

Pinellas County Schools

# Brooker Creek Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                           |           |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Brooker Creek Elementary School

3130 FORELOCK RD, Tarpon Springs, FL 34688

<http://www.brooker-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

## Demographics

**Principal: Joshua Hodges W**

Start Date for this Principal: 1/4/2022

|                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>2019-20 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>2021-22 Title I School</b>                                                                                                                                | No                                                                                                                         |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)                                                                            | 14%                                                                                                                        |
| <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) | Asian Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Students With Disabilities<br>White Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>                                                                                                                                 | 2021-22: A (68%)<br>2020-21: (81%)<br>2018-19: A (77%)<br>2017-18: A (64%)                                                 |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                            |
| <b>SI Region</b>                                                                                                                                             | Central                                                                                                                    |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>                                                                                                                           | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>                                                                                           |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>                                                                                                                               | N/A                                                                                                                        |
| <b>Year</b>                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                            |
| <b>Support Tier</b>                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                            |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>                                                                                                                                           | N/A                                                                                                                        |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .                                         |                                                                                                                            |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

Brooker Creek Elementary, a community that encourages growth by valuing each other's differences, respecting everyone and creating life-long learners.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.:

100% Student Success

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name              | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities         |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Hodges, Josh      | Principal           | Oversees school instructional delivery. |
| Crabb, Melissa    | Assistant Principal | Oversees school instructional delivery. |
| Hickman, Susan    | Teacher, K-12       | Delivers instruction.                   |
| Gabbert, Danielle | Instructional Media | Delivers instruction                    |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 1/4/2022, Joshua Hodges W

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

11

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

37

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

549

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

4

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

4

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator                                                | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                                          | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 61          | 83 | 91 | 87 | 87 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 507   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 11 | 10 | 9  | 8  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 51    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 3  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/18/2022

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

| Indicator                                                | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                                          | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 83 | 88 | 90 | 94 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 457   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0  | 3  | 3  | 2  | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 1  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 2 | 7 | 1 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 35    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator                                                | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                                          | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 83 | 88 | 90 | 94 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 457   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0  | 3  | 3  | 2  | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 1  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 2 | 7 | 1 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 35    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 77%    |          |       | 80%    |          |       | 85%    | 54%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 68%    |          |       | 88%    |          |       | 78%    | 59%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 55%    |          |       | 79%    |          |       | 76%    | 54%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 86%    |          |       | 82%    |          |       | 83%    | 61%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 65%    |          |       | 79%    |          |       | 72%    | 61%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 51%    |          |       | 67%    |          |       | 63%    | 48%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 75%    |          |       | 92%    |          |       | 84%    | 53%      | 53%   |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**



| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 89%    | 56%      | 33%                        | 58%   | 31%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 75%    | 56%      | 19%                        | 58%   | 17%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -89%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 88%    | 54%      | 34%                        | 56%   | 32%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -75%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 84%    | 62%      | 22%                        | 62%   | 22%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 80%    | 64%      | 16%                        | 64%   | 16%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -84%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 83%    | 60%      | 23%                        | 60%   | 23%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -80%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 84%    | 54%      | 30%                        | 53%   | 31%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|-------------------------------------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 46       |        |             | 31        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 79       |        |             | 64        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 80       | 87     | 81          | 85        | 83      | 86           | 94       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 61       | 82     |             | 67        | 73      |              | 75       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 39       | 68     | 71          | 55        | 58      | 60           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 93       | 92     |             | 86        | 83      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 77       |        |             | 77        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 84       | 76     | 72          | 83        | 70      | 60           | 84       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 62       | 59     |             | 65        | 68      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

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

| ESSA Federal Index                                                              |      |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)                                                    | N/A  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students                                            | 68   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |      |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 477  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index                                          | 7    |
| Percent Tested                                                                  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data                                                                   |      |
| Students With Disabilities                                                      |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 41   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners                                                       |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       |      |

| English Language Learners                                                      |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| Asian Students                                                                 |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students                                                 |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |
| Black/African American Students                                                |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                |     |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| Hispanic Students                                                              |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students                                              | 70  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| Multiracial Students                                                           |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students                                           |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| Native American Students                                                       |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        | 0   |
| Pacific Islander Students                                                      |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students                                      |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| White Students                                                                 |     |
| Federal Index - White Students                                                 | 69  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students                                                |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 55 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

School-wide proficiency decreased for ELA and Science. There was an increase of 4% in Math. ELA and Math overall learning gains and L25 learning gains decreased.

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

Based upon progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, student overall learning gains and L25 learning gains demonstrates the greatest need for improvement.

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

Factors that contributed to the need for improvement include the learning deficiencies for various subgroups. These students enter school/grade levels lacking foundational elements required for future learning to take place. Additionally, traditionally average to high performing students did not make a year's worth of growth. To address this need, attention must be focused on choosing high leverage instructional strategies, content focused vertical PLC, implementation of an AVID plan, and the tracking of student learning. Targeted small group instruction will need to increase in frequency.

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

Math proficiency increased from 2021 to 2022 on the state assessments.

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

The percentage of students scoring at the proficient level on math was largely due to third grade. 95% of the third grade students were proficient. This was due to the math teachers planning relevant and rigorous math lessons. Students supported in ESE settings were authentically challenged and learning took place.

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

Vertical PLC's will select instructional strategies with the highest effect size and implement that strategy in the lesson. Rigorous performance tasks will be chosen/selected. These tasks will match the standard being taught and teachers will monitor student learning.

ELP instruction will be delivered with a focus on enrichment and proper intervention.

Student learning will be assessed and tracked. Strategies to close gaps will be discussed in PLC and delivered during intervention blocks and small group instruction.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

- Vertical PLC's will be trained on the expected processes. They will be trained on the designed PLC protocol. This will ensure that the needed lesson elements are planned for.
- Vertical PLC will practice delivering the chosen instructional strategy on themselves with feedback provided.
- Books that guide strategy selection will be provided to each vertical PLC.
- Learning walks will be scheduled, allowing teachers to see practices in place.

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

School administration will:

- Create PLC protocols to guide the process
- Schedule and implement plans for PD opportunities
- Conduct walk-throughs and track strategy usage

### **Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation****Area of Focus Description and**

**Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** Standards-based data collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students not making annual learning gains in ELA and Math. Data showed students performing below grade level in Science. The overall school proficiency is high in all areas as measured by the district MAP assessments and FSA scores. At a micro level, a higher percentage of students making learning gains is needed to ensure future success. Growing teachers' knowledge of highly effective teaching strategies will increase student learning.

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

Proficiency in Science will increase 10% (from 75% to 85%), as measured by NGSSS Science assessment.  
 Students making annual learning gains in English Language Arts will increase 10% (from 55% to 65%), as measured by the district assessment.  
 Students making annual learning gains Mathematics will increase 10% (from 51% to 61%), as measured by the district assessment.  
 Black student proficiency in ELA and Math will remain above 85% as measured by the district assessment.

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

Student learning gains will be measured through the various district assessments given throughout the academic calendar. Data review sessions will be conducted at the conclusion of the assessment cycles and content teams will measure the percentage of students showing appropriate growth.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Josh Hodges (hodgesjo@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being**

Lesson delivery will be differentiated to account for the various academic levels of students. These differentiated lessons will be based upon high impact strategies (using Hattie's research) and delivered in both whole group and small group settings.

**implemented for this Area of Focus.**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Most of the students attending Brooker Creek ES enter their respective grade levels at or close to a proficient academic level. However, about 32% of the students are not making learning gains in ELA and 35% are not making learning gains in Math. As such, the classrooms are made up with students at many varying levels of academic proficiency. Teaching a one size fits all, whole group lesson creates a situation where very few students are actively being taught a lesson that is academically engaging. Students will learn at the level they are being instructed which means some students will regress and others may progress if appropriate scaffolding is present. Lessons delivered using appropriate differentiation in small group settings will help to ensure that students are receiving instruction that is appropriately challenging, rigorous, and engaging.

### **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.

Vertical PLC's will meet bi-weekly and complete a planning protocol. This protocol will guide PLC team members through elements essential for planning a differentiated lesson. This step will allow teachers to intentionally plan differentiated lessons using research to support their decisions.

**Person Responsible** Melissa Crabb (crabbme@pcsb.org)

Professional development opportunities allowing teachers to practice high impact strategies will be presented. These opportunities may include learning walks, whole faculty PD, and/or fish bowl opportunities within vertical PLC sessions.

**Person Responsible** Josh Hodges (hodgesjo@pcsb.org)

Teachers monitor academic growth of all learners and action plan for scaffolded support or enrichment as needed.

**Person Responsible** Josh Hodges (hodgesjo@pcsb.org)

Utilize critical and creative thinking strategies (both imbedded and explicit).

**Person Responsible** Melissa Crabb (crabbme@pcsb.org)

As many of these opportunities will be taking place on campus within a teacher's work hours, administrators recommend that Deliberate Practice Plans incorporate opportunities for growth in the area of differentiation.

**Person Responsible** Josh Hodges (hodgesjo@pcsb.org)

## Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

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

Building and maintaining a positive school culture is a main priority. BCE strives to build a positive culture and environment through the partnership between all stakeholders, including the school based stakeholders, community based stakeholders, and families. As BCE had seven total referrals with zero out of school suspensions during the 2021-2022 school year, the goal for 2022-2023 will be to keep total referrals under 10.

#### Action Steps:

- Events are held throughout the year to celebrate student success and character development.
- Follow our PBIS plan which outlines the student expectations and creates a common language for all stakeholders.
- Hold community engagement events throughout the school year including but not limited to Meet the Teacher, Open House, and Volunteer Orientation.
- Utilize communication resources (Social Media platforms, website, newsletters, school messenger, etc.) to ensure that our stakeholders are made aware of school operations as they relate to supporting academic achievement, school safety, family and community partnerships and other imminent school information.
- Students will have several avenues to share their voice through the National Elementary Honors Society activities, Principal's Multi Cultural Advisory Committee, Safety Patrols, and Student Council Activities.

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

All stakeholders play a critical role in building a positive culture and environment at the school, around student achievement.

Administrators monitor the moral of the staff and provide support when needed. Build and maintain a community to promote high student achievement.

School Counselor provides services to students through small group and individual instruction as well as classroom guidance lessons. The school counselor also works with families and provides resources and access to services as needed.

School staff work together to ensure that all students feel safe while on campus and eager to come to school to learn. Also set high expectations, while monitoring the whole student. (i.e. equity, SEL, etc.) Students come to campus every day with a growth mindset and positive outlook. They engage in discussion to better the school environment. They also participate in other clubs that promote leadership and student/school growth for the whole student body.

Parents/Families volunteer at school and from home to support the classroom and student achievement. They participate in school activities and programs. They also provide resources to teachers to enhance the classroom.

Community/Business Owners are able to volunteer their time to be mentors to students. They can also



provide services and resources that may not be available at the school level to support the needs of the students and staff.

PTA and SAC work not only to support teachers through programs and grants but also to increase family engagement in and out of the school day.