Brookside Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Brookside Middle School

3636 S SHADE AVE, Sarasota, FL 34239

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/brookside

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), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) 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.

Mission Statement:
Brookside Middle School places the child at the center of its learning activities to enable all learners to lead productive, responsible and healthful lives. Brookside prepares students to achieve the highest learning standards by engaging high-quality staff, involved parents and a supportive community.

The following beliefs will be the principles by which we achieve our goals:
- Expectations for learning and behavior will reflect the highest possible standards.
- Successful schooling is a shared responsibility requiring commitment and communication between parents, students, and staff.
- In an atmosphere of shared respect, all students and staff have a right to learn and work in a healthy, caring and safe environment.
- A variety of research-based best practice techniques will be utilized to meet individual needs.

At Brookside, our students are held accountable for following the Cuda Code.
• Cudas are Committed
• Cudas are Understanding
• Cudas are Determined
• Cudas are Appropriate
• Cudas are Successful

Brookside Theme:
Aim Higher

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:

Brookside Middle aims to develop knowledgeable and caring young people to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect.

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
Chase, Ryan	Principal	Provides leadership to the administrative team and the school campus. Oversees the instructional programs and support services on Brookside's campus to establish and maintain a safe, caring, and enriching environment to promote student success. The principal also builds the leadership team and ensures the school complies with district and state requirements.
Rojas, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Professional Development Assistant Principal- Assists the Principal with administrative and instructional functions to meet the educational needs of students. Oversees the curriculum support and professional development.
Dewitt, Holly	Magnet Coordinator	IB (International Baccalaureate) Coordinator- Assists staff in implementing the IB programme across campus. Supports enrichment for students across campus.
Mims, Ginger	Other	ESE Liaison-Provides supports to ESE teachers and case managers in writing IEPs and implementing supports for students in both academics and behavior. Ensures compliance of all IEPs and ESE Services.
Harvilla, Lauren	School Counselor	School Counselor for students M-Z. The goal of the school counselor is to provide assistance to students, teachers and families enabling the student to reach his / her fullest potential. Counselors support students with challenges related to academics/learning, organization, peer interactions, mental health, and behaviors.
Duttweiler, Melissa	School Counselor	School Counselor for students A-L. The goal of the school counselor is to provide assistance to students, teachers and families enabling the student to reach his / her fullest potential. Counselors support students with challenges related to academics/learning, organization, peer interactions, mental health, and behaviors.
Serino, Paul	Behavior Specialist	Student support services and interventions for students across campus. Coordinates PBIS initiatives (with PBIS AP) and provides assistance with behavioral data and progress monitoring.
Sims, Nicole	Other	504 Coordinator: Facilitate 504s for students across campus. Works with students, teachers and families on the implementation of 504s. Support teachers in the MTSS process and the writing and implementation of services.
Varlas, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Assist to coordinate PBIS initiatives (with PBIS AP) and provide assistance with behavioral data and progress monitoring. Support school staff with the master schedule and testing.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Holliday, Meggyn	Assistant Principal	ESE/PBIS Assistant Principal- assists the Principal with administrative and instructional functions to meet the educational needs of students. Oversees ESE support, and positive behavior supports on campus.
Shinall, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	Teacher on Special Assignment: Master Scheduler, Testing Coordinator and ESOL and course recovery support.

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.

The stakeholders listed above support the school team throughout the school year. They are connected to the development of the SIP plan providing ideas, input, and feedback on how we as a school can improve our practices to support student achievement. Parents, students, and staff also provide input for school improvement through PTSO and SAC meetings. During these meetings, data, strategies, testing information, and school updates are shared with all stakeholders to discuss next steps. These next steps assist in ongoing updates during the school year as well as ideas to improve the SIP for the following school year.
The School Improvement Plan as well as school information are posted on the school and district website for stakeholders to review at any time during the school year.

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))

The purpose of the School Improvement Plan is to outline goals that are to be monitored throughout the school year to ensure student success for all students on campus. All stakeholders play a role in that success. Once SIP goals are outlined, a SIP-at-a-glance is created and shared with all stakeholders. This provides an overview of all goals in the plan to be able to be quickly reference during the school year. This SIP At-a-Glance is provided to families at PTSO and SAC as well as posted on our school webpage.
Throughout the year during staff meetings, PLC meetings, PTSO and SAC meetings, data, testing information and school updates are shared with all stakeholders to review progress, discuss next steps and determine action items among the group. These next steps assist in ongoing updates during the school year to ensure continuous school improvement and a focus on student achievement by all. The monitoring of the SIP is a collaborative effort.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	54%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	71%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	78	53	188
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	34	25	70
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	93	50	187
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	65	16	136
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	104	221	109	434

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	5
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	50	47	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	30	32	99
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	67	57	173
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	29	40	113
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	123	82	108	313

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	0	0	0	0	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	50	47	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	30	32	99
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	67	57	173
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	29	40	113
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	82	108	313

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	49	57	49	55	57	50	55		
ELA Learning Gains				51			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			42		
Math Achievement*	60	64	56	65	38	36	62		
Math Learning Gains				60			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			57		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	53	56	49	52	64	53	62		
Social Studies Achievement*	78	81	68	80	60	58	87		
Middle School Acceleration	72	73	73	76	51	49	79		
Graduation Rate					55	49			
College and Career Acceleration					83	70			
ELP Progress	70	57	40	63	76	76	52		

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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	607
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
SWD	35	Yes	2	
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	49			
HSP	57			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	58			

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
SWD	37	Yes	1	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	44			
HSP	57			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	53			

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	49			60			53	78	72			70
SWD	23			36			25	46	43		5	
ELL	34			51			26	66	43		6	70
AMI												
ASN	83			92							2	
BLK	33			39			42	50	80		5	
HSP	44			54			36	74	56		6	76
MUL	46			65			47	72	62		5	
PAC												
WHT	57			68			64	87	78		5	
FRL	43			52			45	71	66		6	70

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	55	51	45	65	60	60	52	80	76			63
SWD	27	39	36	38	51	50	15	49	31			
ELL	38	46	48	52	57	59	27	70	59			63
AMI												
ASN	73	82		91	88				100			
BLK	33	38	38	35	43	34	32	63	82			
HSP	48	49	52	56	54	58	42	78	60			73
MUL	60	47	9	72	71		64	79	90			
PAC												
WHT	64	55	50	76	65	76	61	86	81			
FRL	43	45	44	56	56	56	39	73	68			

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	55	50	42	62	53	57	62	87	79			52
SWD	23	28	27	37	48	59	34	63	33			
ELL	40	46	49	52	55	57	37	82				52

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	88	73		94	60							
BLK	31	39	37	32	36	45	25	83	60			
HSP	49	48	43	60	57	59	55	81	79			55
MUL	53	55	30	58	52		64	90				
PAC												
WHT	64	52	45	72	53	60	76	92	82			
FRL	45	44	39	52	48	50	54	84	72			70

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
07	2023 - Spring	55%	55%	0%	47%	8%
08	2023 - Spring	42%	55%	-13%	47%	-5%
06	2023 - Spring	38%	54%	-16%	47%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	42%	61%	-19%	54%	-12%
07	2023 - Spring	69%	67%	2%	48%	21%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	54%	-3%	55%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	49%	55%	-6%	44%	5%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	65%	12%	50%	27%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	59%	37%	48%	48%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	79%	-5%	66%	8%

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.

This past year our percentage of students scoring at or above grade level in ELA was our data component with the lowest performance. Based on our data, with 45% of our students scoring at or above grade level in ELA proficiency, this has been a weaker area compared to math, science and Civics the past few years. In past years this would have also impacted learning gains as well as the percentage of students in the lowest quartile demonstrating learning gains. With the new FAST assessment, learning gains were not included in this year's school grade calculation, but will be this coming year. We will continue to monitor learning gains as a school and compare student growth from this past year's FAST assessment to progress students are making this coming year. In addition, our Students with Disabilities population (SWDs) is the school's only ESSA subgroup to not meet the federal percent of points index. Brookside Middle School's SWD population is at school is at 37%.

There are a few possible contributing factors to the above information. Over the past two years our ELA team has been making the transition to new standards (BEST Standards) and a new textbook (StudySync). This was also the first year of the FAST assessment, a transition from the FSA to a new state assessment. Another factor was this past school year we began the year without an 8th grade ELA teacher. Another staff member on campus who is ELA certified (a pervious ELA teacher) began the year with the class until a permanent ELA teacher was hired. In 8th grade, we also were short an ELA/ESE teacher and had a long-term substitute teacher in the position. Another major factor was as the year got underway, our school as well as the rest of the district closed due to a hurricane. We then as a staff had to reconvene and work to get students back on track to make up for the lost instructional time. Still recovering from COVID to then lose weeks of time with students due to a natural disaster made the year challenging.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year for Brookside Middle School is the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level in math. The number of students scoring at or above grade level in math dropped significantly with a 12% drop to 53% scoring at or above grade level on the FAST Assessment.

This past year teachers began utilizing a new textbook which could be a contributing factor to this decline. Teachers also in the past two years have transitioned to the BEST Math standards. This was also the first year of the FAST assessment, a transition from the FSA to a new state assessment. While the majority of our math department has been at Brookside teaching together, there have been many outside factors over the past few years that could have impacted student scores. In reflecting on this past year, we are going to be focusing a good amount on the PLC process and ensuring that collaborative planning time is intentional with planning for essential standards to try to improve our math proficiency.

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.

The data component that had the greatest positive gap when compared to the state average is 7th grade math. In 7th grade math, Brookside Middle School had 69% of students with a Level 3 or higher. That is 21% higher than the state average of 48% of students with a Level 3 or above. The math team is very intentional with their planning and execution of lessons as well as their coverage of the standards.

Brookside Middle's reading scores this past year are lower than the state average by 2%. Brookside Middle had 45% of students scoring at or above grade level compared to the state average of 47%. The above information in question one details the contributing factors.

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

This year in reviewing the data, Brookside Middle has a lot of areas to continue to grow in. Our data components that showed the most improvement were 8th grade math and 7th grade ELA. In 8th grade math, there was an improvement in the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level from 36% in 2022 to 50% in the 2023 school year. For 7th grade ELA, there was an improvement in the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level in ELA from 53% in 2022 to 55% in the 2023 school year.

For 8th grade math, the team-teaching in Pre-Algebra is very focused on ensuring they are covering all of their standards and incorporating interventions throughout their curriculum to ensure learning for all students. There is constant remediation and extension happening in the classroom and that is evident in the scores. In ELA, this past year was had an Instructional Facilitator join our staff that worked closely with 7th grade ELA. She pushed in and supported a new ELA teacher in 7th grade and provided consistent support for the team all year.

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

In reviewing the Early Warning Systems, two potential areas of concern are the number of students with more than one early warning indicator as well as students with attendance below 90%. The attendance number stood out because post-COVID we saw this percentage improve and now we are seeing more students missing school again. Our role as a campus is to connect families with the supports they need to ensure students have barriers removed. We will continue to develop plans, provide resources, and connect with students and families to improve student attendance and improve student learning.

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

1) Focus on the PLC Process to improve proficiency and learning gains across campus. As a school community we are committed to the PLC process to meet our students where they are and ensure success for each and every student. The data indicates we need to be laser-focused on ensuring students are learning the essential standards.
PLCs on campus will meet weekly and focus on the four questions below. The goal is to support teacher and student growth.
1. What do we want students to know and be able to do? - Teachers will focus on the essential standards for their course within their PLCs and strategically plan lessons to ensure all students master the essential standards.
2. How will we know if students have learned it? - Teachers will work in PLC teams to develop common formative assessments to guide their instruction. The common formative assessments will be used to determine which students have mastered the standards and which students need further intervention. The common assessment data will help drive the PLC conversation on lesson planning, interventions, and strategies.
3. What will we do if they have not learned it? - Based on the common formative assessments, PLC teams will develop Tier II and Tier III strategies and interventions to implement in the classroom. Teachers will utilize first period, CCR, as well as class time with co-teachers and the instructional facilitator to implement interventions based on essential standards.
4. What will we do if they already know it? - PLC teams will develop extension activities to provide further challenge and deepen learning to students who have mastered the essential standards.

2) Tier I, Tier II, Tier III Instruction- As a campus there are variety of supports that can be implemented to ensure students success. Focusing on where students are at and remediating and extending learning will help all students grow, in particular our SWD population.

3) Continuing to build/maintain a positive campus culture- The past two years our school has been very focused on rebuilding a positive campus culture. With a focus on PBIS and positive relationships among staff and students, we want to continue this work.

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

#1. 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.

Brookside Middle is identified as an ATSI school with one subgroup, Students with Disabilities (SWD), that has not met the 41% expectation. Brookside's SWD students are currently at 37%. Additional supports will be offered to support SWD in proficiency and growth this school year.

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

By the end the 2023-2024 school year, Brookside Middle School will increase the ESSA subgroup data for Students with Disabilities (SWD) by 8%.

ESSA SWD: 37% to 45%

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

Student proficiency and growth will be monitored using the following tools:
- FAST data (PM 1, PM 2, and PM 3)
- i-Ready Diagnostics
- i-Ready Standards Mastery Assessments
- WriteScore
- StudySync Assessments
- ALEKS Math Data
- McGraw Hill Assessments
- Teacher created Common Formative Assessments
- Reading Walk through tracking Form
- PLC Collaborative Planning Time
- ESE Liaison and Case Manager Support for students and teachers

In addition, administration will conduct observations throughout the year and provide feedback and coaching to teachers. Brookside also added an instructional facilitator this school year to support with targeted interventions and monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Rojas (amanda.rojas@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

Brookside Middle School will be using evidence-based interventions aligned to: The PLC Model, John Hattie's- Visible Learning Framework, and MTSS/RTI process
- Common planning for teachers based on grade level and content area
- Response to Intervention: PLC framework to identify essential standards and develop Tier II and Tier III interventions for struggling students
- Instructional Facilitator to support teachers in assessing data, planning intervention and extensions
-Summer Striving Barracuda Camp for Level 1 Students
- Additional ESE Liaison & Behavior Specialist to push into classes and provide support
- Intensive Reading Trainings by district specialists
- Document Based Question (DBQ) Training for Social Studies Teachers
- Focus 5 Reading Strategies (specific to content area)

- WriteScore lessons & assessments
- iReady (diagnostics, assigned lessons, pathway lessons, and Standard Mastery)
- iReady Books, CommonLit 360
- StudySync Textbooks and built in interventions
- Co-Teach Instructional Model for ELA and Math

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our SWD, Students with Disabilities subgroup is currently an under-performing group of students. Brookside will implement the programs and strategies listed to provide intervention and data to drive instruction based on individual student needs. The strategies listed will monitor student growth on grade level standards and provide teachers with ongoing data. Ensuring that teachers are utilizing evidence-based instructional practices and interventions will set the stage for student success. As a support team, when students are not being successful based on progress monitoring, our ESE Liaisons, School Counselors, 504 Coordinator, Behavior Specialists and Administration can all assist.

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.

Brookside Middle School will be utilizing PD time this year to focus on the PLC process. To focus on our SWD population in particular, we have a new ESE Liaison (a former Reading Interventionist) joining the team at Brookside as well as a 504 Coordinator/Interventionist. Brookside's support team, including: the Instructional Facilitator: Nicole Sims, the ESE Liaisons: Ginger Mims and Lisa Oates, and the Behavior Specialists: Paul Serino and Melissa Varlas with work with PLC teams of teachers to analyze data, identify deficiencies, as well as, plan and implement interventions based on student needs. Data will be collected at the start of the year through i-Ready diagnostics and FAST testing, at the midterm through WriteScore, Benchmarks, i-Ready lessons, common formative assessments and FAST testing and then again at the end of the school year through FAST testing.

Person Responsible: Amanda Rojas (amanda.rojas@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Throughout the 23-24 school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

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.

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) at Brookside Middle School are a main focus this year. We want to improve our planning process to improve our overall process in how we are teaching students. In both reading and math this past school year, there was a decline in the percent of students scoring at of above grade level.
There is a need to focus on improving PLC time, to progress monitor, and to focus on the four PLC questions.
process, and support learning in all curriculum areas.

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

The following are Brookside's ELA and Math goals for the 2023-2024 school year:
ELA Proficiency- 59% (Current ELA Proficiency 45%)
Math Proficiency- 69% (Current Math Proficiency 53%)
While this past year was a learning year with the first year of the FAST assessment, we want to maintain the goals we set out to achieve last school year and try to reach them this year.

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

- Weekly PLC meetings with teachers focused on quality instruction
- Monthly Guiding Coalition PLC Meetings with PLC leads and administration
- iReady Diagnostics
- Common Formative Assessments
- iReady Standards Mastery Assessment
- PLC Notes
- Weekly Intensive Reading Walk-Throughs (FORMS)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Rojas (amanda.rojas@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

Brookside Middle School will be using evidence-based interventions aligned to: The PLC Model, John Hattie's- Visible Learning Framework, and the MTSS/RTI process.

- Weekly lesson planning based on state standards and utilizing district Instructional Focus Guides (IFGs)
- Common planning for PLC groups and additional planning time for common team planning
- Intensive Reading classes for all Level 1 students and some Level 2 students
- Review iReady Diagnostic Data (Among departments {with district support}, teams, PLCs and with students)
- iReady Standards Mastery Assessments throughout the school year
- IXL Standards-Based Online program (Math and ELA)
- Weekly SWST Meetings to support students through the MTSS process
- Tuesday Night and Thursday Night School for additional instruction and remediation
- Saturday School two weeks before the end of each quarter.
- Quarterly Data Chats with teachers and administration
- CommonLit360 in Intensive Reading

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PLC Framework:
1. What do we want students to know and be able to do?
2. How will we know if students have learned it?
3. What will we do if they have not learned it?
4. What will we do if they already know it?

By intentionally focusing on the questions above, PLC work can lead to meaningful results for students. Teachers reviewing data, lesson planning, and determining appropriate strategies for students will lead to a growth in student learning.

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.

Weekly PLC Meetings throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Ryan Chase (ryan.chase@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

Brookside Middle School was recognized with a Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) Bronze Award the past two school years for our dedicated efforts to students making positive choices on campus.
We want to continue to develop student skills, make changes to the school environment and use data to identify supports for students. There is a continued need to improve attendance, lower the number of out of school suspensions, and promote positive school culture. As an ATSI School for our SWD subgroup, we also need to ensure our focus is on all students and in particular our students with disabilities to support them in every aspect of their education.

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

Brookside Middle School will be awarded the Gold Level PBIS Model School award for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

- District Data Dashboards
- Monthly PBIS Meetings with school staff (Discussing trends, data, and patterns across campus)
- Monthly PBIS Assistant Principal Meetings (Data Review and Professional Development)
- Professional Development for School Staff
- Behavior Specialist Support in classes based on discipline data
- Quarterly Data Review
-Teacher Feedback and Input
- Bi-Weekly OSS Data Review
-Weekly SWST/CARE Meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Meggyn Holliday (meggyn.holliday@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

- Increase Tier I interventions: Cuda Code, common behavior expectations across campus
- Continue to implement PBIS systems and review classroom management routines and procedures
- Increase the supports for students with disabilities (in particular those students with Social Emotional goals)
- Continue PBIS reward systems to encourage positive choices on campus
- Mentoring Programs on campus
- IB Lessons across campus related to the Learner Profile Attributes (ex. risk taker, caring, balanced)
- Weekly SWST meetings for MTSS monitoring
- Behavior Specialist and Behavior Tech. support across campus
- Staff support to push into classes needing behavior support
- Restorative Circles with School Counselors
- Staff Book Study

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Building positive school culture is crucial for students to feel part of the school community. Brookside is continuing to work towards increasing the sense of community on campus for staff and student. By acknowledging appropriate student behavior versus negative behaviors students are being celebrated and supported for their choices each day. These celebrations turn into positive student behavioral outcomes. Increasing positive behavioral outcomes will increase the amount of time students are in the classroom and learning. Along with promoting positive campus culture is also the instruction in positive decision making. To start the school year, students will review a variety of lessons related to PBIS to set the stage for a successful year.

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.

PBIS rewards and interventions for all students. Data tracking to ensure the school is on track to earn the Gold PBIS award. Data tracking of discipline events and next steps.

Person Responsible: Meggyn Holliday (meggyn.holliday@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: May 2023

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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.

In reviewing testing data from the past few years, ELA is an area that continues to be a growth opportunity for our staff and students at Brookside Middle School. This past year our scores declined 10% down to 45% of students scoring at or above grade level. We also had 51% of students making a year's worth of growth in 21-22 on the FSA. With that, we as a school need to focus on supporting all students with their ELA skills.

Math has historically had very high numbers at Brookside, however this past year, we saw a significant decline in the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or above on the FAST assessment (65% down to 53%). In learning gains on the 2021-2022 FSA, we saw an increase from 53% to 60% and we want to continue that growth while also improving the percentage of students with a level 3 and higher.

While this past year was a learning year with the first year of the FAST assessment, we want to maintain the goals we set out to achieve last school year and try to reach them this year in proficiency and in learning gains.

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

Brookside Middle School students will increase in ELA components and Math components in the following areas:
ELA:
Achievement: 45% to 59%
Learning Gains (based on 21-22 data): 51% to 55%
Lowest Quartile Demonstrating Learning Gains (based on 21-22 data): 45% to 49%

Math:
Achievement: 53% to 69%
Learning Gains (based on 21-22 data): 60% to 64%
Lowest Quartile Demonstrating Learning Gains (based on 21-22 data): 60% to 64%

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

Student growth in math, ELA and reading will be monitored using the following tools:
- FAST data (PM 1, PM 2, and PM 3)
- i-Ready Diagnostics
- StudySync Resources and Assessments
- McGraw Hill Assessments
- ALEKS data
- IXL
- Teacher created common formative assessments
-Reading Walk-Throughs (FORMS)
-Write Score

In addition, administration will conduct observations throughout the year and provide feedback and coaching to teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Rojas (amanda.rojas@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

Brookside Middle School will be using evidence-based interventions aligned to: The PLC Model, John Hattie's- Visible Learning Framework, and the MTSS/RTI process.

- Weekly lesson planning based on state standards
- Common planning for teachers based on grade level and content area
- Response to Intervention: PLC at Work framework to identify essential standards and develop Tier II and Tier III interventions
- Review iReady Diagnostic Data (Among departments, teams, PLCs and with students)
- iReady Standards Mastery Assessments throughout the school year
- IXL Standards-Based Online program (Math and ELA)
- Weekly SWST Meetings to support students through the MTSS process
- Tuesday Night and Thursday Night School for additional instruction
- Saturday School two weeks before the end of each quarter.
- Quarterly Data Chats with teachers and administration
- StudySync Textbook Resources and Assessments
-ALEKS & McGraw Hill Textbook & Resources

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Brookside will work to continue to increase student reading and math proficiency and gains. The interventions and strategies listed above will help teachers improve their instructional practices to best support student learning.

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.

Brookside will be working to training teachers on the implementation of the PLC process. Teachers will work as PLC teams to address the four questions and in particular focus on essential standards. Support staff (Behavior Specialists, ESE Liaisons, Counselors and our TOSA) will assist with data, interventions, and strategies.

Person Responsible: Amanda Rojas (amanda.rojas@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 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).

To ensure resources are allocated based on needs and there is a clear process in place regarding school improvement funding allocations, there must be collaboration among all stakeholders to review the following:
-Goal Setting: Based on the needs, establish goals for the year. Prioritize needs according to their overall impact on student achievement and overall student success.
-Data Review: Analyze relevant data, including academic data, attendance, and discipline data to gain insight into the specific needs of students and areas that require additional supports.
-Budget Allocation: Develop a budget that aligns with the school goals and needs. Allocate funds to address the identified needs.
-Collaboration: Involve all stakeholders, including teachers, parents, students, and community members in the decision-making process. Seek input and feedback on the proposed budget allocation to ensure it reflects the needs of the school community.
-Plan: Create a detailed plan that outlines how funds will be utilized for each school need. Specify the programs, initiatives, and interventions that will be funded and the anticipated outcomes.
-Implementation and Monitoring: Implement the planned programs and interventions. Continuously monitor their effectiveness and make adjustments as needed.
-Evaluate: Regularly evaluate the impact of initiatives on student outcomes and school improvement goals to determine if changes/updates are needed.

Brookside Middle School receives funding for student and instructional support. The allocation of these resources as listed below:

- Per Pupil Allocation - This is the general state funding that is allocated for each student. This funding takes into account standard student allocation along with additional funding depending on student placement in various programs such as ESE and ELL to provide additional support as needed.

-Jump Start Funding (ESSER Funding- Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund):
Academic Intervention (Tuesday and Thursday Night School, Saturday School, Algebra Boot Camp)
Extra Duty Hours for Intervention Services
Instructional Materials (IXL and Write Score)
Instructional Planning (Planning time to focus on the PLC process, essential standards and common formative assessments)
Professional Development
Career and College Readiness (College Field Trips and Career Exploration)

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.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention				$87,840.88
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			0111 - Brookside Middle School	Other Federal		$87,840.88

	Notes: JumpStart ESSER Funding- Academic Intervention, Instructional Planning, Instructional Materials, Professional Development
Total:	**$87,840.88**

Budget Approval

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

No