

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Grady Elementary School



2021-22 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Grady Elementary School

3910 W MORRISON AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michael Campbell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (76%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Grady Elementary School

3910 W MORRISON AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[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	No	21%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

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

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.

Grady Elementary will provide all students with the knowledge, skills, and supports necessary to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Grady Elementary School will be a leader in preparing students for life.

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
Campbell, Michael	Principal	Responsible for observing and evaluating teachers. Ensuring all aspects of the building are running smoothly. Overseeing student progress and data collection.
Gonzalez, Ann-Marie	Assistant Principal	Responsible for curriculum, testing and discipline.
Edwards, Tara	SAC Member	Classroom teacher and runs SAC. Holds monthly SAC meetings and is a liaison between SAC and school. Also in charge of standard and non-standard waivers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Michael Campbell

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.*

3

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

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

536

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

6

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

6

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	111	81	85	82	69	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	502
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	2	1	4	0	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/26/2021

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	86	79	79	72	77	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	487
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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	86	79	79	72	77	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	487
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				83%	52%	57%	79%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				73%	55%	58%	52%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	50%	53%	42%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				81%	54%	63%	86%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				73%	57%	62%	64%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	46%	51%	49%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				74%	50%	53%	88%	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	72%	52%	20%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	81%	55%	26%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2021					
	2019	85%	54%	31%	56%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	81%	54%	27%	62%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	86%	57%	29%	64%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2021					
	2019	74%	54%	20%	60%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	72%	51%	21%	53%	19%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Diagnostic

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18	51	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	49	56
	Students With Disabilities	11	19	23
	English Language Learners	5	16	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17	40	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	34	51
	Students With Disabilities	5	9	22
	English Language Learners	5	10	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17	40	63

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28	52	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	49	56
	Students With Disabilities	11	19	23
	English Language Learners	5	16	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17	31	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	34	51
	Students With Disabilities	5	9	22
	English Language Learners	5	10	25
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32	43	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	49	56
	Students With Disabilities	11	19	23
	English Language Learners	5	16	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	20	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	34	51
	Students With Disabilities	5	9	22
	English Language Learners	5	10	25

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32	45	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	49	56
	Students With Disabilities	11	19	23
	English Language Learners	5	16	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	25	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	34	51
	Students With Disabilities	5	9	22
	English Language Learners	5	10	25
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27	38	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	49	56
	Students With Disabilities	11	19	23
	English Language Learners	5	16	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22	34	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	34	51
	Students With Disabilities	5	9	22
	English Language Learners	5	10	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	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	67			71			50				
ELL	80			73							
ASN	89			95							
BLK	57			64							
HSP	82	69		76	56		76				
MUL	83			83							
WHT	89	65		90	71		86				
FRL	77	45		68	35	10	59				
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	42	47	20	53	70		36				
ELL	80	85		80	85						
ASN	88			94							
BLK	57	62		39	50						
HSP	80	63		78	73	64	63				
MUL	71			82							
WHT	89	81	65	88	75	82	81				
FRL	66	56	52	67	60	45	58				
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	52	41	18	65	68	60					
ELL	46	60		62	70						
ASN	100			100							
BLK	42	17		53	50						
HSP	68	50	40	76	66	57	82				
MUL	79	80		93	80						
WHT	87	51	50	92	61	33	93				
FRL	63	47	31	71	53	48	75				

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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	63
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	77
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	92
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	72
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	83
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	80
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Bottom quartile gains were lower than expected in ELA and Math.

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

Bottom quartile ELA and Math.

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

Students did not take the FSA in 2020. Student gains were calculated for only one grade level. Learning gains were calculated from 3rd grade scores to 5th grade scores.

Close progress monitoring of bottom quartile students.

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

Proficiency in ELA, Math and Science.

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

Teachers taught the full extent of the standard(s). Teachers utilized team planning to increase proficiency.

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

Teachers will scaffold pre-requisite skills necessary for understanding of grade level standards/work.

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.

Teachers and leaders had a full day of professional development to address acceleration.

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

Data chats will occur after assessments and MTSS data check ins with grade levels.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Bottom Quartile Learning Gains

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2021 our bottom quartile learning gains was 38% and our math learning gains for bottom quartile was 25%.
Measurable Outcome:	For the 2021-22 FSA Grady Elementary bottom quartile learning gains will be 70% for ELA and Math.
Monitoring:	Data tracking document for all students. Data chats after assessments with administration. PLC will discuss data trends.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ann-Marie Gonzalez (ann-marie.gonzalez@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data tracking using ideas from the book Driven by Data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Ideas implemented from the book have shown positive student learning gains for all students especially struggling students.

Action Steps to Implement

Create data tracking charts for students and teachers.
Data chats with administration after assessments.
PLC's will discuss data trends and bottom quartile gains.

Person Responsible Ann-Marie Gonzalez (ann-marie.gonzalez@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Decrease number of suspensions.

Administration will monitor discipline through the EdConnect 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.

Administration will provide culture building activities at pre-planning and throughout the year. Grady partners with the PTA to bring families, stakeholders and the school staff closer together. This is accomplished by providing multiple events throughout the year. Procedures and high expectations are set at the beginning of the school year. Staff is constantly building relationships with students and families.

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

Administration models behaviors throughout the school. Staff builds relationships and educates students. Families support the students and the school by giving time, funding, and materials to support academic and behavioral needs. PTA/Community partners help to provide funding and materials needed to support students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Bottom Quartile Learning Gains	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00