

Duval County Public Schools

Brentwood Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	15
Budget to Support Goals	15

Brentwood Elementary School

3750 SPRINGFIELD BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32206

<http://www.duvalschools.org/brentwood>

Demographics

Principal: Felicia Hardaway

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Brentwood Elementary where students are inspired to learn while embracing an appreciation for visual and performing arts.

Provide the school's vision statement

To maintain a high-quality educational program that develops the whole child by integrating a rigorous curriculum with an enlightening introduction to the arts.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Richie, Natalya	Assistant Principal	
Hardaway, Felicia	Principal	
Jones, Alexis	Guidance Counselor	
Tomko, Anne	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Felicia Hardaway

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

1

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

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

17

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	50%	57%	29%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	56%	58%	40%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	50%	53%	47%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	71%	62%	63%	41%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	73%	63%	62%	41%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	52%	51%	53%	48%	47%
Science Achievement	9%	48%	53%	21%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	48%	51%	-3%	58%	-10%
	2018	28%	50%	-22%	57%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	52%	-10%	58%	-16%
	2018	26%	49%	-23%	56%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	29%	50%	-21%	56%	-27%
	2018	23%	51%	-28%	55%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	80%	61%	19%	62%	18%
	2018	34%	59%	-25%	62%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		46%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	64%	-4%	64%	-4%
	2018	44%	60%	-16%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		26%				
05	2019	60%	57%	3%	60%	0%
	2018	37%	61%	-24%	61%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	8%	49%	-41%	53%	-45%
	2018	20%	56%	-36%	55%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	42		65	68						
BLK	40	54	53	70	72	55	5				
FRL	41	56	58	70	74	59	10				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	8	33		27	50						
BLK	28	39	47	39	42	53	19				
FRL	26	39	47	37	42	53	19				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	365
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Students With Disabilities	
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
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	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The data components that showed the lowest performance were:

1. 5th Grade ELA 29% although a 3 percent increase the proficiency was a telling disparity compared to the proficiency in grades 3 and 4. Contributing factors: Novice teacher to grade level as a result teacher was learning the necessary skills and strategies to effectively facilitate highly effective standards based instruction.
2. 5th Grade Science had a 12 percentage point decrease. New teacher to grade level. Teacher spent more time teaching and learning strategies and skills for teaching math. As a result Science suffered due to lack of teacher experience and content knowledge of Science content.

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

5th grade science showed the greatest decline from the prior year:

1. New teacher to grade level who was responsible for Math and Science Content. Teacher was stronger and more confident with the Math curriculum.
2. Co-hort reading comprehension deficit provided challenges to students understanding and retaining Science core content.
3. Grade level teacher changes took place in January 2019 as a result their was a barrier of time for students acquiring science content. Prior teacher did not engage fully with the facilitation of Science Instruction.

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

5th grade science showed the greatest decline from the prior year:

1. New teacher to grade level who was responsible for Math and Science Content. Teacher was stronger and more confident with the Math curriculum.
2. Co-hort reading comprehension deficit provided challenges to students understanding and retaining Science core content.

3. Grade level teacher changes took place in January 2019 as a result there was a barrier of time for students acquiring science content. Prior teacher did not engage fully with the facilitation of Science Instruction.

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

3rd-5th Grade Math showed the most improvement. Math increased proficiency by 30 points, growth by 30 points and gains by 3 points.

New Actions:

1. Acaletics - Math Club
2. Moved teachers up from 2nd grade to 3rd grade
3. Mid year teacher change in 5th grade
4. After school Tutoring
5. Continued continuous data analysis sessions with feedback , followup and intentional observation of student work.
6. All teachers had an opportunity to created grade level math goals that led to overall math team goals
7. Shared math vision and mission
8. Increased Admin evaluative and non evaluative observations with timely feedback and follow up
9. Data driven School Based Professional Development.
10. Focused Admin Common Planning

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

1. Overall the disparity of learning proficiency between math(71% proficiency achievement) and reading (42% proficiency achievement). Although, growth was evident in both areas I wonder how we can further close the reading deficit for Reading Achievement. More specifically, 5th Grade ELA had a proficiency achievement of 29% although this was a 3 percent increase from previous year the proficiency was a telling disparity compared to the proficiency in grades 3 and 4. Contributing factors: Novice teacher to grade level as a result teacher was learning the necessary skills and strategies to effectively facilitate highly effective standards based instruction.
2. 5th Grade Science had a 12 percentage point decrease. New teacher to grade level. Teacher spent more time teaching and learning strategies and skills for teaching math. As a result Science suffered due to lack of teacher experience and content knowledge of Science content.

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

1. Improve academic achievement in 5th grade Science
2. Intentional School Wide Reading Initiatives to increase ELA/Writing achievement disparities
3. Intentional 5th grade reading and science plan for the purpose of increase Science Proficiency
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	1. Teacher facilitation High Quality Standards Based instruction for ELA and Science instruction
Measureable Outcome:	Freckles Diagnostics Achieve Readiness Monthly Screeners Standards Based Assessments
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Natalya Richie (richien1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Implement High Quality Standards Based Instruction 2. Provide an environment where students and teachers are held to High Expectations 3. Ensure that teachers believe that all students can learn.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Opportunity Myth research states that the evidences based strategy focus is responsible for closing the achievement gap by 7 months.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	1. Teacher facilitation High Quality Standards Based instruction for ELA and Science instruction
Measureable Outcome:	1. Penda Learning Activities 2. District Based Standards Based Assessments 3. Curriculum Standards Based Assessments 4. Weekly Progress Monitoring assessments provided by the district will serve as exit tickets and be reviewed during common planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Natalya Richie (richien1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Implement High Quality Standards Based Instruction 2. Provide an environment where students and teachers are held to High Expectations 3. Ensure that teachers believe that all students can learn.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

- 1. Improve academic achievement in 5th grade Science**
- 2. Intentional School Wide Reading Initiatives to increase ELA/Writing achievement disparities**
- 3. Intentional 5th grade reading and science plan for the purpose of increase Science Proficiency**
- 4. Math Coach for Novice Teachers**
- 5. Implementation of LLI Program**
- 6. Supplies**

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Theme this year is College and Career Readiness. We will partner with community and faith based partners to include: Brentwood and Friends, National Panhellenic Council (Local D9 organizations - Omega Psi Phi, Alpha Kappa Alpha, etc.), 2nd Mile, Boys and Girls Club, Wing Stop, Nashon Nicks, Winn Dixie, Foxy Lady Cafe, etc.

1. continue to employ the SAC, PTA, SDM, and Parent and Family Title One and Developmental Meetings to garner stakeholder ideas and buy-in.
2. PBIS initiative for a collective student centered school environment where students feel that they are safe and their voices are valued.
3. School Wide collective collaborative pre planning for the 20-21 school year. Goals, ideas, initiatives will be shared and monitored as a school team.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00

	Total: \$0.00
--	-----------------------------