

Orange County Public Schools

# Brookshire Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>12</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>17</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>22</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>23</b> |

## Brookshire Elementary

2500 CADY WAY, Winter Park, FL 32792

<https://brookshirees.ocps.net/>

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections   | Title I Schoolwide Program                                      | Charter Schools        |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)   |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)   |                        |
| I-E: Early Warning System  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)                                    | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-A-C: Data Review  |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring  | ESSA 1114(b)(3)   |                        |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection                                    | ESSA 1114(b)(6)   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)   |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)                                       |                        |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements   | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>ESSA 1116(b-g) |                        |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## **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 Department 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.

## 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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

**School Leadership Team**

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name             | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Ledesma, Bethany | Principal           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making.</li> <li>- Ensures implementation of cycles of professional learning and manages high-quality professional development to support implementation.</li> <li>- Ensures collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional strategies, and implementation of intervention support and documentation.</li> <li>- Ensures the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process, and adequate professional development is provided to support MTSS implementation.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- Communicates with all stakeholders regarding school-based plans and activities.</li> </ul>   |
| Larsen, Rachel   | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides professional development to drive instruction and improve student learning.</li> <li>- Develop documents to monitor data and address areas of need.</li> <li>- Ensures implementation of cycles of professional learning and manages high-quality professional development to support implementation.</li> <li>- Ensures collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional strategies, and implementation of intervention support and documentation.</li> <li>- Ensures the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process, and conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff and adequate professional development is provided to support MTSS implementation.</li> <li>- Oversees discipline.</li> <li>- Implements truancy policy.</li> <li>- Manages threat assessment processes.</li> <li>- Manages school and student schedules.</li> <li>- Communicates with all stakeholders regarding school-based plans and activities.</li> </ul> |
| Bernier, Megan   | Instructional Coach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning.</li> <li>- Provides guidance on subject-area implementation to ensure student needs are met.</li> <li>- Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-informed instructional planning, along with intervention and enrichment strategies.</li> <li>- Engages teachers in coaching cycles.</li> <li>- Facilitates grade-level common planning and Professional Learning Communities.</li> <li>- Supports implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans.</li> </ul>  |
| Adam, Mariam     | Behavior Specialist | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participates in student data collection (including behavior data).</li> <li>- Integrates core instructional activities and materials into Tier III instruction.</li> </ul>  |

| Name                  | Position Title              | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|
|                       |                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Collaborates with General Education teachers and ensures paperwork compliance.</li> <li>- Creates and meets with student groups to support social skills and behavior.</li> <li>-Collaborates with ESE team.</li> </ul>   |
| Lampugnani, Francesca | School Counselor            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide assistance and support for the implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans and character education instruction.</li> <li>- Provides counseling and support to students in need.</li> <li>-Assists with threat assessment processes.</li> </ul>  |
| Pollock, Marcy        | Curriculum Resource Teacher | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning.</li> <li>- Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding assessments.</li> <li>- Supports implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans.</li> <li>- Provides support and assistance to teachers on test compliance and administration.</li> </ul>   |
| Dunbar, Susan         | Instructional Coach         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides professional development on data analysis to drive instruction and improve student learning.</li> <li>- Provides guidance on intervention resources.</li> <li>- Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning, along with intervention and enrichment strategies.</li> <li>- Identifies systematic patterns of student needs to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies.</li> <li>- Assists in the design and implementation of whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for students considered to be "at risk".</li> <li>- Supports implementation of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III intervention plans.</li> <li>- Provides professional development to support MTSS implementation.</li> <li>-Supports students.</li> </ul> |
| Moberg, Stacey        | Staffing Specialist         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Resource for information regarding the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA).</li> <li>-Communicates with staff and parents in regard to special education.</li> <li>-Coordinates with staff and facilitates meetings for Individual Education Plans (IEPs), Section 504 Plans, Gifted Plans (EPs), etc., and assists in the development of plans.</li> <li>-Collaborates with staff to share best practices and trains them on ESE procedures.</li> <li>-Assists with FTE.</li> </ul>   |



**Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development**

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholder input that was used to determine SIP goals came from the following:

School leadership team members

Data analysis

Panorama stakeholder surveys

School leadership analyzed student achievement data and determined that the proficiency of Students with Disabilities (ESSA) in ELA and mathematics is a priority.

Panorama data from teachers, staff, students, and community members indicate that the need for a positive behavior intervention system could reduce truancy, increase positive interactions with students, increase time spent in class, and improve the overall culture of the school.

School improvement plans are shared with stakeholders through School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings.

**SIP Monitoring**

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

School improvement efforts will be monitored in the following ways:

-Classroom walkthroughs and documentation of instruction.

-Targeted feedback for teachers.

-Review of students in MTSS tiers about every 6 weeks or as needed.

-Monitoring of student data (screening tools, unit assessments, historical data, and state progress monitoring data).

-Teacher common planning documentation (minutes, lesson planning, professional learning).

-Stakeholder feedback surveys.

-The SIP will be formally reviewed during the mid-year review. Adjustments during the year will occur through leadership team meetings.

**Demographic Data**

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)                | Active                    |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | K-12 General Education    |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>                    | No                        |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>                            | 53%                       |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>    | 46%                       |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No  |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No  |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | ATSI  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Asian Students (ASN)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: B<br>2019-20: B<br>2018-19: B<br>2017-18: A  |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |   |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |   |

### Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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 |    |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 9           | 15 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 1  | 0  | 4  | 1  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  |       |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 0  | 3  | 3  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 1  | 6  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 5  | 19 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 5  | 18 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 11 | 10 | 8  | 22 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |       |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 5 | 4 | 8 | 22 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47    |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1           | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |

**Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)****The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator   | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |    | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |    |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 7           | 16 | 10 | 17 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 4  | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8  | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 4           | 3  | 11 | 15 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |       |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22    |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |    | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |    |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 7           | 16 | 10 | 17 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |       |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  |       |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 4  | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8  | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 4           | 3  | 11 | 15 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |       |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22    |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |

## II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

### ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

| Accountability Component    | 2023   |          |       | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement*            | 66     | 57       | 53    | 65     | 56       | 56    | 67     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 56     |          |       | 69     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 55     |          |       | 50     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*           | 67     | 60       | 59    | 65     | 46       | 50    | 62     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 47     |          |       | 45     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 35     |          |       | 25     |          |       |

| Accountability Component        | 2023   |          |       | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                                 | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement*            | 69     | 63       | 54    | 69     | 61       | 59    | 62     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     |        |          |       |        | 66       | 64    |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      |        |          |       |        | 51       | 52    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        | 55       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 68     | 59       | 59    | 66     |          |       | 50     |          |       |

\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

#### ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 68   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 2    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 338  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 5    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 99   |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 57   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 458  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 8    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 98   |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

| <b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b> |  |                           |  |  |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b>                      | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
| SWD                                       | 31                                     | Yes                       | 2  | 1  |
| ELL                                       | 55                                     |                           |  |  |
| AMI                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                                       | 92                                     |                           |  |  |
| BLK                                       | 35                                     | Yes                       | 1  |  |
| HSP                                       | 50                                     |                           |  |  |
| MUL                                       | 58                                     |                           |  |  |
| PAC                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                                       | 82                                     |                           |  |  |
| FRL                                       | 48                                     |                           |  |  |

| <b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b> |  |                           |  |  |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| <b>ESSA Subgroup</b>                      | <b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b> | <b>Subgroup Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b> | <b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b> |
| SWD                                       | 39                                     | Yes                       | 1  |  |
| ELL                                       | 44                                     |                           |  |  |
| AMI                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| ASN                                       | 92                                     |                           |  |  |
| BLK                                       | 44                                     |                           |  |  |
| HSP                                       | 47                                     |                           |  |  |
| MUL                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| PAC                                       |  |                           |  |  |
| WHT                                       | 66                                     |                           |  |  |
| FRL                                       | 45                                     |                           |  |  |

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 66       |        |             | 67        |         |              | 69       |         |           |                   |                     | 68           |
| SWD  | 20       |        |             | 30        |         |              | 33       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 55           |
| ELL  | 45       |        |             | 52        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 3                   | 68           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 89       |        |             | 95        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| BLK  | 37       |        |             | 30        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 3                   |              |
| HSP  | 44       |        |             | 46        |         |              | 47       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 65           |
| MUL  | 38       |        |             | 77        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 80       |        |             | 79        |         |              | 83       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| FRL  | 43       |        |             | 46        |         |              | 39       |         |           |                   | 5                   | 71           |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 65       | 56     | 55          | 65        | 47      | 35           | 69       |         |           |                   |                     | 66           |
| SWD  | 23       | 38     | 45          | 31        | 38      | 45           | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 37       | 63     | 57          | 43        | 33      | 21           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     | 66           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 89       |        |             | 94        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 47       | 55     |             | 40        | 33      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 46       | 59     | 56          | 43        | 33      | 24           | 47       |         |           |                   |                     | 65           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 77       | 51     |             | 78        | 53      | 50           | 85       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 44       | 50     | 47          | 45        | 31      | 25           | 56       |         |           |                   |                     | 59           |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 67       | 69     | 50          | 62        | 45      | 25           | 62       |         |           |                   |                     | 50           |
| SWD  | 29       | 50     |             | 33        | 43      |              | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 39       | 55     |             | 44        | 36      |              | 36       |         |           |                   |                     | 50           |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 83       |        |             | 92        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 53       |        |             | 33        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 49       | 57     |             | 44        | 33      | 20           | 38       |         |           |                   |                     | 52           |
| MUL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 80       | 74     |             | 75        | 59      |              | 77       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 53       | 45     | 50          | 46        | 23      | 10           | 40       |         |           |                   |                     | 53           |

### Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA   |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 54%    | 54%      | 0%                         | 54%   | 0%                      |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 75%    | 60%      | 15%                        | 58%   | 17%                     |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 63%    | 52%      | 11%                        | 50%   | 13%                     |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 63%    | 59%      | 4%                         | 59%   | 4%                      |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 77%    | 62%      | 15%                        | 61%   | 16%                     |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 58%    | 55%      | 3%                         | 55%   | 3%                      |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 67%    | 59%      | 8%                         | 51%   | 16%                     |



### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

According to 2023 FAST data, 5th grade ELA and Math showed the lowest performance with 54% and 58% proficiency, respectively. This is down from the 2022 5th grade proficiency levels of 61% in ELA and up from the Math proficiency level of 43%. This group of students had ELA and math proficiency scores of 52% and 64% in 4th grade, which could have contributed to their low performance in 2023. During this cohort's 4th grade year, there was a lot of teacher turnover in that grade level. One teacher was cut due to low enrollment and when enrollment increased, a brand new teacher was hired. The inconsistency of teachers and the inexperience of teachers may have contributed to the learning gap that was not recovered by the end of 5th grade.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the 2022 to 2023 school year was 3rd-grade mathematics proficiency. Proficiency in this grade level and subject area dropped from 80% to 63%. Third grade had changes in their team that may have affected gains in mathematics. During the 22-23 school year, the third-grade team had 3 teachers added to the team. One teacher was in her first year, another teacher was in her third year, but first as a 3rd grade teacher, and one teacher was new to Brookshire from out of county. The differences in dynamics and experience on the team may have contributed to the changes in scores.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

Based on a raw data comparison of PM3, Brookshire ES outperformed the state averages in each grade level and content area applicable except one. 5th grade ELA data indicate zero variance with the state average at 54% proficiency. Although this is not a gap, this area is the closest to a potential gap. Trend data in other content areas indicate that 5th grade performed below 3rd and 4th grades consistently. Cohort data for this 5th grade group indicate they dropped 17% from 2021 to 2022 (3rd to 4th grade) and came in below the state average (52% to the state's 57% proficiency rate). The 5th grade cohort struggled throughout their intermediate grade levels. They were in 2nd grade during the COVID-19 shutdown and 3rd grade when school was a virtual option. The loss of learning during these grade levels would have meant students did not receive the foundations necessary for success in the 4th and 5th grades.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Fourth-grade ELA is the component that showed the most improvement from 2022 to 2023. Proficiency increased from 52% to 88% during the school year. In math, 5th grade showed the most improvement from 43% to 58% proficiency. The school saw a need to fill gaps from grade level to grade level and in addition to planning days with teams, the instructional coach facilitated vertical alignment planning days. During these plan days, grade-level leaders met and discussed the gaps they were seeing in student achievement and benchmarks as well as where other grade levels could focus to help close those gaps in the previous grade level.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

The data for 3rd-grade students is an area of concern. When examining the EWS of Level 1 proficiency in ELA and Math, 3rd grade increased from 0 students to 28 students in the 2022-2023 school year. This is a larger jump than any of the other grade levels. Additionally, 5th grade has the lowest percent proficiency in ELA and Math, while they have the largest number of students with two or more early warning signs.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.**

ESSA (SWD) subgroup proficiency in ELA and mathematics.

Subgroup (ELL) proficiency in ELA and mathematics across all grade levels.

Closing gaps between 2nd and 3rd-grade reading proficiency.

Maintaining proficiency levels of rising 5th-grade students in ELA and mathematics.

**Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

To create a positive culture and environment, Brookshire Elementary will take a proactive approach to student behavior and streamline PBIS systems campuswide.

Early warning system data for the previous year indicate:

7 students received 1 or more suspensions

32 students in grades 3-5 scored a level 1 on the statewide ELA assessment

31 students in grades 3-5 scored a level 1 on the statewide Mathematics assessment

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The school plans to decrease the number of students who receive 1 or more suspensions and reduce the number of discipline referrals for student behavior. Brookshire would ideally like to keep all students in school with 0 suspensions.

The school plans to decrease the amount of students (by half: 16 students) who score a level 1 on the statewide ELA assessment.

The school plans to decrease the number of students (by half: 16 students) who score a level 1 on the statewide mathematics assessment.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored by the number of behavior calls and discipline referrals the office receives. We will also monitor how many SESIR infractions occur.

The school will monitor instruction and student placement in MTSS to decrease the number of students who score a level 1 on mathematics and ELA statewide assessments.

The school will monitor student outcomes through FAST and STAR progress monitoring assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

PBIS systems change:

Previous practices allowed for teachers to determine their own PBIS systems within their classrooms.

Impacts included inconsistencies in implementation and an inability to effectively monitor implementation outcomes. For the 23-24 school year, the leadership team will assemble a school PBIS committee to include volunteers from multiple grade levels, content areas, and disciplines.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A school committee of individuals who are dedicated to increasing a positive culture will allow for opportunities to share input and distribute leadership. A diverse committee that is led by peers will potentially increase buy-in and consistency across the school. With a school PBIS system, leadership will be able to monitor and support implementation, be more proactive with behaviors, and evaluate effectiveness.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

## Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

Gather data on suspension rates, student achievement levels, and feedback from stakeholders to identify specific areas for improvement.

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

**By When:** Beginning of the year-August 2023

Form a committee of volunteers to build a Positive Behavior Intervention/Support system (PBIS) to be implemented schoolwide.

**Person Responsible:** Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

**By When:** End of First Quarter-October 2023.

PBIS committee will present the plan to staff for implementation. Leadership will support as needed. The plan will define measurable goals, expectations, and plan design. The plan will emphasize and reward positive behavior with a clear framework of expectations and consequences.

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

**By When:** End of First Quarter-October 2023.

In conjunction with the PBIS plan, the school will implement programs and initiatives that promote resiliency.

**Person Responsible:** Francesca Lampugnani (francesca.lampugnani@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Targeted support for teacher implementation will be provided as needed.

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

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Targeted support will be provided to students who are at risk of suspension or struggling academically.

**Person Responsible:** Susan Dunbar (susan.dunbar@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year as data are collected.

The committee will meet throughout the year to review and adjust the plan as needed. The adjustments will be based on data and feedback. Adjustments will be shared with the staff.

**Person Responsible:** Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

**By When:** Quarterly

Students and staff will be recognized and celebrated through awards, recognitions, and other events.

**Person Responsible:** Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

**#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 crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

To increase proficiency for students with disabilities, Brookshire Elementary will focus on strong Tier 1 instruction. This includes differentiated small group instruction in grades K-5 and a focus on foundations in literacy for grades K-2.

According to 2022-2023 FAST PM3 data, achievement for Students with Disabilities (SWD) indicate they are below the 41% federal index for the state.

ELA proficiency: 26%

Mathematics proficiency: 29%

**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 achievement for SWD through appropriate interventions and strong Tier 1 instruction. The goal is to move data for SWD to at least 41% for the Federal Index (a 3% increase).

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students will be appropriately supported through MTSS.

Schedules for SWD will reflect appropriate services for POPI.

Districtwide literacy focus for K-2 students.

Student data will be monitored through FAST/STAR assessments as well as through MTSS data collection.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Bethany Ledesma (bethany.ledesma@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The school will implement a districtwide initiative with a focus on K-2 literacy. The initiative is based on the Science of Reading (SoR), which explores how written language is processed and understood. The research looks at how humans recognize words, understand their meanings, and make sense of what they're reading. The school will ensure teachers receive appropriate professional development and support to efficiently implement SoR principles. The school will also make sure teachers have the appropriate resources and classroom structures to implement instruction with fidelity.

Data will be utilized to ensure students in grades 3-5 are receiving appropriate interventions to address gaps in foundational reading abilities. Research-based programs, such as SIPPS and Being a Reader, will be used in small-group instruction to differentiate based on the needs of students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected as part of a district-wide approach to close literacy gaps. Students in K-2 will be taught reading foundations with the idea they will transition from learning to read to reading to learn by 3rd grade.

Small-group instruction is a best practice for instruction. By utilizing research-based resources, this approach allows teachers to provide interventions for students based on their own targeted needs. By increasing opportunities to be successful in class, students can also become more engaged and confident with the content.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

Gather and analyze data on the current performance of students with disabilities in mathematics and language arts.

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

**By When:** Beginning of the year-August 2023

Review and update Individual Education Plans (IEPs) to ensure they are appropriate and up-to-date. Make sure appropriate student support is scheduled. Ensure students have access to appropriate materials and technologies needed based on IEP.

**Person Responsible:** Stacey Moberg (stacey.moberg@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year. Scheduling-before October 9.

Provide teachers with opportunities for professional development on strategies for differentiating instruction to meet the diverse needs of students (small group instruction, resources, accommodations, etc.).

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

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Encourage regular collaboration between special education teachers and general education teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Stacey Moberg (stacey.moberg@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Regularly collect data to monitor the progress of all students in mathematics and ELA. Analyze assessment data to identify trends and patterns. Use information to make informed decisions about instructional strategies and interventions.

**Person Responsible:** Susan Dunbar (susan.dunbar@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

**CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review**

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The subgroup focus for Brookshire Elementary is Students with Disabilities.

School improvement funding allocations are reviewed through a comprehensive and data-driven process to ensure resources are allocated based on the needs of the school and students.

1. The school will gather data based on student performance, demographics, behavior, attendance, and other areas.
2. The data will then be analyzed to identify areas where the school needs improvement and determine areas

of focus.

3. Clear and measurable goals for improvement will then be established.

4. The school's current resources are evaluated to determine if there are any gaps between what exists and what is needed (personnel, instructional materials, technology, professional development, support services, etc.)

5. Based on the identified priorities, funding is equitably allocated to specific initiatives, programs, and resources that will directly contribute to the school improvement goals (i.e. teacher training, personnel, materials/resources, etc.)

6. Funding decisions are shared with stakeholders, as needed, to gather input and ideas for improvement. As well as to explain decisions made.

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

|               |               |  |  |                |     |                   |
|---------------|---------------|--|--|----------------|-----|-------------------|
| <b>1</b>      | <b>III.B.</b> | <b>Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System</b> |  |                |     | <b>\$900.00</b>   |
|               | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus   | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24           |
|               |               |  | 0751 - Brookshire Elementary                                   | General Fund   |     | \$400.00          |
|               |               |  | <i>Notes: Gift cards for teacher recognition raffle</i>        |                |     |                   |
|               |               |  | 0751 - Brookshire Elementary                                   | General Fund   |     | \$500.00          |
|               |               |  | <i>Notes: Posters/materials for PBIS implementation</i>        |                |     |                   |
| <b>2</b>      | <b>III.B.</b> | <b>Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities</b>              |  |                |     | <b>\$500.00</b>   |
|               | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus   | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24           |
|               |               |  | 0751 - Brookshire Elementary                                   | General Fund   |     | \$500.00          |
|               |               |  | <i>Notes: Possible resources for small groups and staff PD</i> |                |     |                   |
| <b>Total:</b> |               |  |  |                |     | <b>\$1,400.00</b> |

### Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes