Pinellas County Schools

# Brooker Creek Elementary School


## 2019-20 School Improvement Plan

# Table of Contents

# Brooker Creek Elementary School

3130 FORELOCK RD, Tarpon Springs, FL 34688

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

## Demographics

### Principal: Jennifer Mekler H

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

| | |
|---|---|
| **2018-19 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | No |
| **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 13% |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Asian Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Students With Disabilities<br>White Students |
| **School Grade** | 2018-19: A |
| **School Grades History** | 2017-18: A<br>2016-17: A<br>2015-16: A<br>2014-15: A<br>2013-14: A |
| **2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Tracy Webley |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N |
| **Year** | A |
| **ESSA Status** | N/A |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

## 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**
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team**:**

| Name | Title |
|---|---|
| Cannata, Abigail | Assistant Principal |
| Assistant Principal | |
| Mekler, Jennifer | Principal |
| Principal | |
| Brierley, Ashlie | Teacher, ESE |
| Teacher, ESE | |
| Copri, Kellye | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Gabbert, Danielle | Instructional Media |
| Instructional Media | |
| Skryd, Janine | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Vinyard, Laura | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Schuler, Alexa | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Makris, Constance | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Ross, Steven | Other |
| Other | |
| Taylor, Helen | Teacher, PreK |
| Teacher, PreK | |

## Early Warning Systems

## Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 77 | 86 | 83 | 100 | 85 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 533 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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

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

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | |

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

28

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

Wednesday 7/17/2019

## Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---|---|---|
| Attendance below 90 percent | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---|---|---|
| Students with two or more indicators | | |

## Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 13 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |

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

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**School Data**
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 | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 85% | 54% | 57% | 78% | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 78% | 59% | 58% | 53% | 47% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 76% | 54% | 53% | 44% | 40% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 83% | 61% | 63% | 81% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 72% | 61% | 62% | 60% | 56% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 63% | 48% | 51% | 49% | 42% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | 84% | 53% | 53% | 84% | 57% | 55% |

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 77 (0) | 86 (0) | 83 (0) | 100 (0) | 85 (0) | 102 (0) | 533 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 () | 6 () | 8 () | 3 () | 5 () | 3 () | 25 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 5 (0) | 13 (0) | 18 (0) |

**Grade Level Data**

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

NOTE: 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** |
| 03 | 2019 | 89% | 56% | 33% | 58% | 31% |
| | 2018 | 76% | 53% | 23% | 57% | 19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 75% | 56% | 19% | 58% | 17% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 51% | 27% | 56% | 22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 88% | 54% | 34% | 56% | 32% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 50% | 28% | 55% | 23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 03 | 2019 | 84% | 62% | 22% | 62% | 22% |
| | 2018 | 79% | 62% | 17% | 62% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 80% | 64% | 16% | 64% | 16% |
| | 2018 | 83% | 62% | 21% | 62% | 21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 83% | 60% | 23% | 60% | 23% |
| | 2018 | 77% | 61% | 16% | 61% | 16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2019 | 84% | 54% | 30% | 53% | 31% |
| | 2018 | 84% | 57% | 27% | 55% | 29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data

| 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| 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 | | | | | | |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 38 | 40 | 29 | 31 | 47 | 42 | 60 | | | | |
| ASN | 81 | 45 | | 94 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 80 | | | 70 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | 54 | 47 | 81 | 61 | 51 | 84 | | | | |
| FRL | 74 | 55 | | 77 | 38 | | 69 | | | | |

## ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 77 |
| 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 | 541 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

### Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 59 |
| 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 Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Asian Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 89 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Black/African American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | |
| 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 | 77 |
| 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 | 76 |
| 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 | 64 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## Analysis

**Data Reflection**
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our lowest performance was our Students with Disabilities subgroup with 59% of that subgroup meeting proficiency. Some of the contributing factors to this performance are lack of exposure to continuous exposure to grade level standards, lack of exposure to the rigor of standards, and lack of stamina for reading and writing.

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

Our greatest decline was in the area of 4th ELA with a drop of 3% from the previous year and 1% in the cohort. Some of the contributing factors to this decline are lack of stamina in reading and writing and lack of time to independently practice what has been taught. Also, this grade level of students is our highest concentration of Students with Disabilities as described above.

**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**

While we don't have a negative gap in any area compared to the state average, 4th grade Math had the lowest positive gap in comparison to the state average. Some of the contributing factors to this performance are the number of Students with Disabilities in this grade level that have large gaps in foundational mathematic skills and student is not consistently meeting the demands of the standard for all students. Also, our 4th and 5th grade students identified as Gifted learners shows a negative 2% gap in comparison to the state for the number of students scoring a level 4 or 5.

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

Our Students with Disabilities subgroup showed the most improvement by growing from 41% to 59%. Our school took actions such as: protecting our instructional time with VE teachers, creating vertical alignment teams, and implemented a new curriculum program for our ESE intervention blocks to support students foundational skills.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

One potential area of concern for our school, is the number of Level 1 students (18) in our 4th and 5th grades, as measured by ELA and Math FSA. Another area of concern for the 2019-2020 school year, is the number of students(25) that exhibit attendance below 90%.

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

1. Students with Disabilities
2. Math L25
2. Gifted Level 4 and 5 performance
4. 4th grade ELA and Math proficiency
5. 2019-2020 5th grade cohort data

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | ELA/Reading Goal |
| **Rationale** | The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 85% to 90%, as measured by FSA. The problem/gap is occurring because students are not demonstrating mastery of standards at the appropriate level of complexity. If standards based instruction at the aligned level of complexity would occur, the problem would be reduced by 5%. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 85% to 90%, as measured by FSA. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Jennifer Mekler (meklerj@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback. The most important component of the literacy block is ensuring ample time is given to students to read and write appropriate, grade-level text and apply foundational skills, with high-quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | Students will be able to increase their proficiency when they are given the opportunity to increase their stamina for reading and writing and are provided meaningful, timely and actionable feedback with respect to their current performance and demands of the standard. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Teachers intentionally plan instruction aligned with high level of rigor by using Webb's Depth of Knowledge/Marzano's Taxonomy and adjust instruction through the use of talk, text, and student needs.<br>2. Ensure students have ample time every day to practice independently what is taught in reading and writing, allowing for strategic practice as well as build stamina for longer projects across the grade level and school year.<br>3. Teachers analyze task using rubrics to determine where students are in relation to the standard and plan for next steps.<br>4. Teachers will monitor and provide timely and specific feedback to students to support learning.<br>5. Administrators will conduct observations during the ELA instruction block and will provide timely and specific feedback to teachers |
| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Mekler (meklerj@pcsb.org) |

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Mathematics |
| **Rationale** | Our current level of performance is 83%, as evidenced by FSA Math. We expect our performance level to be 90% by May 2020. The problem/gap is occurring because students are not demonstrating mastery of standards at the appropriate level of complexity. If standards based instruction at the aligned level of complexity would occur, the problem would be reduced by 7%. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | The percent of all students achieving math proficiency will increase from 83% to 90% as measured by FSA. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Jennifer Mekler (meklerj@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Ensure that rigorous student-centered instruction occurs daily through the exceptional use of Ready Classroom Mathematics, Dreambox Learning, and Number Routines. Support this work through curriculum meetings, PLCs, and/or feedback. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | All teachers will need support in acclimating to the district's new Ready Math curriculum and Dreambox Learning program. With support of instruction, teachers will be able to differentiate and scaffold student learning to support student performance at the grade level standards. This work will help us reach our goal of 90% proficiency on FSA Math. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Teachers implement daily Number Routines (number talks, high-yield number routines, maintenance routines, etc.) at the start of the mathematics block to increase number sense and flexibility.<br>2. Ensure feedback, professional development and PLCs align with key shifts in math and promote strong alignment between standard, target and task utilizing student work samples and rubrics.<br>3. Empower mathematics teacher leaders to create and sustain a culture of feedback and openness including on-going teacher to teacher feedback,professional development and learning, walks, etc.<br>4. Teachers will monitor student learning and provide timely and actionable feedback to support student growth.<br>5. Administrators will monitor teacher practice and provide timely feedback to support teacher growth. Administrators will regularly observe mathematics lessons and provide feedback, with mathematics coach support as requested. |
| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Mekler (meklerj@pcsb.org) |

| #3 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Science |
| **Rationale** | Our current level of performance is 84% by our state Science assessment. We expect our performance level to be 90% by May 2020. The problem/gap is occurring because all of our students are not demonstrating mastery of standards at the appropriate level of complexity. If standards based instruction at the aligned level of complexity would occur, the problem would be reduced by 6%. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | Our students have maintained, over the last 3 years, a proficiency score of 84% on the state NGSSS assessment. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Jennifer Mekler (meklerj@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Support and utilize formal and informal assessment strategies that inform instruction. Identify proficiency levels and implement instructional strategies to increase conceptual development of key content. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | With our science data staying the same for the past 3 years, we are in need of new interventions and strategies to implement into our science instruction to raise our proficiency scores. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Disaggregate the grade 5 science diagnostic assessment to find areas that are in need of remediation and areas that are in need of enrichment.<br>2. Increase the use of writing in the science block, focusing on the use of grade level content vocabulary and journal writing across grade levels.<br>3. Strengthen staff practice to utilize questions to help students elaborate on content.<br>4. Teachers will monitor and provide students with timely and actionable feedback inclusive of the Confirming the Learning portion of the Instructional model.<br>5. Facilitate science professional development through curriculum and PLCs to include utilizing questions to help students elaborate on content. |
| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Mekler (meklerj@pcsb.org) |

| #4 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Bridging the Gap/Black Student Achievement |
| **Rationale** | Our current level of performance is one out of two students (50%) meeting proficiency standards, as evidenced on FSA ELA, and 100% of students are meeting proficiency in Math, as evidenced on FSA Math. We expect our performance level in ELA and Math to be 100% by May 2020. The problem/ gap is occurring because one black student did not demonstrate mastery of standards at the appropriate level of complexity. If standards based instruction at the aligned level of complexity would occur, the problem would be reduced by 100%. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | The percent of black students meeting proficiency standards will increase in ELA from 50% to 100% as measured by FSA. The percent of black students meeting proficiency standards in Math will remain 100% as measure by FSA. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Jennifer Mekler (meklerj@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | Our black students have an achievement gap in the area of ELA proficiency as compared to the school-wide proficiency ELA data. Through the use of culturally relevant teaching practicing we expect to close this gap in performance. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Teachers differentiate instruction and teach based on best practices for culturally relevant instruction.<br>2. Teachers will handle discipline with the principles of restorative practices, equity and cultural diversity in mind.<br>3. Teachers and administrators will ensure black students are participating in extended learning program opportunities as appropriate. |
| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Mekler (meklerj@pcsb.org) |

| #5 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | School Climate/Conditions for Learning |
| **Rationale** | Our current level of performance is 33% of students receiving referrals, receive multiple referrals. The problem/gap in behavior performance is occurring because the students represented in this data lack appropriate social and academic skills to perform successfully in the classroom. If restorative practice structures are implemented school wide, the problem would be reduced by creating classroom cultures that are responsive and and inclusive of all learner's academic and social needs, as evidenced by a decrease in the same students receiving multiple referrals. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | We expect our number of student receiving multiple referrals to decrease from 33% to 20% as measured by discipline data. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Jennifer Mekler (meklerj@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Strengthen the ability of all staff to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students and create strong classroom communities. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | Students will be more engaged and connected to their classroom environment by having strong relationships with teachers which will decrease the opportunity for off-task and disruptive behavior. With a focus on restorative practices, students will receive fresh starts, equitable discipline and opportunities to communicate their needs to a classroom teacher or trusted adult on campus. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Strengthen the implementation of restorative practices in all classrooms and in less structured areas of the school (cafe, hallways and recess).<br>2.Support the implementation of engagement strategies that support the development of social and instructional teaching practices.<br>3. Professional development with a focus on deescalation of student behavior and appropriate positive inventions (Tier 1 and Tier PBIS)<br>4. Monitor and support all staff for implementation with fidelity and provide specific feedback.<br>5. Address students with repeated behavior concerns in MTSS weekly meetings to provide constructive and effective strategies to implement within the classroom. |
| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Mekler (meklerj@pcsb.org) |

| #6 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Attendance |
| **Rationale** | Our current attendance rate is 96.2% for all students with 7% of students absent 10% or more. We expect our performance level of students missing 10% or more to decrease by 50%. The problem/gap in attendance is occurring because of a lack of parent understanding and/or placing a higher priority of consistent attendance for their child. If parent understanding of the importance of each school day would occur, the problem would be reduced by 50%. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | The percent of all students missing more than 10% of school will decrease from 7% to 3.5%, as measured by attendance dashboard data. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Jennifer Mekler (meklerj@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all tiers on an on-going basis. We will also work to strengthen the implementation of tier two and three interventions to address and support the needs of the students and parents. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | If we establish an understanding for parents of how school absence is tied to academic success, we will be able to decrease our students missing 10 percent or more of the school year. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Review/inform staff of school-wide processes for following up with families when consistent student absences are occurring.<br>2. Engage students and families in attendance-related activities to ensure they are knowledgeable of the data (newsletter, morning show and Parent University)<br>3. Implement tier 2 and tier 3 plans for student specific needs and review barriers and effectiveness on a bi-monthly basis.<br>4. Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis and reflects the appropriate entry codes. |
| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |

| #7 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Family and Community Engagement |
| **Rationale** | We have many families that have been associated with our school for years, that are accustom to our our processes, traditions, etc. As we continue to grow with new, incoming families, we are aware of the need to support new families in order to acquaint them with ways we promote student growth in all areas as well as, in ways we come together as a community. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | We will increase the percentage of families and students being connected and informed to support student achievement by participation in family and community events. This is a new focus so we do not have comparable data. Our goals is to have at least 50% of new families participate in our Bobcat Ambassador program. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Jennifer Mekler (meklerj@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Effectively communicate with families about their student's progress and school processes/practices. Provide academic tools to families in support of their student's achievement at home. Purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to advocate for their students. Intentionally build positive relationships with families and community partners. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | It is imperative for us to build strong relationships with our families in an effort to have open communication with them. As we have communication with families, we are able to express strategies to families in how to help support their student's academic and social/ emotional achievement. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. New family mentor program- Bobcat Ambassadors<br>2. Parent University- quarterly<br>3. Newsletters- monthly<br>4. School Messenger calls/emails to families<br>5. Content-focused events- 0ngoing |
| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Mekler (meklerj@pcsb.org) |

| #8 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Healthy Schools |
| **Rationale** | Our current level of performance is 3/6 as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation, Healthy Schools Program Framework. We expect our performance level to be 6 out of 6 modules eligible for the silver award by May of 2020. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | To increase the health and wellness of students and staff and to ensure that our school will be eligible in 6 out of 6 modules for silver recognition by May 2020 as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program Framework. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Abigail Cannata (cannataab@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | To utilize the Healthy School/Wellness Team to create strategies that are easy and engaging for staff and students on a monthly basis. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | By focusing on engaging and easy strategies to support healthy lifestyles, students and staff will show increased attendance and performance throughout the school year. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. Reestablish Healthy School/Wellness team for the 2019-2020 school year with appropriate members.<br>2. Attend district-supported professional development.<br>3. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment<br>4. Develop and Implement School Program Action Plan and monthly activities<br>5. Review participation two times per quarter.<br>6. Update Healthy Schools Program Assessment and apply for award<br>7. Farm to Table with garden club with cafeteria |
| **Person Responsible** | Abigail Cannata (cannataab@pcsb.org) |

| #9 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Gifted |
| **Rationale** | We expect 90% of our 4th and 5th grade students identified as Gifted learners to score a level 4 or 5 on FSA Math assessment as measured by May 2020. The problem/gap is occurring because student tasks are not aligned to the level of rigor needed to demonstrate high level of performance. If rigorous instruction aligned with rigorous tasks would occur. the problem would be reduced by 8%. |
| **State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** | The percent of gifted students scoring a level 4 or 5 will increase from 82 to 90%, as measured by FSA Math. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Jennifer Mekler (meklerj@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Teachers intentionally plan for differentiation for gifted learners and administrators monitor and provide feedback. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | With intentional planning for differentiated instruction, students will be able to receive the instruction they need to improve/maintain their academic level. |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | 1. 4th and 5th grade cluster teachers attend E3 Cluster planning and micro-credentialing as needed.<br>2. Provide teacher professional development on differentiation for gifted learners.<br>3. Help gifted learners understand "supported risk" and utilize to help gifted learners more effectively engage in complex tasks. |
| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |

## **Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities** (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)**

optional

# Part V: Budget

| 1 | III.A | Areas of Focus: ELA/Reading Goal | | | | $2,750.00 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5100 | 140-Substitute Teachers | 0441 - Brooker Creek Elementary Schl | School Improvement Funds | | $1,960.00 |
| | | | *Notes: TDE for teacher professional development to encompass all content areas* | | | |
| | 5100 | 590-Other Materials and Supplies | 0441 - Brooker Creek Elementary Schl | School Improvement Funds | | $790.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Professional resources to encompass all content areas for teacher growth.* | | | |
| **2** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: Mathematics** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **3** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: Science** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **4** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap/Black Student Achievement** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **5** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: School Climate/Conditions for Learning** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **6** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: Attendance** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **7** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **8** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **9** | **III.A** | **Areas of Focus: Gifted** | | | | **$0.00** |
| | | | | | **Total:** | **$2,750.00** |