

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Graham Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Graham Elementary School

2915 N MASSACHUSETTS AVE, Tampa, FL 33602

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Eric Felder

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Hillsborough 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Graham Elementary School

2915 N MASSACHUSETTS AVE, Tampa, FL 33602

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	97%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	D	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Teach, Learn and Commit to Lifelong Success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educating the Head, Heart, and Hands

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Spires, Carisa	Principal	Organizational leader that oversees the achievement of students, operation of the school, fiscal budget, human capital, and community outreach for the success of students performing at the highest levels of achievement. Collaborates with teachers to foster a learning environment that meets the needs of all students.
Kagel-Hothem, Stacie	Assistant Principal	Monitors curriculum and instruction. Supports the principal's initiatives. Monitors student progress and collaborates with teachers.
	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/15/2020, Eric Felder

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

19

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	49	49	66	57	46	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320	
Attendance below 90 percent	17	12	6	9	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	5	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	19	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	

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	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/23/2020

Prior Year - As Reported
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	46	48	71	53	53	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	326
Attendance below 90 percent	8	11	7	10	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	7	25	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	3	14	20	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	
Number of students enrolled	46	48	71	53	53	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	326
Attendance below 90 percent	8	11	7	10	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	7	25	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	3	14	20	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

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	29%	52%	57%	26%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	55%	58%	50%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	50%	53%	52%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	37%	54%	63%	30%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	57%	62%	53%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	46%	51%	64%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	26%	50%	53%	35%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	16%	52%	-36%	58%	-42%
	2018	30%	53%	-23%	57%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	55%	-22%	58%	-25%
	2018	31%	55%	-24%	56%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	30%	54%	-24%	56%	-26%
	2018	20%	51%	-31%	55%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	39%	54%	-15%	62%	-23%
	2018	27%	55%	-28%	62%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	30%	57%	-27%	64%	-34%
	2018	31%	57%	-26%	62%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	34%	54%	-20%	60%	-26%
	2018	18%	54%	-36%	61%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	23%	51%	-28%	53%	-30%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	33%	52%	-19%	55%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	3	41	64	13	56	69	9				
ELL	45			55							
BLK	26	50	68	34	46	50	19				
HSP	30	54		40	54						
FRL	27	51	67	37	48	61	26				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	9	35		3	35	30	10				
BLK	26	42	45	23	45	59	29				
HSP	36			50	60						
FRL	28	40	48	28	45	55	33				
2017 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	8	39	43	10	48	54	15				
ELL	15			31							
BLK	23	42	38	30	56	61	36				
HSP	33	69		29	50		40				
FRL	24	48	50	29	52	62	32				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	32

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	352
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
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	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
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.

The data component showing the lowest performance is science. One of the contributing factors of science low performance is the fidelity of science instruction and mastery of outcomes by the learners. Consistency of planning and delivering science instruction was not evident in all grade levels.

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

Third grade ELA proficiency had the greatest decline from the prior year. Core instruction did not meet success criteria for a clear depth of understanding the standards from satisfactory to mastery in performance levels. Common planning with core teacher and ESE teachers collaborating was not evident. Open vacancies in third and fifth for the year limited some students from gaining proficiency in reading.

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.

ELA Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The gap was -28% (State at 57% and Graham at 29%). Writing performance on average is 5 out of 10 total points.

Teachers had a limited understanding of Writer's Workshop. Student conferencing was not a consistent success criteria when planning for writing. Fidelity checks of anchor sets and interim writing assessments were minimally monitored.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the low 25% of ELA making learning gains from 48 % to 64%...up 16 percentage points.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance for kindergarten showed 17 students below 90 percent. 26 fifth grade students scored a level one in math.

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

1. ESE Proficiency in Reading and Math
2. ELA Proficiency: Writing Focus
3. Science Proficiency
4. Attendance
5. Culture

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Implementation of science standards with intentional instruction from Pre-K to fifth grade. Science Achievement points for the last three years have been on the decline 2017 35 Achievement Points, 2018 34 Achievements Points, and 2019 26 Achievement Points. Intentional planning of science with collaboration from ESE, ELA and the science teachers. Our target will be comprehension skills that are aligned to grade level standards that will occur through small group delivery with an emphasis on Students with disabilities to improve subgroup performance from the ESSA Federal Index reporting category.

Measurable Outcome: The mid-year grade five science district exam average score will increase by ten percent from 33.18% to 43.18%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carisa Spires (carisa.spires@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: To incorporate comprehension strategies into the five E model...Engage, Explore, Explain, Extend-Elaborate, and Evaluate.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The five E model is an instructional delivery model for science in our K-12 Instructional Frameworks to support science.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Science in master schedule using frameworks as a guide.
2. Post weekly science standards.
3. Grade levels plan weekly science lessons with ESE teachers to support the SWD ESSA group.
4. Science Notebooks are used in every classrooms
5. Long term investigations are in every classroom.

Person Responsible Carisa Spires (carisa.spires@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Science will be an active part of the program at B.C. Graham so that students have a thorough understanding of the standards in the areas of science, math, and ELA. Science is across all disciplines of content. Long Term Investigations will be apart of the systematic approach for science implementation school wide.

The leadership team will prioritize a focus on being intentional with student discussion where students lead with authentic dialogue and techniques that yields to an inquiry of learning that has a depth of knowledge to show clear mastery of content.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

B.C. Graham has developed relationships with business partners and community groups to impact bridging the gap with stakeholders and the school. McDonald's Caspers Company hosted a Spirit Night for the school that included crafts, giveaways, and performances by the school's chorus and drumming team. The Indian Community for Education purchased a license for a science/math computer program for the school called Legends of Learning that allowed students to gain access to math and science standards in an engaging way through using a gaming platform. The community group also refurbished the science resource room so that students could have access to materials that supported the standard of focus. The Indian Community for Education also tutored students during lunch by using hands on experiments to emphasize vocabulary and the mechanics of the scientific method. Idlewild Baptist Church provides school supplies and volunteers to read with kindergarten students. PDQ Restaurant supports teachers by providing meals during Parent-Teacher Conference Nights. All Pro Dad Chapter is established at B. C. Graham Elementary and the chapter encourages parent involvement from dads. There are motivational activities that dads do with their children to open up dialogue and communication in the family. Father's join their daughters at school for the annual Father Daughter dance. Fathers escort their children into a magical night of fun and dance. The night doesn't end until fathers dance with their daughters. B.C. Graham is working on positive initiatives to ensure all stakeholders are involved in the school.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6000	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1761 - Graham Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$0.00
			Notes: Science Resource Position. Science instructor to ensure long term investigations are happening in all classrooms. Plan experiments with teachers and next steps. Extended Learning Instruction for students to increase success criteria of proficiency to mastery of science standards.			
Total:						\$0.00