Brooker Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Brooker Elementary School

812 DEWOLF RD, Brandon, FL 33511

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Roy Moral

Start Date for this Principal: 6/17/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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 Hillsborough 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

Brooker Elementary School

812 DEWOLF RD, Brandon, FL 33511

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	59%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	51%

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 Hillsborough 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.

BRAVES:

Bringing
Rigorous Academics
And
Values as our students
Enter Society

Provide the school's vision statement.

TEAM: Together Everyone Achieves Mores

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
Kelly, Julie	Principal	The school principal is responsible for all facets of the school including students safety, student achievement, hiring all staff, developing all staff, evaluating all staff, facility maintenance, budge, community relations, auditing of equipment, internal records.
Norris, Amber	Assistant Principal	APEI assists principal in the daily activities and needs of running a successful school. The APEI serve as instructional leaders such as attending weekly planning sessions with grade level teams, engage stakeholders by attending schoolwide activities and supporting SAC, and collaborate in the school's decision making process with student success meeting, mentoring, interviewing and evaluation of staff.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/17/2020, Roy Moral

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (59%)
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	117	109	106	136	149	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	764
Attendance below 90 percent	24	12	17	12	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	124	121	152	159	151	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	876
Attendance below 90 percent	6	8	16	9	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	22	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	22	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	5	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	124	121	152	159	151	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	876
Attendance below 90 percent	6	8	16	9	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	22	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	22	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	5	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	63%	52%	57%	61%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	55%	58%	56%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	53%	44%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	54%	63%	60%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	57%	62%	47%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	46%	51%	47%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	50%	53%	60%	48%	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	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%	
	2018	59%	53%	6%	57%	2%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%	
	2018	61%	55%	6%	56%	5%	
Same Grade Comparison		-3%					
Cohort Comparison		-1%					
05	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%	
	2018	51%	51%	0%	55%	-4%	
Same Grade Comparison		12%					
Cohort Comparison		2%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	67%	54%	13%	62%	5%	
	2018	58%	55%	3%	62%	-4%	
Same Grade Comparison		9%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	61%	57%	4%	64%	-3%	
	2018	49%	57%	-8%	62%	-13%	
Same Grade Comparison		12%					
Cohort Comparison		3%					
05	2019	60%	54%	6%	60%	0%	
	2018	54%	54%	0%	61%	-7%	
Same Grade Comparison		6%					
Cohort Comparison		11%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	60%	51%	9%	53%	7%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	52%	1%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
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	27	48	42	31	46	45	29				
ELL	56	47	21	64	55	25	47				
ASN	100	70		100	80						
BLK	44	47	50	49	44	36	69				
HSP	58	57	35	59	62	46	55				
MUL	78	81		68	52		83				
WHT	64	62	55	68	65	52	61				
FRL	51	53	44	54	50	34	48				
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	23	38	39	32	31	17	28				
ELL	42	63	69	48	31	25	10				
BLK	46	50	30	42	35	18	60				
HSP	50	48	45	47	36	17	36				
MUL	64	52		56	41		65				
WHT	64	56	49	61	54	34	61				
FRL	49	47	44	46	41	25	49				
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	32	33	23	27	27	17	16				
ELL	46	56	58	58	54	58	21				
ASN	82			100							
BLK	53	62		45	43		25				
HSP	51	51	50	47	44	58	44				
MUL	75	62		66	56		80				
WHT	64	54	39	64	47	38	68				
FRL	51	52	43	49	42	50	38				

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	476
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
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	56

Hispanic Students	
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	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
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.

Using historical state data, Brooker's data shows ELA Lowest 25% and Math Lowest 25% students were behind the state and district average.

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

Using historical state data, the 20-21 fifth grade students had the greatest decline in the area of ELA.

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.

Using historical state data, the ELA Lowest 25% of students had the greatest gap when compared to the state average.

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

Using historical data, Brooker's 5th grade ELA was 5% higher than the state and 4th grade math same grade level data comparison went up 12%.

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

Using historical data, attendance and course failures are two potential areas of concern.

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

1. SWD
2. Lowest 25%
3. Planning
4. Reflection
5. Adjust instruction according to data/reflection

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Staff analysis of data determined that teachers need to devote time for intentional planning to mee the needs of all learners, especially student in the lower 25%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the number of students scoring proficient and making learning gains in all content areas which measured by the state assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amber Norris (amber.norris@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Staff will analyze the school data using the Fish Bone Protocol to determine the root cause of the low percent of students making learning gains. The Instructional Learning Team will lead Professional Learning Communities to identify opportunities to increase teacher effectiveness in planning for meeting student needs in each content area will be scheduled. PLC designated time to collaborate, implement, and reflect on the effectiveness of new learning strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers own the data, use the data to guide instruction, reflect on the effectiveness of the teaching, and then adjusting instructions, student learning is increased.

Action Steps to Implement

The leadership team will incorporate grade level student success meetings, grade level planning meetings, school side data analysis, teachers use of aggressive progress monitoring during instruction, targeted walk through to progress monitor and make needed adjustment in instruction with SWD.

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 leadership team will incorporate grade level student success meetings, grade level planning meetings, school side data analysis, teachers use of aggressive progress monitoring during instruction, targeted walk through to progress monitor and make needed adjustment in instruction with bottom 25 percent in all content areas.

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.

Brooker provides a variety of opportunities to increase parent, community members, and faculty/staff involvement:
- Culture committee - Brooker Way
- Question and Answer session with parents
- Parent participation in character education activities
- Monthly Newsletters and parent links
- Grandparents and Veteran's Day Breakfast
- Volunteer orientation
- Parent Academic Information Nights
- Technology Nights for Parents
- Movie nights
- School Spirit Nights
- Publix reading and math nights
-

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