Brooker Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Brooker Elementary School

812 DEWOLF RD, Brandon, FL 33511

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Roy Moral

Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2021

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
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: B (58%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (54%)
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 Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Brooker Elementary School

812 DEWOLF RD, Brandon, FL 33511

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	56%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

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 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.

Empower leadership skills in all learners as they pursue academic excellence and develop socially responsive mindsets as responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering Lifelong Learners

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
Koplin, Heidi	Principal	Develops and coordinates educational programs through meetings with staff, reviews of teachers' activities, and issuance of directives. Administers and develops educational programs for students with mental or physical disabilities. Confers with teachers, students, and parents concerning educational and behavioral problems in school. Establishes and maintains relationships with community organizations, and other schools to coordinate educational services. Requisitions and allocates supplies, equipment, and instructional material as needed. Directs preparation of class schedules, cumulative records, and attendance reports. Walks about school building and property to monitor safety and security. Plans and monitors school budget. Plans for and directs building maintenance. Performs any other duties as assigned.
Norris, Amber	Assistant Principal	Makes or shares in the making of decisions in a timely manner, using appropriate levels of involvement so that actions may be taken and commitments made by self and others. Acts in accordance with the shared vision and mission of the district and school; cares about the organization's reputation and is aware of the effect his/her decisions make on the organization. Influences the school stakeholders by a variety of means, such as persuasive argument, setting examples, or using expertise; is able to present ideas to others in an open, informative, and nonevaluative manner; is able to write clearly and concisely. Uses data to implement curriculum and instructional supervision; gathers, analyzes and uses data from varied and multiple sources to build relationships, form concepts, and create hypotheses; analyzes alternatives and perspectives when solving a problem or making a decision. Assists with oversight of and responsibility for the school's instructional program and its results. Assists with oversight of and responsibility for the safety and discipline of school's students. Assists with oversight of and responsibility for the school's human resources selections, management, and development. Assists with oversight of and responsibility for the school's business and research efforts. Assists with oversight of and responsibility for the accuracy and timeliness of the school's records and reports.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Assists with oversight of and responsibility for the school's administration and operation. Assists with oversight of and responsibility for the school's property and physical plant. Assists with the provision of leadership in the development or revision and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. Performs any other duties as assigned.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/18/2021, 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.*

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

827

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

4

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

3

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	115	124	116	118	132	158	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	763
Attendance below 90 percent	5	18	15	13	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
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	3	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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

Sunday 8/22/2021

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	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	

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	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	

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				63%	52%	57%	59%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	55%	58%	53%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	50%	53%	44%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				64%	54%	63%	55%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				61%	57%	62%	47%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	46%	51%	26%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				63%	50%	53%	55%	51%	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	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	57%	4%	64%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	60%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	60%	51%	9%	53%	7%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Reading
iReady Math
Science Baseline and Midyear and Spring SSA

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35	52	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	48	57
	Students With Disabilities	30	55	67
	English Language Learners	27	41	54
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30	42	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	39	48
	Students With Disabilities	21	38	69
	English Language Learners	22	11	56

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45	56	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	49	58
	Students With Disabilities	26	33	47
	English Language Learners	9	19	34
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24	52	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	48	54
	Students With Disabilities	21	43	54
	English Language Learners	0	27	27

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62	73	76
	Economically Disadvantaged	55	70	72
	Students With Disabilities	49	63	66
	English Language Learners	38	52	63
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27	42	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	33	54
	Students With Disabilities	21	44	51
	English Language Learners	0	7	29

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62	65	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	61	65
	Students With Disabilities	53	50	62
	English Language Learners	41	43	54
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34	46	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	43	42
	Students With Disabilities	29	40	29
	English Language Learners	14	22	33

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61	64	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	55	58	60
	Students With Disabilities	57	53	59
	English Language Learners	40	43	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42	45	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	37	50
	Students With Disabilities	43	36	48
	English Language Learners	0	0	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	50.7	56.5	42.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41.5	44.7	
	Students With Disabilities	32.4	56.5	
	English Language Learners	17.1	18.7	

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	26	22	29	32	21	18	10				
ELL	50	60		46	33		60				
ASN	93			100							
BLK	33	73		43	55		30				
HSP	54	52	30	43	26	8	32				
MUL	51	40		50	50		60				
WHT	62	53	40	64	44	13	44				
FRL	45	44	44	48	34	17	35				
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				

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
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				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	94%

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	51

English Language Learners	
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	97
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	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	37
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	50
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	46
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	40
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?

Students with disabilities and students who are not English proficient do not have the same level of learning growth as their grade level peers.

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

According to both iReady diagnostic assessments and FSA, students in the bottom quartile continue to struggle with making learning gains in the areas of both reading and math.

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 number of students on eLearning may have had some impact on student learning. This would be difficult to quantify.

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

For the 2021 school year, the FSA data did not indicate any areas of improvement. However, the 2019 FSA test data indicated gains in Math bottom quartile.

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

The leadership team will incorporated 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.

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

Teachers will engage in grade level collaborative planning to determine what skills and strategies students need support and scaffolding in order to accelerate learning. In addition, teachers will identify student skills/strategies as 'look-fors' to aggressively monitor student 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.

Teachers will need support with planning using acceleration plans located in instructional guides. Teachers will need professional development on ways to Aggressively Monitor student learning. Teachers may need ideas and strategies to scaffold student learning and responding.

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

Collaborate with district resource teachers to plan lessons and units, create professional development, and develop site based content leaders to support this work throughout the year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2020-21 school year, hundreds of students were eLearning and or on quarantine. The loss of learning time in the prior year impacts the learning for the 2021-2022 school year. Teachers acknowledge the need for planning to develop supports and scaffolds for students in order to accelerate learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the number of students scoring proficient and making growth in reading and math on iReady diagnostics.
Monitoring:	During Instructional Leadership Team meetings, the team wil review diagnostic assessment data to determine what progress has been made toward goal and what additional supports the teams may need.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amber Norris (amber.norris@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Staff will analyze the school data 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. Grade level collaborative planning using district created instructional guides.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers need time to review and analyze the data and outline next steps. Using PLCs to review and discuss data, teachers can adjust their instructional pacing, routines, or strategies to meet the needs of the students.

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule common weekly planning time.
Schedule planning support with district resource teachers for science and math.
Use district created and approved planning tools; instructional resources, pacing guides, and acceleration resources.
Review content standards prior to planning sessions.
Create checks for understanding using learning ladders.
Schedule side-by-side coaching and lesson study with district content leads.

Person Responsible	Amber Norris (amber.norris@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To best determine which students need more or less support, teachers will gather data throughout the lessons to aggressively monitor student use of strategies and learning.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of agressive monitoring strategies, student learning and growth as measured by iReady, will improve.
Monitoring:	Grade level PLCs will discuss the data collected from daily classroom lessons. Teams will identify strategies that students continue to struggle with and determine next steps to readdress the learning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heidi Koplin (heidi.koplin@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	During collaborative planning, teachers will identify lesson targets, skills, or strategies. Teachers will gather information throughout the unit and adjust the lesson to meet the needs of the students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The students in the bottom quartile are not making the same learning gains as their grade level peers. Making adjustments to the lesson in the moment, will correct any misunderstanding and provide the lowest scoring students the opportunity attain success.

Action Steps to Implement

Create look-fors to be used in monitoring student engagement for each content area.
Conduct weekly walkthroughs to collect data on student engagement.
Share walkthrough data at Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) monthly meetings.
Plan and schedule job embedded PD related to increasing student ownership of learning; i.e. Kagan structures, accountable talk, and other engagement strategies.
Schedule support with district content leads to provide additional coaching and support; i.e. Math resource and Science resource.

Person Responsible	Heidi Koplin (heidi.koplin@hcps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with disabilities scores below 41% on the Spring FSA in 2021 for both reading and math.
Measurable Outcome:	Students with disabilities will improve overall achievement in ELA from 23 to 40. Students with disabilities will improve overall achievement in Math from 32 to 50.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring data from math monthly assessments, ELA monthly assessments, as well as iReady data will be collected and analyzed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heidi Koplin (heidi.koplin@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use frequent progress monitoring to plan for and deliver small group instruction that targets critical areas for both reading and math. Students will set monthly goals for progress monitoring and track individual data to show growth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Frequent progress monitoring of critical areas empowers teachers and students to respond quickly and adjust lesson pacing and content delivery. Students who are aware of their goals and strategies to get to the goal is empowered and motivated to apply strategies learned.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data conferences with individual students will identify a skill gap for each.
2. Set a goal of reaching stretch goals, as measured by iReady.
3. Identify lead measures for each student to incorporate addressing specific skill gap.
4. Monitor implementation with data conference with teacher.
5. Monitor growth data through regular assessments.

Person Responsible	Heidi Koplin (heidi.koplin@hcps.net)

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.

Brooker reported 4.4 incidents per 100 students. This rate is greater than the statewide rate of 1.0 incident per 100 students. The area of concern to monitor is violent incidents which is 4.26 incidents per 100 students.

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.

Brooker is a PBIS and 7 Mindsets Model School. As a result, the school receives additional district support and resources to successfully implement the 7 Mindsets Social Emotional Learning program within the classroom setting.

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

Administration - provide resources and training for 7 Mindsets and PBIS, communicate schoolwide expectations
Teachers - Teach and review expected classroom behaviors and expectations, communicate with parents and students about positive classroom behaviors and culture, morning meetings
Sarah Allen - School Counselor - 7 Mindsets Model School Liaison, Classroom guidance, individual counseling and strategies
Kimberly Guion- School Counselor - Classroom guidance, individual counseling and strategies, 7 Mindsets
Juanita Colleton - Social Worker - Collaboration with community organizations, support families and students
Cristina VazquezSantisteban - School Psychologist, psychoeducational evaluation