

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Brooker 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 16 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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, budget, 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 meet the needs of all learners, especially students 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 instruction, 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.