Brookview Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Brookview Elementary School

10450 THERESA DR, Jacksonville, FL 32246

http://www.duvalschools.org/brookview

Demographics

Principal: Tracey Kendrick

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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: C (48%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Brookview Elementary School

10450 THERESA DR, Jacksonville, FL 32246

http://www.duvalschools.org/brookview

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-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	67%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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.

Brookview Elementary School enables every student to reach their highest potential by establishing a curriculum that meets or exceeds government standards for education; providing extracurricular programs that develop children's mental, physical and social skills; and partnering with parents and the community to create an environment geared to the success of all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Brookview Elementary School is committed to equipping students with the tools they need for academic, personal and social achievement.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kendrick, Tracey	Principal	Instructional leader of Brookview Elementary.
Taylor, Tammy	Assistant Principal	School level leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/28/2021, Tracey Kendrick

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

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
30

Total number of students enrolled at the school
480

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	70	73	75	77	91	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	8	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	2	0	2	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	16	53	24	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148

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	2	4	5	22	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	1	0	1	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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 7/22/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
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	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	

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	

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	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
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	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	

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	

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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				47%	50%	57%	45%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	56%	58%	48%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	50%	53%	42%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				51%	62%	63%	61%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				44%	63%	62%	51%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				31%	52%	51%	36%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				38%	48%	53%	51%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	50%	-2%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	53%	61%	-8%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	64%	-15%	64%	-15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	57%	-11%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	35%	49%	-14%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

ELA and math progress monitoring iReady Diagnostic exam, 3-5 PMAs

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16	17	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	17	25
	Students With Disabilities	20	20	33
	English Language Learners	18	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11.3	18.6	34.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	11.3	18.6	34.3
	Students With Disabilities	20	20	75
	English Language Learners	18.2	0	22.2

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5	20	16
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	20	16
	Students With Disabilities	0	17	0
	English Language Learners	0	13	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2.8	15.5	24.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	2.8	15.5	24.3
	Students With Disabilities	17	17	33
	English Language Learners	0	13.3	13.3

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12.86	13.7	15.49
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.86	13.7	15.49
	Students With Disabilities	20.0	10.0	11.11
	English Language Learners	0	0	7.69
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29.41	27.78	29.23
	Economically Disadvantaged	29.41	27.78	29.23
	Students With Disabilities	10.00	10.00	12.50
	English Language Learners	10.00	9.09	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12.66	26.25	14.46
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.66	26.25	14.46
	Students With Disabilities	16.67	33.33	8.33
	English Language Learners	0	6.67	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18.52	10.00	18.75
	Economically Disadvantaged	18.52	10.00	18.75
	Students With Disabilities	15.38	0	9.09
	English Language Learners	7.14	13.33	14.29

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12.50	16.46	16.92
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.50	16.46	16.92
	Students With Disabilities	5.88	6.25	7.69
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13.75	3.66	24.62
	Economically Disadvantaged	13.75	3.66	24.62
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	29.11	21.95	35.94
	Economically Disadvantaged	29.11	21.95	35.94
	Students With Disabilities	11.76	6.25	9.09
	English Language Learners	20.00	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

<table>
<tr><th colspan="13">2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</th></tr>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>ELA Ach.</th>
<th>ELA LG</th>
<th>ELA LG L25%</th>
<th>Math Ach.</th>
<th>Math LG</th>
<th>Math LG L25%</th>
<th>Sci Ach.</th>
<th>SS Ach.</th>
<th>MS Accel.</th>
<th>Grad Rate 2019-20</th>
<th>C & C Accel 2019-20</th>
</tr>
<tr><td>SWD</td><td>22</td><td>33</td><td></td><td>32</td><td>43</td><td></td><td>29</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>ELL</td><td>28</td><td>65</td><td></td><td>50</td><td>56</td><td></td><td>29</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>ASN</td><td>63</td><td>60</td><td></td><td>76</td><td>70</td><td></td><td>50</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>BLK</td><td>28</td><td>60</td><td></td><td>27</td><td>47</td><td></td><td>22</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>HSP</td><td>39</td><td></td><td></td><td>47</td><td>60</td><td></td><td>50</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>MUL</td><td>55</td><td></td><td></td><td>64</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>WHT</td><td>40</td><td>60</td><td></td><td>48</td><td>46</td><td></td><td>30</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>FRL</td><td>36</td><td>56</td><td>46</td><td>42</td><td>52</td><td>53</td><td>29</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="13">2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</th></tr>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>ELA Ach.</th>
<th>ELA LG</th>
<th>ELA LG L25%</th>
<th>Math Ach.</th>
<th>Math LG</th>
<th>Math LG L25%</th>
<th>Sci Ach.</th>
<th>SS Ach.</th>
<th>MS Accel.</th>
<th>Grad Rate 2017-18</th>
<th>C & C Accel 2017-18</th>
</tr>
<tr><td>SWD</td><td>15</td><td>58</td><td>63</td><td>27</td><td>40</td><td>33</td><td>10</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>ELL</td><td>33</td><td>50</td><td>67</td><td>42</td><td>47</td><td>40</td><td>31</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>ASN</td><td>46</td><td>47</td><td></td><td>52</td><td>35</td><td></td><td>36</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>BLK</td><td>44</td><td>56</td><td>40</td><td>40</td><td>41</td><td>27</td><td>33</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>HSP</td><td>38</td><td>50</td><td>56</td><td>56</td><td>50</td><td>43</td><td>33</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>MUL</td><td>48</td><td>65</td><td></td><td>52</td><td>35</td><td></td><td>40</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>WHT</td><td>53</td><td>71</td><td>83</td><td>56</td><td>48</td><td>36</td><td>43</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>FRL</td><td>45</td><td>57</td><td>62</td><td>49</td><td>41</td><td>27</td><td>40</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="13">2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</th></tr>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>ELA Ach.</th>
<th>ELA LG</th>
<th>ELA LG L25%</th>
<th>Math Ach.</th>
<th>Math LG</th>
<th>Math LG L25%</th>
<th>Sci Ach.</th>
<th>SS Ach.</th>
<th>MS Accel.</th>
<th>Grad Rate 2016-17</th>
<th>C & C Accel 2016-17</th>
</tr>
<tr><td>SWD</td><td>25</td><td>38</td><td>41</td><td>41</td><td>50</td><td>43</td><td>31</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>ELL</td><td>25</td><td>48</td><td>35</td><td>50</td><td>44</td><td>26</td><td>20</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>ASN</td><td>62</td><td>69</td><td></td><td>85</td><td>65</td><td></td><td>81</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>BLK</td><td>38</td><td>42</td><td>50</td><td>49</td><td>44</td><td>33</td><td>39</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>HSP</td><td>37</td><td>41</td><td>29</td><td>56</td><td>52</td><td>30</td><td>50</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>MUL</td><td>39</td><td>25</td><td></td><td>58</td><td>50</td><td></td><td>42</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>WHT</td><td>49</td><td>57</td><td>53</td><td>64</td><td>51</td><td>54</td><td>50</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>FRL</td><td>42</td><td>46</td><td>41</td><td>59</td><td>51</td><td>38</td><td>51</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	386
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	64
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
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	49
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	60
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	45
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA proficiency scores were making slight improvements, however progress monitoring for 2020-21 showed this trend was eroded by the COVID slide, with grade 3-5 reporting 13% proficiency in the fall. Overall ELLs and students with disabilities continue to struggle in ELA, showing very modest gains. Overall math proficiency remained stagnant in grades 3 & 4, however significant improvements were made in grade 5. Science proficiencies increased overall, but subgroups remained unsuccessful.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA and Math, particularly in all subgroups

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors were the COVID slide for all students in addition to virtual learning for 25% of the school population. Attendance continues to be an issue.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science and 5th grade math

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Science for 5th grade was taught in the cafeteria and grade level Socrative sessions were held regularly to reinforce concepts learned. Science was also taught weekly on the resource wheel during Media. A deep analysis of math students identified push groups that met 4 times per week for remediation.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Math push groups will commence the first semester. Students in K-3 will continue to receive instruction and interventions using Reading Mastery and 4-5 will use Corrective Reading. Level 1 ELA students will receive Tier 3 interventions daily. Science interventions will continue and be stepped down to grade 4 as well.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will continue their work in the learning arc, focusing on standards-based instruction. In addition, we are planning professional development opportunities around restorative practices and attendance in order to find strategies to improve attendance as well as keeping students in the classroom.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We are building capacity in literacy through effective use of Reading Mastery in K-2 and Corrective Reading interventions in intermediate grades. We continue to strive for incremental improvement in our delivery and outcomes in this area. We will continue to catch struggling students in math by incorporating intervention groups across all grade levels and classrooms, using the Standards Mastery lessons provided by the district as well as other interventions recommended through the research of our academic coaches.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Effective teacher relationships and collaboration is below average. On the 5 Essentials Survey, "Collective Responsibility", "Collaborative Practices", and "Quality Professional Development", all scored between Very Weak and Weak. Teachers report that they do not believe other teachers feel responsible for student outcomes and improving the school. They indicated a desire to observe other teachers' instruction and to work on instructional strategies together.
Measurable Outcome:	Brookview will increase the Collaborative Teachers indicator on the 2022 5 Essentials Survey from 29 Weak to Neutral or higher.
Monitoring:	Administration and instructional coaches will focus on these goals during common planning and PLCs. A monthly survey will be administered highlighting progress in these areas and results discussed in monthly faculty meetings were everyone can problem-solve together.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tammy Taylor (taylort7@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Hold PLCs around quality book studies that promote/teach evidenced based strategies; leadership will facilitate collaboration and focus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By teachers and coaches sharing and collaborating around a common text, systems of dialogue will be established. Coaches will cover classes, giving teachers the opportunity to observe other teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

Assign a book study that will introduce effective instructional strategies and give time during PLCs for teachers to collaborate.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Collective Responsibility, Teacher Influence, and Student Responsibility were low indicators in our 5 Essentials Survey. Portions of these indicators dealt with student behavior such as teachers helping to maintain discipline in the entire school, not just their classrooms and feeling responsible to help students develop self-control. Many teachers feel that they don't have influence on setting the standards for student behavior.
Measurable Outcome:	Brookview will increase the Collective Responsibility, Teacher Influence, and Student Responsibility indicators on the 2022 5 Essentials Survey from Weak to Neutral or higher.
Monitoring:	Administration and instructional coaches will focus on these goals during common planning. A monthly survey will be administered highlighting progress in these areas and results discussed in monthly faculty meetings were everyone can problem-solve together.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Guidance counselor and PBIS committee will do PD on restorative practices and push in to assist teachers in attending to students social-emotional healthy. Teachers, Title I funded Reading Coach, Title I funded Math Interventionist, Title I funded media specialist, Title I funded tutor, & Title I paraprofessionals across campus will also participate in a book study of Drive by Daniel Pink, focusing on motivation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By training teachers in restorative practices such as trust circles and learning about human motivation, the staff will increase their strategic knowledge and learn to effectively resolve student behaviors so that students are in the classroom and can focus on their learning goals. Title I funded paraprofessionals, tutors, coaches, interventionists, and the librarian will also be involved,, continuing these efforts during lunch, resource, and small groups. When students feel a sense of universal organization and structure across campus they can focus on improving their own behavior, thereby paving the way to academic growth.

Action Steps to Implement

Guidance counselor will lead a PBIS/Restorative Practice committee in research into effective means to meet students social/emotional needs. Book study on human motivation will commence in Quarter 1.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Most students at BVE are experiencing the negative impact of The Opportunity Myth. In order to be successful academically, students require grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and teachers with high expectations
Measurable Outcome:	90% of our content core teachers will use common planning and Professional Learning Communities to implement successful standards-based instruction, tasks, and assessments.
Monitoring:	The Standards Walkthrough Tool Dashboard will be monitored monthly and discussed at weekly leadership meetings. Teachers who are not yet proficient in standards-based instruction will participate in a coaching cycle with one of the instructional coaches, to be monitored in leadership meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracey Kendrick (kendrickt1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional delivery will be focused in meeting the expectations of the standard through tasks and assessments. We will use the Standards Walkthrough Tool to measure core classroom daily instructional alignment to standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are engaged and often successful in the classroom, but only XX% of students at BVE can perform grade level standards in reading and XX% in math as evidenced by the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment. This indicates a disconnect between instruction and the grade-level standards. BVE must ensure that students are receiving standards aligned instruction in order to be successful on state exams and have the tools to meet subsequent progression of standards

Action Steps to Implement

The admin team and coaches will facilitate common planning using the learning arc planning template. Training all of our instructional team members in standards-based instruction ensures that students receive strong, consistent learning direction. This will improve student achievement in reading and math.

Person Responsible	Tracey Kendrick (kendrickt1@duvalschools.org)

The admin team and coaches will monitor implementation of standards based instruction through standards-based walkthroughs. Assisting in implementation and monitoring are Title I -funded Reading Coach and Math Coach.

Person Responsible	Tracey Kendrick (kendrickt1@duvalschools.org)

#4. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Leadership is not content with the 5 Essentials feedback on Instructional Leadership. Specifically in the reporting that the Vision and the Learning Goal Expectations are unclear. Brookview leadership team will focus on communicating a clear vision with clear learning outcome expectations for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	These indicators will move to the Strong rating on the 5 Essentials Survey.
Monitoring:	A monthly survey will be completed by all faculty throughout the 21-22 school year. The results of the monthly survey will be discussed openly in faculty meetings. Collaborative problem-solving techniques will be developed to address deficits. Leaders are developing a concise collection of questioning to be used when communicating with the staff regularly to maintain focus on the vision and the SIP areas of focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tammy Taylor (taylort7@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Survey in combination with collaborative problem-solving; open communication that regularly highlights the areas of focus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our mantra for the year is: "You get what you focus on, so focus on what you want."

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 2021-22 data, ELA was identified as a critical need. Students at our school need support with learning the foundational skills of how to read and also understanding the content they are reading. As an Area of Focus, student success in ELA progress will also increase student achievement in other subject areas. o The percentage of students in grades 3-5, below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment are as follows: 3rd grade is 63%, 4th grade is 65%, and 5th grade is 53%. o The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2020-2021 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment is as follows: 1st - 80% and 2nd - 73%
Measurable Outcome:	K-5 data: *Increase percentage of K-2 students scoring "At Grade Level" or above by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points. *Increase percentage of 3 -5 grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.
Monitoring:	Our school leadership team, district content specialist support, and Supplemental Instructional APs will review ELA data from district assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracey Kendrick (kendrickt1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data Driven Lesson Planning: Understanding where students are with mastery of standards, using data from informal and formal assessments, planning clear objectives, implementation, and checking for understanding when lesson planning. Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Not all students are on the same level, but all standards must be mastered. Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet students at their level to support their needs. Progress Monitoring: Ensuring whole group lessons, interventions, and assessments are done with fidelity. Checking effectiveness from student data.

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: Collecting data from classrooms in real time and providing immediate
and clear feedback for teachers and school leadership teams to work together to ensure effectiveness.

Data-driven Lesson Planning: Effective lesson planning requires teachers to determine three essential
components such as the objective, the implementation, and a reflection. https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/howto-
plan-effective-lessons

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Small group instruction is the key to data-driven results and is the
gateway to meeting the needs of all learners. https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/turn-small-reading-groups-intobig-
wins

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress Monitoring: Student progress monitoring helps teachers evaluate how effective their instruction is, either for individual students or for the entire class. https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/how-student-progressmonitoring-improves-instruction
	Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: The implementation review is a plan designed to 1) recognize accomplishments, 2) track actions, 3) measure implementation impact, 4) evaluate the plan, 5) determine next steps. It may be used by the school alone or with the assistance of the support lead. https://institutionalresearch.syr.edu/what-we-do/student-ratings/creating-an-action-plan/action-plan-teachingstrategies/

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with all four strategies listed above. Professional Development
during Early Release Days and Common Planning will be essential for Leadership to support teachers. Based
on observational data and teacher feedback, PD topics will be set before each Early Release and Common
Planning.

Person Responsible   Tracey Kendrick (kendrickt1@duvalschools.org)

During Common Planning and individual teacher data chats, specific data pertaining to ELA reading and student success will be discussed and analyzed to ensure we are monitoring progress.

Person Responsible   Tracey Kendrick (kendrickt1@duvalschools.org)

Give immediate feedback on any observations/walkthroughs conducted by state support, school leadership,
district content specialists, and district leadership.

Person Responsible   Tracey Kendrick (kendrickt1@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, Brookview ranked 891 out of 1395 schools in the state, and 51/97 in the county for school incidents, with a score of 0.80. For the 2019-2020 year, there were 4 incidents of fighting or physical attacks. The school averaged 3 suspensions per 100 students for the same year. For 2021-22 school year, the leadership team including the school counselor, as well as a school-level PBIS/Restorative practice team will research and develop practices to improve these statistics at Brookview. The team will bring best practices to the faculty through professional development and become involved when a teacher requires guidance in the classroom. This may be in the form of covering a class for a teacher to have a safe discussion with a student to get them back on track, or facilitating a truth circle when an incident appears imminent. We will work to involve parents as well, utilizing Title I funded printers and supplies to keep parents informed via a monthly news letter, data informational sheets per student after assessment periods, and night-time parent involvement events (printer and supplies to be used to distribute invitations for said events). Involving parents as partners in education will have a marked impact on student achievement.

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.

Parents will be welcomed to Brookview through Title I engagement events such as math or science nights. Furthermore, in a determined effort to bring parents into the circle as partners in their child's education, data will be sent home along with grade level expectations every assessment cycle, along with an invitation to schedule a conference to discuss what those metrics mean.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Principal Tracey Kendrick, Assistant Principal Tammy Taylor, School Counselor Mrs. Marsh, PBIS/ Restorative Practice committee headed by the school counselor, instructional coaches, and all of Brookview instructional staff

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00