

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Graham Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Graham Elementary School

2915 N MASSACHUSETTS AVE, Tampa, FL 33602

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Eric Felder

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	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 Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (44%)
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	
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	98%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	94%

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.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Spires, Carisa	Principal	Oversees operations and instructional programs to promote quality education and community outreach.
Kagel-Hothem, Stacie	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Instruction

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, 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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

15

Total number of students enrolled at the school

288

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	5	37	49	42	46	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	225
Attendance below 90 percent	0	22	30	23	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	0	31	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	31	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/2/2021

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	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

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	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	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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				29%	52%	57%	29%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	55%	58%	39%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	50%	53%	48%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				37%	54%	63%	28%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				50%	57%	62%	46%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	46%	51%	55%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				26%	50%	53%	34%	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	16%	52%	-36%	58%	-42%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	33%	55%	-22%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2021					
	2019	30%	54%	-24%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	62%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	30%	57%	-27%	64%	-34%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2021					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	23%	51%	-28%	53%	-30%
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 Fall, Winter and Spring for K-5 (Reading and Math)

Science- District Common Assessment (BOY, MOY) and FSA

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28	29	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	29	0
	Students With Disabilities	-	-	-
	English Language Learners	0	50	40
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21	21	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	21	0
	Students With Disabilities	-	-	-
	English Language Learners	0	25	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35	33	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	33	0
	Students With Disabilities	-	10	10
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28	26	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	26	0
	Students With Disabilities	1	10	10
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	4	11	13
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	4	11	13
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	8
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	8
	Students With Disabilities	7	7	8
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	4	4	6
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	4	6
	Students With Disabilities	14	0	0
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2	0	2
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	0	2
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0-	0	0
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	3	3	8
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	3	8
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	3	6
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	3	6
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	10	10	11
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	17	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	66

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											
ELL	35										
BLK	15	19		7	11		9				
HSP	32										
FRL	19	20		7	8		11				
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				

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	19
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	114
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	0

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	28
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	12
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	31
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	19
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?

Core instruction needs to strengthen as indicated by proficiency rate.

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

Science data demonstrates greatest need for improvement.

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

Planning was teacher based without the help of a coach. New actions are the common planning time is built into the master schedule for grades 3, 4, and 5 to meet with district science coach and/or APEI for science planning to include data dives and planning of aggressive monitoring techniques such as laps and feedback.

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

We are taking and tracking the unit science assessments.

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

Common planning with support for our intermediate grades.

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

Science ELP on Saturdays, aggressive monitoring techniques in planning,

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.

Aggressive monitoring training during pre planning, aggressive monitoring is the focus of our Instructional Learning Team, part of our planning, coaching, walk through feedback and additional PD throughout the year such as on October 19- Discussion techniques to use as a way to monitor learning.

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

Maintain teachers next year and beyond. Science instruction is happening Head Start through grade 5 to build a science community.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus	Why?
Description and Rationale:	~FSA Math indicates that 9% and FSA ELA 21% and Science 11% proficient performance met.
Measurable Outcome:	Our 2021 - 2022 FSA ELA data will improve by 20% in proficiency, Science data will improve by 20% and our FSA Math data will improve by 32% in proficiency.
Monitoring:	Teachers will participate in intentional planning to focus on grade level standard planning with aggressive monitoring and feedback included for whole group and small group instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carisa Spires (carisa.spires@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Doug Fisher's Feedback is .74 effect size along with aggressive monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our students have unfinished learning, we want to use strategies to accelerate learning not just remediate.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Pre-Pre Planning Training for all instructional staff in Data Driven Instruction with a focus on how to aggressively monitor.
2. Pre Planning Training for all instructional staff on how to do aggressively monitoring. .
3. Aggressive monitoring laps are planned weekly during common grade level content planning.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>What? Teachers will aggressively use formative diagnostics and informative assessments frequently to drive content using acceleration during small group instruction.</p> <p>Why? ~FSA Math indicates that 9% and FSA ELA 21% and Science 17% proficient performance met. Increase SWD ESSA to at least 41%</p>
Measurable Outcome:	Our 2021 - 2022 FSA ELA data will improve by 20% in proficiency, Science data will improve by 20% and our FSA Math data will improve by 32% in proficiency.
Monitoring:	Aggressive monitoring will be monitored by walk through feedback from administration and progress monitoring data on ELA PMAs and Math monthlies as well as the iReady diagnostics for all students including looking at students with disabilities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eric Felder (eric.felder@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Aggressive Monitoring using feedback and laps.</p> <p>ALL of our students get immediate, targeted, concise feedback</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Monitoring beginning with highest learners allows for real-time feedback before students practice a concept incorrectly</p> <p>If our highest learners don't understand a concept, then our lowest learners will probably also need additional instruction</p>

Action Steps to Implement

- 1- Professional Development on Data Driven Instruction using Aggressive Monitoring ad Feedback during Pre Pre Planning
- 2- Professional Development on Data Driven Instruction using Aggressive Monitoring ad Feedback during Pre Planning
- 3- Include Aggressive Monitoring Planning of Laps and Success criteria in Planning session
- 4-Some teachers have visited other schools to see Aggressive Monitoring in action and for planning
- 5- Administration walk throughs with feedback
- 6- Designed an observable template for teacher observables and student observables from the 4 Principles of Excellent Instruction to support Aggressive Monitoring
- 7- ILT's focus this year is Aggressive Monitoring in the classroom to support the development

Person Responsible Eric Felder (eric.felder@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Why? ~FSA Math indicates that 9% and FSA ELA 21% and Science 11% proficient performance met. We have lots of unfinished learning and aggressive monitoring will help to accelerate learning.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	Our 2021 - 2022 FSA ELA data will improve by 20% in proficiency, Science data will improve by 20% and our FSA Math data will improve by 32% in proficiency.
Monitoring:	<p>What? Teachers will aggressively use formative diagnostics and informative assessments frequently to drive content using acceleration during small group instruction</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carisa Spires (carisa.spires@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>B. C. Graham will have common planning time to intentionally plan for aggressive monitoring. How? ~Instructional Priorities will be introduced to the staff. ~Intentional planning of aggressive opportunities during ELA, Math, and Science instruction in whole group and in small group instruction using Wonders for K-2 and LAFS or Math for instruction.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>During the pandemic, the students lost valuable instruction. Aggressive teaching techniques such as aggressive monitoring will help students gain their unfinished learning. How? ~Instructional Priorities will be introduced to the staff. ~Intentional planning of aggressive opportunities during ELA, Math, and Science instruction in whole group and in small group instruction using Wonders for K-2 and LAFS or Math for instruction.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

- 1- Pre Pre Planning training on Data Driven Instruction with a focus on Aggressive Monitoring.
- 2- Pre Planning training on aggressive monitoring techniques.
- 3- Common planning time built into the master schedule during the day
- 4- Weekly common content planning time with school or district content coach.
- 5- Feedback to instructional staff through coaching and instructional walks.
- 5- Monitor data on electronic data walls and data walls displayed in the meeting room.

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

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: B. C. Graham has not achieve 50% proficiency in the past 5 years.

Measurable Outcome: Based on the 2020-2021 ELA FSA scores, 19%. in grade 3, 19.2%, in Grade 4, 22.2% and in Graded 5, 19.4% scored at proficiency, which is level 3 or higher. Our goal is to increase proficiency from 19% to 50% and SWD ESSA to 41%.

Monitoring: Our focus will be monitored by aggressive instructional practice, collaborative planning, ELP, and our district monthly common assessments in addition to IReady diagnostics.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Aggressive Monitoring with feedback during standards based instruction in whole group and small groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: All students get immediate, targeted, concise feedback. Monitoring beginning with the highest learning allows for real time feedback before students practice a concept incorrectly, Based on research from Doug Fisher.

Action Steps to Implement

Pre-Planning Training- Administration trained the staff on Data Driven Instruction to include Specific feedback and Aggressive Monitoring to check for understand of learning targets.

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

Content Planning- The school based coaches and district coaches incorporate aggressive monitoring weekly into the instructional planning for monitoring. Achievement Level Descriptors will be used to target levels of performance for proficiency aligned to the standards.

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

Coaching- School based reading coach will provide facilitation of lesson planning using planning protocols and Achievement Level Descriptors to drive discussion for acceleration and aggressive monitoring using laps. Data chats with teachers to progress monitor monthly assessments and diagnostics to create targeted groups for instruction. The coach will provide modeling of standards based lessons for whole group and small group instruction.

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

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: 0% of our SWD ESSA students at Graham made gains last year.

Measurable Outcome:

Our goal is to learning gains for our SWD ESSA from 0% to 50%.

Monitoring:

Our focus will be monitored by the use of district approved curriculum, aggressive instructional practice, and our district monthly common assessments in addition to IReady diagnostics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eric Felder (eric.felder@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Aggressive Monitoring with feedback during standards based instruction during small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

All students get immediate, targeted, concise feedback. Monitoring beginning with the highest learning allows for real time feedback before students practice a concept incorrectly, Based on research from Doug Fisher.

Action Steps to Implement

Coaching- District based ESE coach will provide instructional materials and Achievement Level Descriptors to drive discussion for acceleration and aggressive monitoring using laps. Data chats with the teacher to progress monitor monthly assessments and diagnostics to create targeted individual goals for instruction. The coach will provide modeling of standards based lessons for small group instruction.

Person Responsible

Eric Felder (eric.felder@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.

After viewing of Safe Schools for Alex report and learning that our school is very high with 11.5 incidents per 100 students, our staff has worked to develop a school wide discipline plan and PBIS system. We are focused on routines and procedures for academics and behavioral using SHINE (Sit Up Straight, Hands Folded, In Your own Space, Nice Voice, Eyes on Speakers- Success Happens inside Everyone).

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.

B. C. Graham has a clear vision for building a positive school culture. B. C. Graham uses the PBIS system to recognize and reward students' effort. B.C. Graham uses SHINE around the school for procedures in the classroom and in common areas. All student has been trained on using Social Emotional Learning strategies in everyday lessons.

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

All staff members at B. C. Graham will contribute to recognizing and rewarding students daily. A PBIS committee works to plan, organize and implement monthly PBIS celebrations.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00