Bradford Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bradford Elementary School

3856 SE 144TH ST, Starke, FL 32091

bradfordschools.org/bes

Demographics

Principal: Cassie Melvin

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	
* 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 Bradford 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

Bradford Elementary School

3856 SE 144TH ST, Starke, FL 32091

bradfordschools.org/bes

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bradford 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.

It is the mission of the faculty, staff, parents, community, and stakeholders of Southside Elementary to create empowered scholars who will be successful and productive citizens with the ability to solve real world problems, while accepting ownership of their learning through collaboration and critical thinking.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through implementing Positive Behavior Intervention Systems (PBIS) with fidelity, providing rigorous instruction for our students, offering applicable professional development for faculty and staff, and providing extended learning time; an increase in learning gains in reading and math will occur.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Melvin, Cassie	Principal	Oversee all instructional and non-instructional operations of Southside Elementary School.
Morgan, Lauren	Assistant Principal	Oversee all instructional and non-instructional operations of Southside Elementary School.
Adams, Tammy	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach for Southside Elementary
Couey, Susie	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Instructional curriculum resource teacher for instructional staff for Southside Elementary.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Cassie Melvin

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.*
21

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.*
17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

583

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

10

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

18

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	96	80	101	122	85	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	583
Attendance below 90 percent	25	44	49	59	43	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	266
One or more suspensions	1	1	12	5	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA	3	6	4	5	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	1	2	6	11	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	28	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	46	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	26	31	40	76	35	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	273

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	4	7	11	16	21	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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	13	8	6	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 10/6/2021

2020-21 - 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	51	65	68	51	66	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	353
Attendance below 90 percent	33	28	33	16	30	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	1	8	11	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	4	8	2	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	8	10	3	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

2020-21 - 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	51	65	68	51	66	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	353
Attendance below 90 percent	33	28	33	16	30	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	1	8	11	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	4	8	2	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	8	10	3	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				44%	53%	57%	39%	48%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	49%	58%	44%	49%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	46%	53%	56%	52%	48%
Math Achievement				44%	55%	63%	54%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				36%	50%	62%	52%	50%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				30%	35%	51%	45%	45%	47%
Science Achievement				32%	43%	53%	39%	41%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	52%	59%	-7%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	47%	-7%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	31%	42%	-11%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	51%	60%	-9%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	49%	-9%	64%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	30%	46%	-16%	60%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	30%	39%	-9%	53%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Curriculum Associates iReady all grade levels

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	7/10%	20/27%	32/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/10%	20/27%	32/42%
	Students With Disabilities	*Working on Data	*Working on Data	*Working on Data
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3/4%	11/15%	20/25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/4%	11/15%	20/25%
	Students With Disabilities	*Working on Data	*Working on Data	*Working on Data
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/14%	14/21%	24/32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/14%	14/21%	24/32%
	Students With Disabilities	*Working on Data	*Working on Data	*Working on Data
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4/7%	8/12%	26/36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/7%	8/12%	26/36%
	Students With Disabilities	*Working on Data	*Working on Data	*Working on Data
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11/19%	28/46%	37/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/19%	28/46%	37/60%
	Students With Disabilities	**Working on Data	*Working on Data	*Working on Data
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4/7%	11/18%	25/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/7%	11/18%	25/41%
	Students With Disabilities	*Working on Data	*Working on Data	*Working on Data
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/9%	11/17%	23/36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/9%	11/17%	23/36%
	Students With Disabilities	*Working on Data	*Working on Data	*Working on Data
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4/7%	6/10%	25/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/7%	6/10%	25/40%
	Students With Disabilities	*Working on Data	*Working on Data	*Working on Data
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/13%	8/16%	20/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/13%	8/16%	20/40%
	Students With Disabilities	*Working on Data	*Working on Data	*Working on Data
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/15%	13/26%	22/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/15%	13/26%	22/44%
	Students With Disabilities	*Working on Data	*Working on Data	*Working on Data
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Subgroup Data Review

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	29	24		23	38		31				
BLK	21	26		17	32		21				
WHT	49	57		41	38		21				
FRL	34	31		23	26		21				
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	31	40	53	33	40	42	25				
BLK	33	43	57	30	26	28	11				
WHT	52	53	50	52	42	33	39				
FRL	39	46	48	38	33	31	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	23	36	43	32	33	21	6				
BLK	28	36	47	33	42	55	33				
WHT	44	47	69	66	58	39	42				
FRL	37	42	56	52	49	48	32				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	227
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - 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%	

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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	23
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	41
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	27
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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?

Southside scores consistently seem to decrease in proficiency in both math and ELA/reading each year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math is showing a high priority need for improvement. 30% proficient in grades 3-5 last year on the FSA and 35% making gains with 27% proficiency in the bottom quartile.

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

The pandemic contributed along with many years of inconsistency around campus. We are hoping that with constant expectations that do not waiver and implementation of the Acaletic math intervention program, we will make gains in grades 3-5, and also build upon mathematical foundational skills in grades k-2.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science acheivement increased from 6% to 25% for SWD from previous years. SWD, looking at bottom quartile also increased from 21% to 42% proficiency for math.

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

In previous years, an increase focus on SWD in the area of math. This upcoming school year however, implementation of Acaletics will be present and non-negotiable.

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

We will be utizling WIN Time for SRA one power hour of intervention each morning. Acaletics will be present for math and all staff will be trained in this program also.

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.

All staff have had an opportunity to do SRA training and we have mutiple people from our campus and the district able to do walk throughs to check in on SRA. Acaletics will provide training via their program coordinator which is assigned to our school specifically and we also have a local school in a neighboring district which will allow us to collaborate if/when needed.

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

Reoccuring Title I funds will help continue Acaletics as we will not need to have reoccring PD once all staff are trained. Constant walk throughs for accountability of implementation of programs will need to occur to ensure buy in from all staff.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math is a high area of need on our campus. Only 30% of students in grades 3-5 had an overal achievement level of 3 or higher for proficiency. 35% provided math gains. Our bottom quartile of students were only 27% proficient, which count for our school three times.
Measurable Outcome:	We have created a math intervention time of no more than 30 minutes within the Eureka curriculum block. Taking away some fluency practice if needed and also the application problem, we will be adopting Acaletics as a math intervention for all grades K-5.
Monitoring:	All teachers and staff will be trained in Acaletics program and there will be ways to monitor the progress of each student. They will have a mastery goal which will allow them to attend "Green Parties" and also "scrimmages" via progress monitoring. First training date is set for Oct. 13th.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cassie Melvin (melvin.cassie@mybradford.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence of Acaletics implementation has shown to aide schools similar in demographics and data as Southside, going from an overall school grade of "D" to a "B".
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on our current FSA data, along with our baseline iReady data, it shows our school is a "Tier 3" school with a "Tier 1 problem" and requires urgent intervention. Southside is already a low 300 performance school for Florida and we fall under an extended school day. Based on our baseline data alone, if students only made typical growth, our proficiency would show only 28%.

Action Steps to Implement

All teachers and staff will be trained in Acaletics program and there will be ways to monitor the progress of each student. They will have a mastery goal which will allow them to attend "Green Parties" and also "scrimmages" via progress monitoring. First training date is set for Oct. 13th.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA is another high focus area as our recent FSA data shows that only 37% of grades 3-5 were proficient in ELA. 40% of these students made gains from their previous test. Bottom quartile was 36%.
Measurable Outcome:	SRA during our designated "WIN TIME" (What I Need) for the first hour of each day to cover our extended day time where we are working on strengthening our overall phonemic awareness and foundational reading skills. Students who did not test into SRA are provided enrichment opportunities, however this is a very few number of students. Our goal is to strengthen K-2 as these students will roll up and hopefully become more effective 3-5 students in reading and comprehension.
Monitoring:	SRA during our designated "WIN TIME" (What I Need) for the first hour of each day to cover our extended day time where we are working on strengthening our overall phonemic awareness and foundational reading skills. Students who did not test into SRA are provided enrichment opportunities, however this is a very few number of students. Our goal is to strengthen K-2 as these students will roll up and hopefully become more effective 3-5 students in reading and comprehension. HMH Coaching will be provided to 3 teachers on our campus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lauren Morgan (morgan.lauren@mybradford.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	STAR progress monitoring tests will help indicate if SRA intervention is working. We are also providing LLI for teir 3 intervention. HMH Coaching will be provided to 3 teachers on our campus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SRA during our designated "WIN TIME" (What I Need) for the first hour of each day to cover our extended day time where we are working on strengthening our overall phonemic awareness and foundational reading skills. Students who did not test into SRA are provided enrichment opportunities, however this is a very few number of students. Our goal is to strengthen K-2 as these students will roll up and hopefully become more effective 3-5 students in reading and comprehension. HMH Coaching will be provided to 3 teachers on our campus.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

School culture and environment via discipline data are consistent wth the data across the state. Last school year Southside Elementary had 151 total referrals and 51% of these referrals occured in the classroom. However, records from the website listed show that Southside has a high incident ranking.

HMH Coaching will be provided to 3 teachers on our campus.

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.

Southside Elementary helps to build and supportive environemnt for staff and students by providing learning conditions that meet the academic and social emotional needs of our staff and students. Administration provides high expectations to be met based on our previous school data and climate.

New administration and the school closures of Brooker Elementary and Hampton Elementary provide new faces and culture to Southside's campus this school year where we aim to create an all-inclusive and safe atmosphere for all members of our school family.

PTO and SAC meetings encourage all stakeholders into our decision making for our campus.

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

Southside Elementary has a PBIS team which consist of various teachers and led by our Behavior Resource Teacher (BRT) on campus along with administration. Studens are encourage to meet our expectations with reminders and a reward system in place to influence the behaviors that we wish to see around campus.

Culture building and appreciate of staff is also imperitve this school year to create a positive, loving school family. We have adopted the motto, "Southside. Same Side. United begins wtih "U"." as something that is read on announcements each day for staff and student reminders.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$30,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6150	7000-GRANTS AND DONATIONS U.S.	0081 - Bradford Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$30,000.00
			Notes: Acaletics, training & materials			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6150	7100-GRANTS & DONATIONS U.S.-CONTINUED	0081 - Bradford Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$5,000.00
			Notes: SRA materials if/when needed via Title I funds for ELA/Reading Intervention			
					Total:	$35,000.00