

Hernando County School District

Brooksville Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Brooksville Elementary School

885 N BROAD ST, Brooksville, FL 34601

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/bes>

Demographics

Principal: Dana Kublick

Start Date for this Principal: 8/11/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Brooksville Elementary School

885 N BROAD ST, Brooksville, FL 34601

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/bes>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">34%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	B

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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 walkthroughs with admin to discuss instructional practices. Assist grade level teams in SWAP of common fomatives.
Inmon, Rlchard	Assistant Principal	
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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/11/2018, Dana Kublick

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.*

4

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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
	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 5/11/2020

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

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

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	
	(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	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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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				
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%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
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.

5th Grade FSA Science (47%)

Math LQ (45%)

Science- In 2019 there was no true Science block on the schedule. This cause teachers (in particular FSA grade levels) to look over Science as a whole.

Math LQ- Many of our LQ students are double dipper students (LQ in both 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 achievement 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%)

We believe that this gap is because the 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)

The addition of ELA resource teachers, and ELA bootcamps prior to FSA.

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

Primary grade attendance and the amount of ODRs resulting in suspensions.

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

1. Differentiation of core instruction.
2. Close achievement gap (Black,SWD)
3. Reduce disproportionality of disciplines and suspensions for black students
4. Differentiate Teacher support though PD Choice Boards.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase the rigor of standards and differentiation of instruction in all subject areas. While BES improved its overall grade from a C to a B in 2019, several subgroups were identified as underperforming. Specifically, SWD (31%) and Black (34%). The increased rigor and differentiation across all subject areas will target all subgroups and achievement categories.

Measurable Outcome: 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 9% points and Black proficiency by 6% points. Increase Science proficiency by 10% points. 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
Differentiated PLC/PD Choice Board for teachers
Teacher/Admin and Teacher/Student data chats
Campus wide use of Thinking Maps
Common formatives
MTSS walkthrough tool

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Common planning with ESE and Gen. Ed. teachers to discuss student data and plan rigorous differentiated instruction. Specifically, what are we doing with our SWD. PD Choice board will provide differentiated support to the teachers giving them what they need to be successful. Data chats (Teacher/Admin/Teacher/Student) will ensure that our subgroups are on track for achieving targeted goals. Campus wide use of Thinking Maps will increase the 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 an the grade level are teaching to the same level of rigor and adjusting their teaching strategies bases on results of common formative assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data chats
 - * Individual Teacher/Admin Data chats will occur every 9 weeks. Admin will be meeting with grade level teams 2x a month to have grade level data chats.
 - *Teachers/Admin and Teachers/Students will continuously monitor subgroup data (specifically, SWD, and Black) as new progress monitoring data becomes available and after every diagnostic window.
 - * Data chats will utilize Student data (LQ Posters, mentor tracking sheets, attendance data, discipline data) to discuss LQ learning gains.
 - * Leadership team will be discussion student subgroup data (iReady, Discipline, classroom formatives, attendance) 2x a month.
 - * Administration will work with 5th grade science teachers discussion how we will monitor progress towards mastery for 5th grade FSA.

Person Responsible Mike Lastra (lastra_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

2. Common Formatives
 - * Teachers will post all common formatives in Microsoft Teams along with formative data as well as

instructional implications.

* Admin, Leadership Team, and District Coaches will monitor Formative use and data folders in grade level Microsoft Teams Channels.

Person Responsible Mike Lastra (lastra_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

3. Thinking Maps

* Presschool Thinking Maps refresher.

* Re roll out 8 Thinking Maps school wide to refresh students (2 per week).

* Admin/Coaches walkthroughs to monitor consistency, fidelity, and rigor with the maps.

* Highlight exemplar Thinking Map use

Person Responsible [no one identified]

4. PD Choice Board

* IPC, Math Resource, and MTSS Coordinator will create a digital choice board for teachers to choose what support they need.

* Each teacher will choose one topic from the choice board each month.

* Admin will also prescribe support for teachers based on need (walkthrough data, formative, iready, data chats).

* IPC, Math Resource, and MTSS Coordinator will share out at Core Leadership Team and SBLT what supports they are providing to teachers and follow through with them.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The remaining school wide improvement priority not addressed in Areas of Focus is #3 (reduce the disproportionality of disciplines and suspensions of black students). To address this priority we will be creating a school based Equity Team. The Equity Team will be meeting monthly to look at RtIB discipline data of all of our subgroups. They will also be organizing a parent and family focus group comprised of family members of our black subgroups (including families of students with high disciplines, median disciplines, and no disciplines). The team will look at the responses from the focus group and compare it to the RtIB data and use it to come up with an action plan for improvement.

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.

At BES we utilize a school wide house system. Every student, teacher, administrator, para professional, secretary, custodian, food and nutrition employee, and even bus drivers belong to one of six houses. The six houses hall have names that are character traits that we believe all well rounded students should exhibit. The houses are, Integrity (green), Loyalty (Blue), Courage (orange), Compassion (red), Authenticity (yellow), and Perseverance (purple). Every student was sorted into their house with a personalized written invitation during a school wide assembly. The houses have monthly meetings (including all k-5 students in each house) where they learn about the meaning of their house and how well rounded students display the character traits of all houses. Every Wednesday is House Wednesday, were students, teachers and staff get to show off their house colors. Since we are an elementary school we do not have sports teams, the houses give the students something to belong to and be proud of. Through PBIS, students also earn points for their houses throughout the school year.

The house point leaders are displayed every week for students to see. At the end of the year the house with the most points earns the House Cup, which is present to the house at an end of the year assembly for all students. Parents and community parents have also joined in on our house system with many of them belonging to different houses.

We have also started a house mentoring initiative. We have identified at risk students from our underperforming subgroups and assigned each one of them a mentor from their house. The mentors meet with them 2x a month to goal set, go over classroom data, and positive relationship building.

Brooksville Elementary is a community school, close to local businesses in Downtown Brooksville. Our School advisory Council (SAC) includes many of these business partners. We have many other community partnerships that help us build and maintain a positive school culture. Local churches provided character building workshop presentations throughout the year, local restaurants provide incentives for students that meet behavior goals, and we also have a great partnership with our Boys and Girls club.

Every Friday we create a video news letter highlighting five things going on at our school for that week. The "Friday Fives" highlight individual student successes, teacher lessons, school accomplishments, and general information. The videos are published to our various social media platforms (Twitter, Facebook, Class Dojo, and Instagram) to reach all of our stakeholders.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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