for instructional staff on programs implemented.

Person Responsible: Cassie Melvin (melvin.cassie@mybradford.us)

By When: -Interventions will begin day 1 based on 2022-2023 PM3 data.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

- Student attendance is an area of concern school-wide.
- 199 students in grades K through 5 missed 10% or more of the school-year based on 2022-2023 data.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

- Students in grades K through 6 will attend school 95% of the school-year based on ESW for 2023-2024.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

- Changes in the code of conduct state that students may be denied participation in school events based on excessive absences.
- Attendance support personnel will monitor students at risk of excessive absenteeism.
- School implements an attendance contract for students at risk of excessive absenteeism.
- Parent notification sent when students reach excessive absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cassie Melvin (melvin.cassie@mybradford.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

- Changes in the code of conduct state that students may be denied participation in school events based on excessive absences.
- Attendance support personnel will monitor students at risk of excessive absenteeism.
- School implements an attendance contract for students at risk of excessive absenteeism.
- Parent notification sent when students reach excessive absences.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- District-driven initiative focusing on increasing attendance by promoting awareness and educating parents of the correlation between attendance and student proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

- Increasing the contact / communication to parents / guardians at varying increments for excessive absences.
- Attendance contract
- Flyer
- Robocalls

- Social Media Posts
- Home Visits
- Attendance Incentives

Person Responsible: Cassie Melvin (melvin.cassie@mybradford.us)

By When: Ongoing from onset of school year

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

-Thirteen new teachers have been hired for the 2023-2024 school year.

-Six teachers voluntarily left seeking financial advancement, which is fewer than the previous school year.

-Sixth grade was inherited at the elementary level.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

-Climate Surveys (mid-year and end-of-year)

-The only way to measure this area of focus is the decrease of the number teachers who finish the school year

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

-Climate Surveys

-Opportunity for bonus with an effective or highly effective VAM score

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cassie Melvin (melvin.cassie@mybradford.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

-Additional instructional support has been hired

-Collaborative planning for instructional staff (funded by UniSIG, 3 days weekly, 1 hour each day)

-New hire professional development

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

-Weekly meetings between instructional coaching staff and new hires to ensure new hires feel supported and successful

-Tuesday Tidbits (meetings where teachers share best practices with colleagues)

-Collaborative planning allows new teachers to work with veteran teachers to ensure high quality, content rich instruction

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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.

-Climate Surveys

-Mentor

-Weekly meetings with CRT

Person Responsible: Cassie Melvin (melvin.cassie@mybradford.us)

By When: Within first week of school

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Meetings with our district administration occur throughout the spring and summer to determine financial needs. We utilize Title I and Unisig funds to obtain materials/resources and staffing needs while in turnaround. Our SAC also helps provide input on how to utilize funds if obtained per school improvement goals.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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 curriculum and supports are in place at Bradford Elementary: HMH, UFLI, LLI (SRA, Edmark, SIPS, FCRR for interventions as needed) STAR progress monitoring (STAR Reading and STAR early literacy), DIBELS.

Based off the 22-23 end of the year data shows that: 55 PR on STAR Reading.

Kindergarten showed 47% were not on track to score a level 3 or above.

1st grade showed 31% (significant decrease from 62% previous year) of students show not being on track to score a level 3 or above.

2nd Grade: 55% (slight decrease from 57%) of students not being on track to score a level 3 or above.

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

HMH, LLI, Top Score, Star Progress Monitoring, STAR Reading

51% of our 3rd grade students scored below a level 3

56% of our 4th grade students scored below a level 3.

56% of our 5th grade students scored below a level 3.

Due to these numbers, we will receive targeted support from Chris Chaplin, state regional literacy director from Just Read Florida. Targeted support includes: B.E.S.T. ELA standards professional learning and implementation support, school improvement planning support to develop literacy goals, literacy leadership team professional learning and implementation planning, literacy coach professional learning and ongoing support, train-the-trainer opportunities for district and school staff to build capacity and differentiated support based on data.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Highly effective/effective kindergarten team helps to ensure that students are receiving strong foundational skills. A minimum of 10% growth in each grade level K-2 will be the goal to increase the predicted proficiency.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Overall ELA proficiency will increase by 6% to reach 60% proficiency from 54% from previous 22-23 FAST ELA proficiency results.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Common task analysis via data chats bi-weekly with school administration will occur and ensure that teachers are providing rigorous benchmark based instruction that are aligned with our pacing guides. STAR frequent monitoring will occur throughout the school year.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Melvin, Cassie, melvin.cassie@mybradford.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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?

Science of Reading professional development will be given to our teachers via district administration and state literacy director. UFLI will be used as both the everyday curriculum in grades K-2 during the regular reading block however also used in grades 3-6 if needed for intervention purposes.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Our most recent data from 22-23 assessment is the rationale for high impact interventions.

Based off the 22-23 end of the year data:

Kindergarten showed that 47% of their students were not on track to score a level 3 or above

1st Grade showed that 31% of their students were not on track to score a level 3 or above.

2nd grade showed 55% of their students were not on track to score a level 3 or above.

47% of our students scored below a level 3 in grade 3.

60% of 4th grade students scored below a level 3.

52% of 5th grade students scored below a level 3.

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
<p>Due to the most recent ELA data, we will receive targeted support from Chris Chaplin, state regional literacy director from Just Read Florida. Targeted support includes: B.E.S.T ELA benchmarks professional learning and implementation support, school improvement planning support to develop literacy goals, literacy leadership team learning and implementation planning, literacy coach professional learning and ongoing support, train the trainer opportunities for district and school staff to build capacity and differentiated support based upon data.</p> <p>We have already had one training during pre-planning with Chris Chaplin as of today.</p>	<p>Melvin, Cassie, melvin.cassie@mybradford.us</p>
<p>UFLI Implementation in all classrooms K-2.</p> <p>On site coaching from Tammy Adams, literacy coach. DIBELS will be used again to measure fluency. Assessments are embedded into UFLI, modeling of foundation lessons for teachers in K-2. Training support provided, parent night provided. Pre-planning provided UFLI for new teachers and a "2.0" for refresher for previous teachers on site.</p>	<p>Melvin, Cassie, melvin.cassie@mybradford.us</p>
<p>New Implementation of PBIS</p> <p>Hired a new Behavior Resource Teacher (BRT) that has created Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) committees that meet regularly. Implementing school-wide PBIS School Store. Students earn points weekly in class for exhibiting positive behavior that turn into Tornado Tokens they can cash in for prizes at the school store. BRT has established check-in/ check-out systems for students that have a history of recurrent Office Disciplinary Referrals (ODRs). Our BRT has also put into place "Behavior Contracts" and "No-Contact Contracts" that allow students to acknowledge and agree on an action plan that encourages strategies to reduce problem behaviors. Implementation of a school wide mentoring program is in the works.</p>	<p>Melvin, Cassie, melvin.cassie@mybradford.us</p>
<p>Subgroups Increasing but still Underperforming</p> <p>Students receive daily targeted intervention according to our school-wide intervention model. They receive explicit targeted intervention on benchmarks not yet mastered. Students are strategically grouped according to academic needs identified via performance on state-wide assessments. Intervention is conducted by certified teachers or paraprofessionals with their micro-reading credential to close the achievement gap. An on-site math and science coach has also been brought on to offer additional support to underperforming students.</p> <p>Students are also being put (in 6th grade) into intensive math/reading classes based on their FAST performance or deficiency letters that went home.</p>	<p>Melvin, Cassie, melvin.cassie@mybradford.us</p>
<p>Intervention Support and Course Failures</p> <p>Students in sixth grade that met state criteria for being considered deficient in the area of mathematics or English language arts have been placed in remedial courses three days per week. Students in those courses receive instruction from a certified teacher or paraprofessional with their micro-reading credential. Students are</p>	<p>Melvin, Cassie, melvin.cassie@mybradford.us</p>

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

monitored monthly and will have the ability to test out of remedial intervention pending results of future state-wide assessments.

Monitoring of Students Retained

Students that have been previously retained in a given grade are automatically placed into tier 3 instruction groups starting at the beginning of the school year. Students receive all 3 levels of tiered instruction and supports utilizing curriculum approved in Florida's K-12 Reading Plan. Our intervention specialist, Rex Mitchell, has worked with our instructional coaches to outline an intervention model addressing benchmarks from prior grade levels students have yet to master as the focal point for intervention instruction in order to close the achievement gap.

Melvin, Cassie,
melvin.cassie@mybradford.us

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be available to view on www.bradfordschools.org under Bradford Elementary School. We will also have hard copies available to view for anyone without internet capabilities. We share this during our beginning of the year SAC meeting and also to our teachers and staff. Parents may obtain this information as well via our Facebook social media.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

www.bradfordschools.org

This site is where we cite our school mission and vision plans. Parents may utilize FOCUS parent portals, PTC face to face are required, parent nights where parents learn to help their children, encouragement of PTO meetings and scheduling them later in the afternoon.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We have included into our master schedule a strategic intervention time for each grade level. We have inherited 6th grade at all elementary schools and have considered an advanced math option (however we are looking at state guidelines to determine if this is possible). We have purchased "Do the Math" to target our lower level math students for tier 3 purposes. We have hired effective/highly effective staff to increase intervention/coaching support for our teachers.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

One of the additional resources we will utilize will be Food 4 Kids where we can get our "food insecure" students fed going into the weekend.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Our school based Threat Assessment team assists in mental health services. We are also contracted with Meredian for supports. Our school guidance counselor filters through these requests or referrals.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Students may have an opportunity to experience a career day in the spring working around the testing schedule to raise awareness for post secondary or workforce opportunities.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

- Students may be receiving tier 2 or tier 3 behavior supports with Behavior Intervention Plans in place.
- Students receive additional check in/counseling via ESE teachers, mentors or Behavior Resource Teacher.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Teachers have bi-weekly data meetings and weekly mini PD opportunities that is additional time for planning funded by Unisig. Paraprofessionals have an opportunity to plan with their assigned grade levels.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

We house 2 VPK classrooms and students are given kindergarten screeners prior to leaving for the summer break. VPK must now be included in data meetings with administration.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science					\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA					\$279,323.75
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24	
	5100	150	0081 - Bradford Elementary School	UniSIG	4.0	\$89,000.00	
			Notes: Four instructional paraprofessionals to assist in literacy intervention and literacy tutoring.				
	5100	210	0081 - Bradford Elementary School	UniSIG		\$12,000.00	
			Notes: Retirement for Instructional Paraprofessionals				
	5100	220	0081 - Bradford Elementary School	UniSIG		\$7,000.00	
			Notes: FICA for Instructional Paraprofessionals				
	6400	120	0081 - Bradford Elementary School	UniSIG		\$143,500.00	
			Notes: Hourly stipends for Professional Development in extended hours with Embedded Planning 50 teachers x \$33/hr x 3.0 hrs per week x 28 weeks				
	6400	210	0081 - Bradford Elementary School	UniSIG		\$17,500.00	
			Notes: Retirement for PD Stipends				
	6400	220	0081 - Bradford Elementary School	UniSIG		\$10,323.75	
			Notes: FICA for PD Stipends				
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System					\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment					\$0.00
Total:						\$279,323.75	

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No