Brooksville Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Brooksville Elementary School

885 N BROAD ST, Brooksville, FL 34601

https://www.hernandoschools.org/bes

Demographics

Principal: Dana Kublick

Start Date for this Principal: 6/13/2019

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
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 below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Hernando 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

Brooksville Elementary School

885 N BROAD ST, Brooksville, FL 34601

https://www.hernandoschools.org/bes

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	B	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to "Make Every Moment Count for Every Child, Every Day!"

Provide the school's vision statement.

Brooksville Elementary is a School of Career Studies. Dream Big, Explore More.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lastra, Mike	Principal	
Benard, Daiquiri	Other	Assessment Coordinator: Organize school wide testing schedule, ensure all testing accommodations are met. Provide Administration with FSA and progress monitoring data as needed. Present data to staff and Leadership Team.
DeNote, Carrie	Other	Math Resource: Pull small groups throughout the day of students needing Tier 3 in Math. Organize and lead math leadership team meetings. Thinking Maps Math Lead. Organize family math events. ST Math and Reflex Math coordinator.
Peeler, Lisa	Administrative Support	
Gibson, Patricia	Instructional Coach	School Based IPC: Provide teachers with training and feedback on instructional practices. Provide teachers with coaching cycles as needed. Accelerated Reader Lead. Organize AR family nights. Participate in classroom walkthoughs with admin to discuss instructional practices. Assist grade level teams in SWAP of common fomatives.
Inmon, RIchard	Assistant Principal	
Boyer, Miranda	Attendance/ Social Work	
Jernigan, Kristi	School Counselor	
Gorham, Malinda	Other	MTSS Coordinator: Lead school wide MTSS meetings. Assist teachers in making tiered groups. Present LQ growth data to Leadership team.
Anderson, Amy	Other	Title I Facilitator

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	95	114	110	128	104	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	655
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	1	4	7	18	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	5	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	27	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	2	17	18	40	26	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

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	2	2	2	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 6/13/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	6	25	22	22	9	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	3	7	18	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	0	1	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	30	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	3	9	19	29	25	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	6	25	22	22	9	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	3	7	18	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	0	1	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	34	30	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	3	9	19	29	25	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	53%	54%	57%	60%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	53%	58%	61%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	52%	53%	62%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	58%	58%	63%	64%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	57%	62%	64%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	48%	51%	44%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	54%	53%	63%	54%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	95 (0)	114 (0)	110 (0)	128 (0)	104 (0)	104 (0)	655 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (6)	0 (25)	0 (22)	0 (22)	0 (9)	0 (18)	0 (102)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	4 (3)	7 (7)	18 (18)	10 (14)	5 (13)	45 (55)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (4)	5 (0)	2 (1)	1 (2)	1 (6)	2 (0)	13 (13)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12 (34)	27 (30)	14 (37)	53 (101)

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

NOTE: 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**
03	2019	50%	57%	-7%	58%	-8%
	2018	60%	62%	-2%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	59%	6%	58%	7%
	2018	43%	53%	-10%	56%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	44%	52%	-8%	56%	-12%
	2018	49%	53%	-4%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	46%	62%	-16%	62%	-16%
	2018	56%	67%	-11%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	62%	5%	64%	3%
	2018	71%	60%	11%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	60%	-2%
	2018	61%	56%	5%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	48%	55%	-7%	53%	-5%
	2018	49%	56%	-7%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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 2017-18**	**C & C Accel 2017-18**
SWD	18	32	33	25	42	36	30				

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
BLK	43	42	38	49	50	10	8				
HSP	52	56		47	63		45				
MUL	35	42		52	75						
WHT	56	59	63	62	67	55	55				
FRL	47	52	54	52	63	42	44				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	24	38	42	38	49	36	18				
BLK	31	37	33	38	48	29	18				
HSP	56	57		70	76		42				
MUL	38	40		40	60						
WHT	54	49	45	69	69	56	60				
FRL	46	49	45	59	65	50	44				
2017 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	13	25	36	29	25	29					
BLK	38	41		42	48	45					
HSP	71	74		69	83		60				
MUL	50	42		67	50						
WHT	62	64	69	66	65	41	67				
FRL	55	57	58	61	60	37	58				

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)	TS&I
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	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	51
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

5th Grade FSA Science (47%)
Math LQ(45%)
Science-Last year there was no true Science block on the master schedule. This caused teachers (especially in FSA grade levels) to over look Science as a whole.
Math LQ- Many of our LQ students are double dipper (LQ ELA and Math). These students get more ELA remediation than math. Which is evident in our 12% Increase in ELA LQ.

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

Math achievement (-5%)
Math achivement was 63%

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.

Math LQ (45%)
Lack of true Math interventions

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

ELA LQ (+12%)
ELA resource teachers, ELA boot camp.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance (especially in primary grades) and overall suspensions.

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

1. Strong bell to bell standards based core instruction
2. Tiered interventions and the resources to do them
3. Data Ownership of teachers and students
4. Strengthen the common formative process
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase the rigor of standards based instruction in all subject areas.
Rationale	In 2018-19 BES improved its overall school grade from a C to a B (Increase of 5 overall points). The increased rigor across all subject areas will target all achievement subcategories. (ELA, Math, ELA LG, MAth LG, ELA LQ, Math LQ), BES has been identified as having two underperforming subgroups (SWD 31%, Black 34%). These subgroups will be continually monitored throughout the year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase FSA overall Math and ELA achievement by 5% points each. Increase LQ learning gains by 5% in each category (Math and ELA). Increase SWD proficiency by 5% and Black proficiency by 5%. Increase Science achievement by 10% 60% of our K-2 students will make a years growth in iReady.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mike Lastra (lastra_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Common Planning TIme/PLCs Data Days Teacher-Admin and Teacher-student Data Chats Thinking Maps Common Formatives MTSS Walkthough tool
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Common Planning with ESE and Gen Ed. teachers to discuss student data and plan rigorous differentiated instruction will directly target our SWD (ESSA underperforming subgroup 31%). Data chats (admin-teacher/teacher/student) will ensure that our subgroups are on track for achieving a learning game. Thinking maps will increase rigor by allowing students to rely on their metacognition and extend their own thinking across all subject areas. The common formative process will ensure that all teachers on the grade level are teaching to the same level of rigor.
Action Step	
Description	1. Data Chats *Teachers-admin and teachers-students will monitor subgroup data (specifically SWD, and Black) through data chats after every diagnostic window. *Data chats will utilize Lower Quartile posters to discuss LQ students learning gains. *Data Days will be grade-level data chats (3 Hour Block) subs will be provided. *Discussions with teachers on individual students in the black subcategory and what each of those students need. *Specifically monitoring subgroup performance in Science 2. Common Formatives *Teachers will enter all common formative data as well as instructional implications on formative spreadsheet

located on Formative folder on Google Drive 3x every 9 weeks.
*Admin, Leadership Team, and District Coaches will monitor Formative folder on Team Drives throughout the
year.

3. Thinking Maps
*Day 1 Training (preschool)
*8 Week Roll out with weekly common planning
*Walk through to monitor consistency, fidelity, and rigor with the maps
*Train the Trainer (days 4 & 5) in September
*Teacher training in November (next steps) and January (next steps)
*Recognition of exemplar maps submitted by grade levels (starts in January)
*Attend Thinking Maps Leadership Conference

4. MTSS Walkthroughs
*Monitor implementation of evidence-based instruction
*Monitor correct placement of tier 2 and tier 3 interventions to the right students

5. Common Planning
* Provide substitutes for ESE teachers to participate in all grade-level team plannings
* Grade level team will provide brief notes about what was discussed during planning time

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2	
Title	
Rationale	
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	

Action Step	
Description	1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

Please refer to the uploaded Parental Involvement Plan for a full explanation.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Kindergarten roundup occurs in the spring before the child enters Kindergarten. The campus is open for parents and potential students to explore the campus and get to know some of the staff. Students in attendance at roundup are screened to determine entry level skills. Student placement balances classes in terms of academic knowledge and behavior. At the beginning of the school year, an open house opportunity is provided to incoming Kindergarteners. A future practice has been added for Kindergarten students and their parents will be to have a separate Kindergarten open house. This way children can come, meet their teacher and have a tour of the campus so they may be less anxious upon their arrival to school. For the first three days, Kindergarten parents are allowed to walk with their child to class in the morning.

Collaboration with schools which are receiving exiting 5th grade students includes visits from guidance counselors to describe a day in the life of a 6th grader at the respective receiving schools. These schools hold Transition events for families and open campus events to afford new 6th graders the opportunity to familiarize themselves with their new school environment. Our main feeder middle school Principal will conduct campus visits each semester to speak with 5th grade students about middle school expectations.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Kindergarten roundup occurs in the spring before the child enters Kindergarten. The campus is open for parents and potential students to explore the campus and get to know some of the staff. Students in attendance at roundup are screened to determine entry level skills. Student placement balances classes in terms of academic knowledge and behavior. At the beginning of the school year, an open house opportunity is provided to incoming Kindergarteners. A future practice has been added for Kindergarten students and their parents will be to have a separate Kindergarten open house. This way children can come, meet their teacher and have a tour of the campus so they may be less anxious upon their arrival to school. For the first three days, Kindergarten parents are allowed to walk with their child to class in the morning.

Collaboration with schools which are receiving exiting 5th grade students includes visits from guidance counselors to describe a day in the life of a 6th grader at the respective receiving schools. These schools hold Transition events for families and open campus events to afford new 6th graders the opportunity to familiarize themselves with their new school environment. Our main feeder middle school Principal will conduct campus visits each semester to speak with 5th grade students about middle school expectations.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Before school begins, members of the SBLT conduct a data analysis of available performance data: attendance, discipline, walkthrough, FCAT Science, EOC, iReady ELA, and iReady math. Priorities for PD are generated from this analysis. Areas for intervention are targeted. An inventory of intervention materials is conducted and any shortages of intervention supplies are ordered. A master schedule is created that provides adequate time for all curricular areas, supplemental lab time and scheduled blocks for Tier II and/or Tier III support.

Once school resumes, the Principal establishes a schedule of bi-weekly SBLT meetings during which all available data are reviewed. Team Leaders meet with SBLT on a bi-weekly schedule as well. At the Team Leaders meeting, weekly assessment data are reviewed and problem solving activities occur whenever mastery learning has not occurred -- 80% or more of students achieve 70% or better on the weekly assessment. Reteaching and differentiation are focuses of problem-solving for this school year. The Principal will also meet on the alternating Tuesdays with the instructional team to further dissagregate data.

Targeted problem-solving focused on expenditure of Title I funds is a focus of the SBLT for this school year
. Return on investment analysis for expensive software purchases is being conducted in an effort to determine to what degree students benefit from participation with the program. The Title I Facilitator explores other options.

Prior to scheduling Individual Problem Solving (IPS), teachers are asked to meet with their team to problem-solve. A checklist provides a structure and documentation of the teams' reviews of student performance. Teachers are free to move students into or out of Tier II supports depending upon data. Students only move into or out of Tier III supports through the IPS meetings. The IPS team consists of the principal, social worker, behavior specialist, and psychologist.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Brooksville Elementary is a School of Career Studies. Career Studies is a specials class that students attend each week with specific rubrics for each grade level. . We collaborate with community partners and businesses throughout the year to bring career awareness to our students through guest speakers and visits. We have a 2 day Career Expo at the end of the year to culminate our program with all of our partners. Students interview and learn firsthand about a variety of careers.