Sheehy Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sheehy Elementary School

6402 N 40TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Delia Gadson Yarbrough

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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
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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: D (32%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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 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

Sheehy Elementary School

6402 N 40TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

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-5	Yes	96%

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

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.

Sheehy will equip students with knowledge and skills needed to succeed in our ever-changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Sheehy will empower students to be great.

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
Gadson Yarbrough, Delia	Principal	Monitor the fidelity of the plan and engage stakeholders and instructional leaders in the monitoring and implementation of the plan, making adjustments as needed.
Tshiamalenge, Sabrina	SAC Member	Serve as the SAC Chair to engage stakeholders in the implementation and monitoring of the plan. THe SAC .Chair will lead meetings and create the agendas.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Delia Gadson Yarbrough

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.*
1

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
20

Total number of students enrolled at the school

337

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

4

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

4

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	50	49	56	51	48	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	303
Attendance below 90 percent	20	26	28	23	13	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	24	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	25	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 11/10/2021

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	37	63	42	54	60	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320
Attendance below 90 percent	9	24	10	14	17	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	0	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	37	63	42	54	60	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320
Attendance below 90 percent	9	24	10	14	17	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	10	36	22	31	44	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
Course failure in Math	12	46	26	42	41	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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				32%	52%	57%	28%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	55%	58%	48%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67%	50%	53%	59%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				39%	54%	63%	26%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	57%	62%	39%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	46%	51%	45%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				38%	50%	53%	23%	51%	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	22%	52%	-30%	58%	-36%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	34%	55%	-21%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	62%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	57%	-18%	64%	-25%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-35%					
05	2021						
	2019	37%	54%	-17%	60%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-39%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021						
	2019	35%	51%	-16%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison							

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Student data is compiled from our three assessments (Fall,Winter, and Spring) iReady diagnostics for both ELA and Math assessments. Data is compiled from baseline, mid-year, and end of the year assessments for 5th grade Science.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9	17	27.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.4	16.1	16.4
	Students With Disabilities	9.5	18.2	20.0
	English Language Learners	6.1	19.2	17.6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7.4	8.5	15.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	7.8	8.9	0
	Students With Disabilities	7.5	9.1	0
	English Language Learners	4.3	9.6	0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13.9	14	19.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.9	12.9	3.2
	Students With Disabilities	14.8	14.8	3.7
	English Language Learners	16.7	16.7	3.2
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11.1	5.6	5.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.9	12.9	3.2
	Students With Disabilities	14.8	14.8	3.7
	English Language Learners	16.7	16.7	3.2

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17.3	9.6	9.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	10	7.5
	Students With Disabilities	19.5	9.8	9.1
	English Language Learners	13.3	6.7	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11.1	5.6	5.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.9	6.5	0
	Students With Disabilities	12.5	0	0
	English Language Learners	13.3	6.7	09.5

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	9.5	7.5	9.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	8.5	4.3	0
	Students With Disabilities	9.4	9.4	6.3
	English Language Learners	10.6	8.5	4.3
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	3.8	1.9	9.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	2.1	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	5.7	2.9	0
	English Language Learners	4.2	2.2	0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	7.2	0	12.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	15.7	1.9	1.9
	Students With Disabilities	16.3	4.7	4.5
	English Language Learners	16.7	4.1	4
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	7.2	0	12.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	5.9	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	8.9	0	0
	English Language Learners	6.3	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Science	All Students	13.64	23	18
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	10	13.5
	Students With Disabilities	10	5	13
	English Language Learners	10	4	14.3

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	9	53	64	12	61	67					
ELL	15			23							
BLK	17	39	64	20	29	50	15				
HSP	28			22							
FRL	18	37	53	21	30	47	18				

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	4	42		17	83						
ELL	36	83		38	55						
BLK	29	53	59	37	59	50	35				
HSP	42	91		45	70						
FRL	31	59	67	38	62	54	34				

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	20	41	42	5	12	20					
ELL	32	67		21	33						
BLK	24	42	52	25	39	44	18				
HSP	42	67		26	50						
FRL	28	47	59	27	39	45	23				

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	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	276
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	27
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	33
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	30
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	33
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?

Mid year data indicates a drop in proficiency levels in the areas of Reading and Math. ESSA subgroups declined in proficiency performance as the year progressed in both reading and math. In Grades 1 - 3 students showed a greater proficiency rate in the area of reading. In grade 4, students averaged about 9% in proficiency in both Reading and Math. In grade 5, students averaged about 12% in proficiency in Reading and Math. ESSA subgroups did not meet proficiency.

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

There is an urgent need for improvement in all three content areas of: reading, math, and science. There is a larger need for Math school-wide.

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

Contributing factors include a lack in instructional consistency due to students moving in and out of e-learning modes of instruction. There were several changes in teachers and classes in both primary and intermediate classes based on teaching staff and students that moved from e-learning to brick and mortar delivery as the year progressed.
New actions include: all students and staff are on campus this year which will allow for more consistent teaching and learning. Goal setting with students will be implemented with data analysis to drive small group instruction.

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

Grade 1 Reading i Ready growth showed an 18 point increase. They also showed an 8 point increase in math. Grade 2 showed a 5 point increase in Reading. Grade 4 demonstrated consistent growth and gains with students in the bottom quartile.

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

Consistent structures and routines with small group interventions were credited to these gains.
A continued focus on ensuring the ELA and Math Blocks are planned to include a shared lesson (core) with independent practice (rotations) to accommodate small group instruction.
Coaches will provide teachers in grades 3 - 5 with feedback and coaching cycles to ensure time is allotted in the instructional blocks for small group instruction that is tailored to the data to meet the needs of students and to provide reteaching of areas in need of remediation.

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

Common planning time with an instructional coach with of focus on unpacking standards and determining when to compact the curriculum for acceleration. Data analysis after all common assessments to ensure standards are addressed appropriately. Core instruction will also be a key focus so that teachers can use scaffolding and aggressive monitoring during their lessons to gauge student learning and understanding.

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.

Professional development opportunities include the following:
-Book Study of Teach Like a Champion by Doug Lemov
-Aggressive Monitoring PD and coaching
-Explicit Modeling PD and Coaching
-ILT work around collaborative structures to increase engagement and discussion
-Common Planning PLCs to unpack standards
-Data dives to determine instructional strategies to address standards that are not being met

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

Instructional coaches will facilitate collaborative planning PLCs to effectively plan lessons that include an unpacking of the standards. This team will ensure core instruction is planned to meet the rigor of the grade level standards. A focus on task alignment will be an essential part of planning.
Coaches will track data with teams and provide support for students that are in need of small group interventions.
Data folders will be utilized to ensure students are goal setting and tracking progress.
We will work to build student agency and persistence for students who often tend to give up when faced with challenging content and tasks. Data will be shared and celebrated weekly in hallways and on the morning show to keep students motivated.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional Priority - Teachers will incorporate targeted questions, standards-aligned tasks, and aggressive monitoring techniques to make in the moment lesson adjustments. Data collected will be utilized to plan for core and small group instruction. Rationale: Based on the 2021 FSA Data the overall % of Points earned fell to 33%, a 17 point drop from 2019 (50). Students scoring a Level 3 and above in ELA decreased from a 32 to 19 (-13) with ELA Gains dropping from 58% to 38% (-20) and Bottom Quartile falling to 56% from 67% (-11). In Math, the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 and above dropped to 21% from 39% (-18) with Learning Gains falling to 31% from 63% (-32) and students in the Bottom Quartile making gains fell to 56% from 67% (-11). In Science, students scoring a Level 3 and above fell to 18% from 38% (-20). From the data, it is evident that core instruction needs to be strengthened. This can be achieved through structured collaborative planning sessions that will focus on understanding the depth and understanding of the grade level standards in all content areas. Planning protocols will ensure questions are targeted and aligned to the rigor of the standards, tasks and activities are standards aligned, and through the use of aggressive monitoring techniques, data will be used to make lesson adjustments and plan for core and small group instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	Measurable Outcomes Include: By December 2021, 70% of teachers as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided opportunities for students to be engaged in standards-aligned tasks. By December 2021, 70% of teachers as evidenced in walkthroughs will have incorporated targeted questions into core instruction. By December 2021, 70% of teachers as evidenced in walkthroughs will have incorporated aggressive monitoring techniques during instruction. By May 2022, 90% of teachers as evidenced in walkthroughs will have provided opportunities for students to be engaged in standards-aligned tasks. By May 2022, 90% of teachers as evidenced in walkthroughs will have incorporated targeted questions into core instruction. By May 2022, 90% of teachers as evidenced in walkthroughs will have incorporated aggressive monitoring techniques during instruction.
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored by: Developing a set of Look-fors to be shared with all teachers. Academic Coaches and Administration will provide teachers with a period of safe practice. Instructional Leadership Team Walkthroughs will be scheduled on the following days to collect data and determine needs and support. September 8th - 9th October 6th - 7th November 9th - 10th December 8th - 9th January 5th - 6th February 8th - 9th March 9th - 10th April 6th - 7th May 4th - 5th The ILT will review the data from the walkthroughs and determine next steps. ILT Meetings will take place on the following days: 8/24, 9/21, 10/19, 11/16, 12/14, 1/18, 2/15, 3/22, 4/19, 5/17
Person responsible	Delia Gadson Yarbrough (delia.gadson-yarbrough@hcps.net)

for monitoring outcome:	
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Use of Data Driven Instruction techniques, based on the work of Bambrick to provide scaffolded strategies for acceleration. 2. Ongoing feedback to teachers on the implementation of targeted questions during core instruction and grade level task alignment to the standards that will increase student engagement and academic ownership. 3. Weekly facilitated collaborative planning PLCs that will utilize data to plan core and small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on our FSA data, it is evident that core instruction needs to be strengthened to deepen the understanding teachers have of grade level standards. Teachers will focus on a culture that promotes data driven instructional practices to build their capacity, content knowledge, and instructional strategies. This will ensure students will receive instruction aligned to grade level expectations and standards to meet the learners' needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a school-wide culture of data driven instruction
1. Establish a weekly collaborative planning schedule for all grade levels and content areas.
2. Schedule Data Driven PLC meetings for the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month.
3. Schedule ILT meetings on the third Tuesday of each month.
4. Create electronic data walls and utilization of the Data Den Room to display data to support progress monitoring.
5. Data Walls will be used to monitor all students, in addition to, having a focus on ESSA subgroups scoring below 41% and our BQ students.
6. Ensure planning protocols are used during planning PLCs that include norms, roles, and expectations.
7. Planning PLC will be monitored by administration to deepen teacher understanding of the BEST and/or FL Standards and standards-aligned tasks during instruction.
8. Professional Learning will focus on aggressive monitoring techniques and strategies to allow teachers to make in the moment lesson adjustments.
9. Goal setting with students to encourage academic ownership and inspire growth.

Person Responsible	Delia Gadson Yarbrough (delia.gadson-yarbrough@hcps.net)

Create a school wide culture of data driven instruction with a focus on data analysis.
1. Design Data Driven PLC protocols to use with teams.
2. Train/model the use of the Data Driven PLC protocols to build teacher capacity.
3. Create action plans to promote acceleration during instruction.
4. Goal setting with students to encourage academic ownership and growth.
5. Schedule time for monitoring of goals monthly with students.
6. Provide ongoing professional development for teachers on how to utilize data gathered through aggressive monitoring to make in the moment lesson adjustments.

Person Responsible	Delia Gadson Yarbrough (delia.gadson-yarbrough@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2021 FSA scores 14% of Grade 3 students, 21% of Grade 4 students, and 20% of Grade 5 students scored a Level 3 or higher. According to baseline iReady Diagnostic data, 12% of Grade 3, 11% of Grade 4, and 10% of Grade 5 students are on level in reading. From the data, it is evident that core instruction needs to be strengthened in ELA. Students have experienced learning loss due to gaps in instruction and e-learning due to the pandemic. Teachers need to ensure lesson targets and tasks are aligned to grade level standards during core instruction to increase the instructional rigor of lessons. By focusing on ELA, instructional improvements will include instruction with rigorous tasks at or above grade level complexity expected for the grade level, targeted small group instruction, and frequent monitoring of student progress in the area of reading.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 scoring at a Level 3 or higher on FSA ELA assessment will increase to 40 as measured by the progress monitoring tools an the FSA ELA assessment.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, iReady and Achieve 3000 reading progress, ELA monthly assessments, and other district monitoring tools in order to prepare for grade level in order to prepare for the ELA FSA in 2022.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Delia Gadson Yarbrough (delia.gadson-yarbrough@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	During Collaborative Planning with the Reading Coach, Teachers will develop clarity around the alignment of instruction, learning targets, daily tasks, and end of unit performance tasks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We want to ensure learning tasks are aligned to the grade level standards and ensure core instruction is rigorous to encourage productive struggle and student ownership of learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure structures for collaborative planning includes a framework for task alignment to the guiding unit question and focus standards.

Person Responsible Delia Gadson Yarbrough (delia.gadson-yarbrough@hcps.net)

Implement coaching cycles in grades 3 - 5, with the Reading Coach to focus on teacher clarity of the guiding question and its relation to the daily learning target to include an explicit model with a think aloud. An emphasis on this work will be on teacher understanding of the guiding question and connecting it to the tasks through the gradual release of responsibility model.

Person Responsible Delia Gadson Yarbrough (delia.gadson-yarbrough@hcps.net)

Conduct focus walkthroughs in grades 3 - 5, providing feedback to teachers on the explicit model with gradual release of responsibility and the rigor of the learning tasks.

Person Responsible Delia Gadson Yarbrough (delia.gadson-yarbrough@hcps.net)

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.

Based on Sheehy Elementary's Discipline Data for the 2020-2021 school year there were a total of 58 school incidents and 22 Bus incidents. Of the reported incidents, the two most reported categories were disruptive and other minor incidents. There were 13 incidents identified as Disruptive and 13 incidents identified as as "other minor incidents".
The school will monitor discipline data biweekly through the DREAM TEAM. Data to be reviewed will be by Class DOJO, Behavior Tracker, and the School Incident and Referral System.

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.

Dr. P.L. Sheehy Elementary School builds a positive culture and environment by establishing and promoting our schoolwide expectations to all stakeholders. These guidelines for success were created after analyzing schoolwide behavior and discipline data through the 2019-2020 school year. The guidelines for success are: Be Safe, Be Respectful, and Be Your Best!
Sheehy's Dream Team meets biweekly to promote a positive schoolwide culture and climate at Sheehy. Each member of the team represents a stakeholder group to promote open lines of communication. Feedback is welcome to enhance the learning experience at Sheehy. Our Student Services Team provides services, support, and resources to our families. We also have a food pantry that is open for all families. Attendance is a focus area this school year. Our goal is to increase opportunities to meaningfully engage with our families, parents and stakeholders with a focus on improving our schoolwide attendance rate to 96%.
This year the Dream Team will also work with 7 Mindsets to implement the program schoolwide. We will meet regularly with Kirk Jones to promote and monitor progress with the program implementation.

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

Dream Team Members consist of a team of teachers and administrators that meet biweekly to improve the climate and culture of the school. Behavior and Attendance Data is reviewed at each meeting and action steps are created and implemented to improve conditions.

Principal/AP

- Increase school to home communication to target parents' beliefs about the importance of attendance.
- Implement quarterly parent engagement virtual meetings to educate parents about the importance of attendance.

Social Worker
-Monitor school wide attendance weekly
-Promote daily attendance with programs such as "Beat the Bell" and daily class recognitions
- Monitor interventions for students with frequent absences
-Work with teachers to ensure the fidelity of interventions is ongoing.

School Counselor
-Incorporate effective practices and lessons that promote good attendance with classes.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00