# Brookshire Elementary

# 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Brookshire Elementary

## 2500 CADY WAY, Winter Park, FL 32792

### https://brookshirees.ocps.net/

## Demographics

## Principal: Bethany Ledesma

Start Date for this Principal: 2/14/2018

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | No |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 46% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: B (56%)<br><br>2018-19: B (61%)<br><br>2017-18: A (67%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | [LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#) |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | ATSI |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#). | |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

## 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.](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

# Brookshire Elementary

## 2500 CADY WAY, Winter Park, FL 32792

### https://brookshirees.ocps.net/

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2021-22 Title I School** | **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School PK-5 | No | 46% |

| **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 | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | B | | B | B |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

## 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.**

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

## School Leadership Team

**Membership**
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| Fritz, Jason | Principal | - Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making.<br>- Ensures implementation of cycles of professional learning and manages high quality professional development to support implementation.<br>- Ensures collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional strategies, and implementation of intervention support and documentation.<br>- Ensures the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process, and adequate professional development is provided to support MTSS implementation.<br>- Manages school resources, including but not limited to: facilities, budget, personnel, materials, and supplies that are designed to support the areas of focus for school improvement.<br>- Communicates with all stakeholders regarding school-based plans and activities |
| Larsen, Rachel | Assistant Principal | - Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning.<br>- Develops documents to monitor data and address areas of need.<br>- Ensures implementation of cycles of professional learning and manages high quality professional development to support implementation.<br>- Ensures collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional strategies, and implementation of intervention support and documentation.<br>- Ensures the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, and adequate professional development is provided to support MTSS implementation.<br>- Communicates with all stakeholders regarding school-based plans and activities. |
| Bernier, Megan | Instructional Coach | - Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning.<br>- Provides guidance on the K-12 ELA Plan and Math Plan to ensure student needs are met.<br>- Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding databased instructional planning, along with intervention and enrichment strategies.<br>- Facilitates grade level common planning.<br>- Supports implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Adam, Mariam | Behavior Specialist | - Participates in student data collection (including behavior data).<br>- Integrates core instructional activities and materials into Tier III instruction.<br>- Collaborates with General Education teachers and ensures paperwork compliance.<br>- Creates and meets with student groups to support social skills and behavior.<br>- Collaborates with ESE team. |
| Lampugnani, Francesca | School Counselor | - Provide assistance and support of implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans.<br>- Provides counseling and support to students in need. |
| Pollock, Marcy | Instructional Coach | - Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning.<br>- Provides guidance on the K-12 ELA Plan and Math Plan to ensure student needs are met.<br>- Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning, along with intervention and enrichment strategies.<br>- Facilitates grade level common planning.<br>- Supports implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans.<br>- Provides support and assistance to teachers on ELL strategies and compliance. |
| Watson, Kayla | Teacher, K-12 | - Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning.<br>- Provides guidance on the K-12 ELA Plan and Math Plan to ensure student needs are met.<br>- Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning, along with intervention and enrichment strategies.<br>- Facilitates grade level common planning.<br>- Identifies systematic patterns of student needs to identify appropriate, evidence based intervention strategies.<br>- Assists in the design and implementation of whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for students considered to be "at risk".<br>- Supports implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans<br>- Provides professional development to support MTSS |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| | | implementation.<br>-Supports students |
| Christner, Beth | Teacher, K-12 | - Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning.<br>- Provides guidance on the K-12 ELA Plan and Math Plan to ensure student needs are met.<br>- Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning, along with intervention and enrichment strategies.<br>- Facilitates grade level common planning.<br>- Supports implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans.<br>- Facilitates STEM activities.<br>-Supports students |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Wednesday 2/14/2018, Bethany Ledesma

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
0

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
3

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
39

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**
537

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

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**
5

**Demographic Data**

## Early Warning Systems

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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 | 74 | 89 | 90 | 102 | 78 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 513 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 7 | 16 | 10 | 17 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 4 | 3 | 11 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

| 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 9/1/2022

**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 | 12 | 90 | 97 | 83 | 75 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 453 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 9 | 19 | 14 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

**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 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

**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 | |

**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 | 12 | 90 | 97 | 83 | 75 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 453 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 9 | 19 | 14 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

**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 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

**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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 65% | 56% | 56% | | | | 70% | 57% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 56% | | | | | | 59% | 58% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 55% | | | | | | 51% | 52% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 65% | 46% | 50% | | | | 71% | 63% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 47% | | | | | | 60% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 35% | | | | | | 40% | 48% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 69% | 61% | 59% | | | | 75% | 56% | 53% |

## 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 |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 55% | 9% | 58% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 57% | 6% | 58% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -64% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 66% | 54% | 12% | 56% | 10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -63% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 62% | 0% | 62% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 67% | 63% | 4% | 64% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 57% | 16% | 60% | 13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -67% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 72% | 54% | 18% | 53% | 19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 23 | 38 | 45 | 31 | 38 | 45 | 55 | | | | |
| ELL | 37 | 63 | 57 | 43 | 33 | 21 | 33 | | | | |
| ASN | 89 | | | 94 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | 55 | | 40 | 33 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 59 | 56 | 43 | 33 | 24 | 47 | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | 51 | | 78 | 53 | 50 | 85 | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 50 | 47 | 45 | 31 | 25 | 56 | | | | |

| 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 | 29 | 50 | | 33 | 43 | | 31 | | | | |
| ELL | 39 | 55 | | 44 | 36 | | 36 | | | | |
| ASN | 83 | | | 92 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | | | 33 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 57 | | 44 | 33 | 20 | 38 | | | | |
| WHT | 80 | 74 | | 75 | 59 | | 77 | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 45 | 50 | 46 | 23 | 10 | 40 | | | | |

| 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 | 25 | 40 | 47 | 32 | 52 | 53 | 38 | | | | |
| ELL | 58 | 67 | 57 | 58 | 66 | 67 | 62 | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 50 | | 46 | 36 | 10 | 46 | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 52 | 50 | 55 | 57 | 54 | 67 | | | | |
| WHT | 82 | 67 | 43 | 83 | 67 | 23 | 84 | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 58 | 49 | 54 | 55 | 40 | 69 | | | | |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 57 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 66 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 458 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 44 |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Native American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Asian Students** | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 92 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 44 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 47 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Multiracial Students** | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Pacific Islander Students** | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **White Students** | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 66 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 45 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**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?**

School-wide historical data show:
Mathematics learning gains and mathematics learning gains in the bottom quartile consistently lagged behind other content areas from 2019-2022. These areas dropped significantly from 2019 to 2021 and increased minimally from 2021 to 2022.

ELA achievement decreased steadily from 2019 to 2022 (70% to 67% to 65%)
ELA learning gains increased from 2019 (59%) to 2021 (69%) and then decreased in 2022 (56%)
ELA bottom quartile gains decreased slightly from 2019 to 2021 (51% to 50%) and increased slightly to 55% in 2022.

Math achievement decreased from 2019 to 2021 (71% to 62%) and then slightly increased in 2022 to 65%
Math learning gains decreased from 2019 to 2021 (60% to 45%) and slightly increased in 2022 to 47%
Math bottom quartile gains decreased from 2019 to 2021 (40% to 25%) and slightly increased in 2022 to 35%

Science achievement decreased from 2019 to 2021 (75% to 62%) and then increased to 69% in 2022

In respect to 2022 scores:
3rd grade scored the highest in ELA (75% proficiency) and mathematics (80% proficiency)
4th grade scored 52% proficiency in ELA and 64% proficiency in mathematics
5th grade scored 61% proficiency in ELA and 43% proficiency in mathematics

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Progress monitoring (iReady) and state assessments (FSA) show that the greatest need(s) for improvement are mathematics learning gains and mathematics learning gains with the lowest 25%. These areas are currently below the district averages.
2019
LG: 60%
Bottom quartile: 40%
2021
LG: 45%
Bottom quartile: 25%
2022

LG: 47%
Bottom quartile: 35%

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

Many factors may have contributed to the need for improvement in mathematics learning gains and mathematics gains in the bottom quartile:
Early budget cuts cost the school 3 instructional positions. Among those loses was one 4th grade teacher and one 5th grade teacher. This increased class sizes. We also had to reallocate an ESE resource teacher, which increased the caseload of the remaining teacher. 33% of the students in the bottom quartile were ESE.
The school took safety and sanitary precautions that adjusted scheduling of interventions to limit mixing students within other classes.
In 4th and 5th grade, teacher absences, experience and team dynamics may have contributed to the state outcomes.
While the school cannot control budget cuts, we have strategically placed teachers in specific grade levels that are beneficial to students and match the teacher's strengths.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Data from 2021 to 2022 indicate that 5 of the 7 tested components increased in percentage. The component that increased the most was math learning gains in the bottom quartile. The 2022 score is 35% and the 2021 score was 25%. This is a 10% increase.

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

The school used multiple data points to determine which students needed extra support in mathematics. Historical data from prior years' FSA were analyzed, iReady results were analyzed, and student aggregate data were analyzed. This helped the school determine correct placement in regard to math intervention. The school was able to hire an intervention teacher as well as a tutor. These employees, in addition to the school-based coaches, worked with identified students on mathematics based on identified areas of need.

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

Intervention scheduling-students will need to be correctly placed in math and language arts intervention. Data (FSA, FAST, iReady, MTSS, EWS, qualitative) will be used to determine accurate placement.
Small group instruction-teachers will be receiving continuing support with data analysis and small group instruction. Professional development, with a consultant, has been scheduled to continue supporting teachers with how to identify areas of need, how to identify students who need additional support, how to build small group lessons, and how to execute those lessons. Next steps will include monitoring.
Student data analysis-structures will be put into place that will make data analysis deliberate and actionable. The information can then be used for small group instruction, reteaching, intervention, etc.

**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 attend common planning/professional learning communities (PLCs) each week. Administration and school leadership team members will be in attendance for support and direction.
The school will continue a professional development series on small group instruction with consultant, Taylar Wenzel.

Leadership will share professional development opportunities, in regard to BEST standards, with teachers. Teachers will also receive support with lesson planning and standard implementation during common planning and coaching cycles.
Teachers will receive feedback from the leadership team during observations and classroom walkthroughs.
Administrators and teachers/teacher leaders will attend school district professional development, throughout the year, related to BEST standards and resources.

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

Small group professional development will support levels K-5. This will allow the school to build small group instructional practices with K-2 teachers.
Classroom walks, feedback, and coaching will be implemented to increase improvement of instruction and pedagogical practices (student processing and collaboration, justifying answers, identifying and correcting errors in reasoning). Leadership will share a focus, or look-fors, with teachers.
Provide resources, and help utilizing those resources, to support student foundations in reading and math literacy (iReady, SIPPS, manipulatives)

**Areas of Focus**
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

**:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**<br>**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Mathematics is an area that identified as a critical need based on 2022 and historical FSA data. The specific areas of need in mathematics are mathematics learning gains and learning gains in the bottom quartile.<br>Mathematics gains in the bottom quartile have consistently lagged behind state and district averages from 2019-2022.<br>Mathematics learning gains dropped from 2019 to 2021 (-15) and increased minimally from 2021 to 2022 (+2).<br>Overall, 45 students (not in the bottom quartile) in grades 4 and 5 did not make learning gains.<br>Mathematics learning gains in the bottom quartile decreased from 2019 to 2021 (-15) and increased from 2021 to 2022 (+10). While there were increases in the scores, the data remains lower than state and district averages as well as the school's lowest data component. |
| **Measurable Outcome:**<br>**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | The mathematics learning goal for the 2022 school year is 60%. This would be a 13% increase and bring the school back to pre-pandemic status in this component.<br>The 2022 school year mathematics goal for the bottom quartile is 50%. This would require a gain of 15% and surpass the school status from 2019, as well as bring the school toward current district averages. |
| **Monitoring:**<br>**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | The progress of this area will be monitored through both qualitative and quantitative data.<br>The school will use progress monitoring assessment/assignment data (FAST, iReady), common assessment data, classroom walkthrough data, and intervention/enrichment data (MTSS, EWS, and course placement) to monitor progress toward the goals. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jason Fritz (jason.fritz@ocps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Standards-based instruction-teachers are expected to provide instruction and tasks that align to the BEST standards.<br>Small group instruction-teachers are expected to incorporate small group instruction into their lessons. This strategy will allow teachers to deliver differentiated instruction driven by individual student data and needs. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | BEST standards are new to grades 3-5 this year.<br>The school is purchasing professional development for small group instruction. This PD is a series and was introduced during the 21-22 school year. The professional development aims to help teachers analyze data, determine areas of need or enrichment, identify students for differentiated groups, planning lessons, and executing them successfully. |

| Action Steps to Implement | |
|---|---|
| List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step. | |

Review and analyze mathematics (current and historical) data from standardized and common assessments.

**Person Responsible**     Jason Fritz (jason.fritz@ocps.net)

Review 2022 intervention/enrichment lists and identify students in the bottom quartile as well as those who did not make learning gains.
Identify bubble students for proficiency gains.
Identify teachers in need of coaching/support

**Person Responsible**        Jason Fritz (jason.fritz@ocps.net)

Identify individuals to provide instruction and make sure students are appropriately scheduled.

**Person Responsible**        Rachel Larsen (rachel.larsen@ocps.net)

Provide professional development to teachers:
Small group instruction with Taylar Wenzel
Common planning/PLC support with data, BEST standards and curriculum documents
Coaching cycles
Ensure teachers have opportunities to collaborate with content experts (ESE, ELL, coaches)

**Person Responsible**        Megan Bernier (megan.bernier@ocps.net)

Observe instruction and monitor implementation of professional development. Provide feedback to teachers.

**Person Responsible**        Jason Fritz (jason.fritz@ocps.net)

Ensure assessment conditions are in compliance and students are tested in optimal conditions for success.

**Person Responsible**        Marcy Pollock (marcy.pollock@ocps.net)

Review assessment/achievement data, reflect on progress, make changes as necessary (change intervention, re-focus instruction, provide different/additional PD, shift teacher/student support, etc.)

**Person Responsible**        Jason Fritz (jason.fritz@ocps.net)

Regular school celebrations to recognize teachers, classes and students to make progress toward their goals.

**Person Responsible**        Jason Fritz (jason.fritz@ocps.net)

Determine MTSS levels for each student.

**Person Responsible**        Kayla Watson (kayla.watson@ocps.net)

| #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Critical areas in need of academic progress for students with disabilities is proficiency levels in English Language Arts and Mathematics. Based on the FSA ELA data, 24% of students with disabilities scored a level 3, 4, 5. 76% of students with disabilities scored a level 1 or 2. Based on the FSA mathematics data, 34% of students with disabilities scored a level 3, 4, 5 and 66% scored a level 1 or 2. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | The school plans to increase English Language Arts proficiency and mathematics proficiency for students with disabilities to increase the ESSA federal index to 41% or higher. |
| **Monitoring:** **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | English Language Arts proficiency and mathematics proficiency will be measured as students are assessed on the state FAST assessment as well as school-based iReady diagnostics. We will use data from each assessment (August, December, May) to monitor student gains and proficiency outcomes. Common assessments-proficiency scores will be reviewed |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jason Fritz (jason.fritz@ocps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Standards-based instruction-teachers are expected to provide instruction and tasks that align to the BEST standards. Small group instruction-teachers are expected to incorporate small group instruction into their lessons. This strategy will allow teachers to deliver differentiated instruction driven by individual student data and needs. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | BEST standards are new to grades 3-5 this year. The school is purchasing professional development for small group instruction. This PD is a series and was introduced during the 21-22 school year. The professional development aims to help teachers analyze data, determine areas of need or enrichment, identify students for differentiated groups, planning lessons, and executing them successfully. |

### Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Review and analyze English Language Arts and mathematics data (current and historical) from standardized and common assessments.

| **Person Responsible** | Jason Fritz (jason.fritz@ocps.net) |
|---|---|

Review 2022 intervention/enrichment lists and identify students who did not make learning gains.
Identify bubble students for proficiency gains.
Identify teachers in need of coaching/support

| **Person Responsible** | Jason Fritz (jason.fritz@ocps.net) |
|---|---|

Identify individuals to provide instruction and make sure students are appropriately scheduled.
Ensure students are receiving services and scheduled per their IEPs.

| **Person Responsible** | Rachel Larsen (rachel.larsen@ocps.net) |

Provide professional development to teachers:
Small group instruction with Taylar Wenzel
Common planning/PLC support with data, BEST standards and curriculum documents
Coaching cycles
Ensure teachers have opportunities to collaborate with content experts (ESE, ELL, coaches)

| **Person Responsible** | Megan Bernier (megan.bernier@ocps.net) |

Provide new educational resources and support professional learning, usage and implementation (i.e.
Write Score, district curriculum documents).

| **Person Responsible** | Megan Bernier (megan.bernier@ocps.net) |

Observe instruction and monitor implementation of professional development. Provide feedback to
teachers.

| **Person Responsible** | Jason Fritz (jason.fritz@ocps.net) |

Ensure assessment conditions are in compliance and students are tested in optimal conditions for
success.
Support implementation of new resources requiring assessment components.

| **Person Responsible** | Marcy Pollock (marcy.pollock@ocps.net) |

Review assessment/achievement data, reflect on progress, make changes as necessary (change
intervention, re-focus instruction, provide different/additional PD, shift teacher/student support, etc.)

| **Person Responsible** | Jason Fritz (jason.fritz@ocps.net) |

Regular school celebrations to recognize teachers, classes and students to make progress toward their
goals.

| **Person Responsible** | Jason Fritz (jason.fritz@ocps.net) |

Determine MTSS levels for each student.

| **Person Responsible** | Kayla Watson (kayla.watson@ocps.net) |

## 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

**Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

The school will collaborate with all stakeholders to promote a positive culture and environment:
Teachers will form committees to support different initiatives throughout the school (Cheer, clubs, etc.).
The school will meet with PTA/SAC to share school improvement data, discuss fund raising activities,

school celebrations, etc.

Community events both on and off campus will help promote a positive and welcoming environment.

Schoolwide celebrations will be planned which will recognize students, class, and teacher progress toward academic and life skills goals.

Celebrations will be inclusive of all students and classes.

Staff events to promote collaboration and build trust, relationships, and respect. This includes traditions from previous years to show teachers appreciation.

Continued use of the Caring School Community program/curriculum for building class culture.

Schoolwide initiatives such as "Start with Hello" to foster positive culture with students and staff.

Restorative practices for conflict resolution.

Culturally Responsive Instruction to promote understanding of student backgrounds and development.

Partner with outside vendors to offer extra-curricular opportunities for students.

Newsletter communication will be shared with staff to keep them aware of what is occurring throughout the school.

Connect Orange messages and social media posts will inform families and the community of what is occurring at Brookshire and positively market the school brand.

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

School-based leadership team will plan and facilitate events/activities within the schools to celebrate staff and students.

The school will collaborate with SAC/PTA to support school improvement and appreciation efforts. These groups consist of school personnel, community members, and parents.

Teachers will build a positive culture with their students by building classroom community.

Teachers will participate in PLCs and trainings to build relationships and content knowledge on initiatives.

Students will participate in restorative practices daily within their classrooms to build relationships and as needed for conflict resolution.

Outside vendors/businesses will partner with the school to offer extra-curricular opportunities for families and/or provide services to the staff.