Brooksville Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Brooksville Elementary School

885 N BROAD ST, Brooksville, FL 34601

https://www.hernandoschools.org/bes

Demographics

Principal: Dana Kublick

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2021

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
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* 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hernando County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Brooksville Elementary School

885 N BROAD ST, Brooksville, FL 34601

https://www.hernandoschools.org/bes

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lastra, Mike	Principal	
Inmon, RIchard	Assistant Principal	
Gorham, Malinda	Instructional Coach	
Gibson, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	
Abel, Elizabeth	Other	
Jernigan, Kristi	Behavior Specialist	
Seifried, Victoria	Other	
Gibson, Allison	Psychologist	
Benard, Daiquiri	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/14/2021, 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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

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

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

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	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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 5/20/2021

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	
	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	
	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				53%	54%	57%	50%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	53%	58%	48%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	52%	53%	44%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				58%	58%	63%	63%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				64%	57%	62%	66%	53%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	48%	51%	49%	43%	47%
Science Achievement				47%	54%	53%	52%	58%	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	50%	57%	-7%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	65%	59%	6%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	52%	-8%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	46%	62%	-16%	62%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	62%	5%	64%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	48%	55%	-7%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	19	47	36	22	6		23				
BLK	22	50		28	14		17				
HSP	32			37							
MUL	27			30							
WHT	50	52	44	48	44	43	61				
FRL	37	41	35	35	38	41	41				
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				

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	296
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	26
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	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	29
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	49
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Managing Accountability Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Administrative walkthrough data: BES had 128 walkthroughs for the 2020-21 school year, which is approximately 122 less than the required number of walkthroughs. Putting systems in place to increase Increasing administrative walkthroughs will allow administration to provide timely feedback to teachers on their instruction. Walkthrough look fors will also be tied to 2 other focus areas (Collaborative planning, and PBIS).
Measurable Outcome:	Increase administrative walkthroughs by 200% (300 total) for the 2021-22 school year.
Monitoring:	Administrative walkthrough data will be reviewed weekly, walkthrough heat map will be pulled and discussed bi weekly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Specific teacher feedback on the Danielson Framework.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Effective feedback is concrete, specific, and useful; it provides actionable information for teachers.

Action Steps to Implement	

Administration will identify Danielson components aligned to areas of focus (Collaborative planning, PBIS). Pre school training will be provided to staff on these components.
1E- Designing Coherent Instruction
4A- Reflecting on Teaching

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

Walkthrough data collection poster will be created by administration. Poster will be a visual for two data points, number of walkthroughs and focus area components/domains.
Administrative secretary will track what teachers have received walkthrouhgs each week. She will add to poster.

Person Responsible	RIchard Inmon (inmon_r@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Pre school Training on Danielson components (1E, 4A,...........) to teachers so that they are aware of administrative focus areas during walkthroughs. Administration will also train teachers on the various non evaluative look for tools that will be utilized this school year.

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

Administration will complete Interated Reliability Training. Calibrating walkthroughs for the fist month of school to ensure alignment and cohesiveness and provide the appropriate feedback.

Person Responsible	RIchard Inmon (inmon_r@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Administration will complete 6 walkthroughs per day. (3 Each) For a total of 30 for each week. Administrative confidential secretary will monitor administrative walkthroughs each day.

Person Responsible   Lisa Peeler (peeler_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Administration and Core Team will have a walkthrough meeting every Friday. Core instructional team will discuss walkthroughs from the week and action plan based off of feedback. Administrative Confidential Secretary will schedule weekly meetings. Principal will be responsible for meeting agenda. Coaches will be responsible for action planning.

Person Responsible   RIchard Inmon (inmon_r@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Data sharing: Heat map data will be shared with leadership team bi weekly to identify data trends and allow for action planning. Administrative secretary will schedule individual meetings for teachers receiving needs improvement during walkthroughs. Focus area progress and trends will be shared at monthly faculty meetings.

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

Administration will identify and highlight teachers receiving highly effective in focus area components/ domains and schedule learning walks to visit their classroom and observe.

Person Responsible   Patricia Gibson (gibson_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Kudos Board will be created for highlighted teachers. In a common area.

Person Responsible   Patricia Gibson (gibson_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data from the 2020-2021 FSA assessments for grades 3-5 showed a decrease of student achievement levels. 2018-2019 ELA proficiency changed from 53-42% (-11), ELA Lower Quartile 56-45% (-11), Math Proficiency 58-43% (-15) Our rationale is to focus on collaborative planning for standard based instruction that will increase student proficiency and mastery of benchmark expectations.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal is to increase student proficiency in ELA standards on the state assessment for grades 3-5 by 11% The goal is to increase student proficiency in Math standards on the state assessment for grades 3-5 by 11% The goal for grades K-2 is to show 60% typical growth on the iReady diagnostic by the end of the 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored by having administration present at each planning session for grades K-5. Administration walkthroughs will monitor the effectiveness of the collaborative planning. Administrative data chats will progress monitor student achievement on standards based common assessments and iReady benchmarks.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional coaches and administration will facilitate collaborative planning with grade level teams for the 2021-2022 school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Consistent standards based planning facilitated by administration and instructional coaches will strengthen standards based teaching that will bring forth an increase in student achievement for both ELA and Math. Resources include district instructional support and planning tools.

Action Steps to Implement

2021 Post school planning with coaches on building formatives and collaborative planning.
2021-2022 Preschool planning with coaches and administration on collaborative planning focus areas.

Person Responsible	Patricia Gibson (gibson_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Two site based coaches (Gibson/Gorham) One k-2 coach and one 3-5 coach. Coaches will be responsible for overseeing planning/SWAP/lesson delivery/Modeling/etc.
One Math Resource teacher that supports grades K-5.
District Instructional Coach will focus on instructional practice support and for grades K-2.
Grade level planning times selected by teachers.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Abel (abel_e@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Administration will be present at every grade level planning. Grade levels will be split into two groups (K-2 and 3-5). Administration will split duties and oversee one group, switching groups at the end of the semester.

Person Responsible	Lisa Peeler (peeler_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Pre school training on Danielson rubric 1E and 4A. Focused on the planning process and reflection on formatives.

Person Responsible Malinda Gorham (gorham_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

The initial ELA and Math PLC will be focused on the utilization of the pre and during planning tool. A binder will be created with all the necessary tools needed for collaborative team planning. The following PLCs will move towards strengthening the pre and during planning practices. Student achievement will be monitored by analyzing common formative data.

Person Responsible Patricia Gibson (gibson_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Administrative walkthroughs with specific look fors that are tied to the planning process.
Feedback will be provided through Frontline and administrative conferences.
Exemplar teachers will be highlighted through learning walks and a variety of platforms.

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

Weekly Core Instructional team meetings to discuss trends and to meet the needs of support for teachers.

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Over the last two school years BES students have received 110 disciplines for disrespect and 75 for class disruptions. Sanford Harmony is a research based SEL curriculum that has been proven to reduce disciplines in the classroom. Based on the 2021 Student Engagement Survey only 71% of students feel supported by their peers (Question 32). Student survey data also only 66% of students work in class with students other than their friends. One of the goals of Sanford Harmony is to increase the feeling of community among students.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce the amount of of disciplines for disrespect by 20%. Increase the percentage of students that work in class with peers other than their friends and the percent of students that feel supported by their peers by %10.
Monitoring:	Admin walkthroughs, meet up planning sheet look fors. Administrative walkthrough meetings will have an SEL section. Leadership team participating in morning meet ups will allow to monitor what teachers are doing meet ups with fidelity.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Social Emotional Learning: Sanford Harmony
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Harmony fosters knowledge, skills, and attitudes boys and girls need to develop healthy identities, create meaningful relationships, and engage productively by providing SEL learning resources, tools, and strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration will identify one teacher from each grade level to attend the Train the Trainer District PD. This will become the BES Sanford Harmony Team.

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

Sanford Harmony Team will provide a 1 hour Post school overview of expectations for Sanford Harmony for the upcoming 2021-22 school year.

Person Responsible	Kristi Jernigan (jernigan_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Master Schedule will include a school wide Sanford Harmony Meet Up time (8:35am).

Person Responsible	RIchard Inmon (inmon_r@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Sanford Harmony Lead will make sure that all teachers have Sanford Harmony Kits prior to school starting.

Person Responsible	Kristi Jernigan (jernigan_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Pre school grade level trainings will be scheduled during pre school week. The Sanford Harmony Team will be in charge of putting together the training and presenting.

Person Responsible   Kristi Jernigan (jernigan_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Sanford Harmony Lead will create common Meet Up planner poster on dry erase for each teacher to post in rooms.

Person Responsible   Kristi Jernigan (jernigan_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Morning announcements will include a reminder for class Meet Ups. Leadership Team members will participate in meet up each morning (different classes each day).

Person Responsible   Lisa Peeler (peeler_l@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

All faculty meetings will start with a class meet up and buddy up activity.

Person Responsible   Kristi Jernigan (jernigan_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Sanford Harmony Curriculum will be utilized and taught to all grade levels thought the Specials rotations.

Person Responsible   Kristi Jernigan (jernigan_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Administrative walkthroughs will focus on Sanford Harmony evidence. Domain 2C will be the component that will track if teachers are utilizing the Meet Up planning sheet.

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

Leadership Team agenda will include an SEL section. Leadership team will discuss SEL walkthrough data and plan for classrooms to visit to better support Sanford Harmony Meet Up.

Person Responsible   RIchard Inmon (inmon_r@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

BES monthly PLC schedule will include SEL the 4th week of every month. During this PLC, administration will discuss walkthrough observations, data trends, and next steps.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

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.

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.

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Managing Accountability Systems	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00