

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Bryan Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Bryan Elementary School

2006 W OAK AVE, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Tamethea Simmons

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Bryan Elementary School

2006 W OAK AVE, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	89%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Preparing today's learners for tomorrow's challenges.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Setting high expectations, raising the standards for all students, staff, and parents.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Simmons, Tamethea	Principal	The principal directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of an elementary, adult, ESE, or other specialized public school sites. The principal demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/2/2022, Tamethea Simmons

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Total number of students enrolled at the school

646

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

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	115	101	124	84	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	614
Attendance below 90 percent	1	33	26	22	18	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	260
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	32	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	19	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	6	12	12	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
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

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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	106	108	112	95	94	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	627
Attendance below 90 percent	0	26	19	22	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	21	11	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	17	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	22	20	23	36	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122

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	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	106	108	112	95	94	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	627
Attendance below 90 percent	0	26	19	22	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	21	11	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	17	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	22	20	23	36	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122

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	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	53%	56%				36%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						46%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						47%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	56%	50%	50%				47%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	75%						57%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%						38%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	59%	59%				29%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	38%	52%	-14%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	36%	55%	-19%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	62%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	41%	57%	-16%	64%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	29%	51%	-22%	53%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	9	48	60	34	69	67	13				
ELL	39	59	48	53	70	57	40				
BLK	47	71		43	75						
HSP	42	58	51	57	74	63	45				
WHT	27			60							
FRL	42	59	57	56	74	65	41				

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	13	32	45	25	41	32	21				
ELL	33	40	54	44	51	48	43				
HSP	34	43	59	47	51	44	44				
WHT	44			38							
FRL	35	44	57	45	51	47	45				
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	18	49	48	31	64	41	7				
ELL	27	44	48	42	55	38	16				
BLK	33	30		64							
HSP	35	46	49	46	56	33	27				
WHT	42	50		48	62						
FRL	35	45	46	45	57	39	28				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	44
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students

Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement**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?

The school earned a B this year. Subgroup points = 56%
We saw big gains in bottom quartile and learning gains.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The lowest data components from the 2021-2022 school year were students with disabilities with 43 proficiency and Our English Language Learners with a proficiency of 52%.

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 have unfinished learning in all content areas. Students are receiving core instruction on grade level standards and unfinished learning is being addressed through aggressive monitoring and acceleration. Teachers need additional support in instructional practices and content knowledge, as well as a further sense of urgency, to effectively address student deficits in specific standards and provide acceleration.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Overall, our math scores showed the most improvement.
Proficiency = 56%
Learning Gains = 75%
Bottom Quartile = 65%

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

The factors that contributed to this our collaborative planning sessions, data dives, aggressive monitoring and small group instruction. Our resource team provides training, strategies, and coaching cycles to our teachers in order to move their students. We focused on small group instruction along with acceleration. We created a school wide data wall that everyone was able to access. We also used the data wall for triangulation and MTSS Tiered groups.

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

Foundational skills taught with fidelity in grades K-2. Teachers will use lessons from iReady teacher toolbox and Imagine Learning to teach foundational skills to students in grades 3-5. Teachers will need

to teach vocabulary and word work explicitly through many different modes of learning. Our resource team will focus on our deficit areas during weekly planning times. During core instruction, teachers will 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.

Data Driven instruction-Preplanning

Unpacking the new standards in 3rd-5th sessions throughout the year

Data Dives throughout the year to specifically lead teachers through analyzing their data and planning for student success.

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

Strong resource team consisting of reading coach, reading resource, math coach, and MTSS resource. This team will use their expertise to coach and guide students to strengthen the core and small group instruction.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Teachers will leverage effective instructional strategies, standards-aligned tasks, and apply acceleration and scaffolding practices. Evidence collected through aggressive monitoring will be used to make target instructional decisions. Rational: During the Instructional Review, trends noticed were teacher talk vs. student talk. There was a lot of teacher "doing" for the students. We want to focus on giving students the opportunity to work on grade level benchmark independently without so much scaffolding.

Measurable

Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, We will be working towards improving our proficiency.
 Math = 62%
 ELA = 45%
 Science = 50%

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Weekly leadership team meetings will be held to analyze data and adjust next steps. Monthly assessments, iReady diagnostics and informal assessments will be used to measure student progress in math. F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring, Benchmark assessments, iReady diagnostic, Achieve 3000 level sets, Wonders Spotlight and Unit Assessments will be use monitor student progress in ELA. Science growth will be measured through formative assessments, mini weekly assessments, and informal assessments. Resource Team will check-in weekly with Administration during "Admin Meetings" and monitor progress with student data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tamethea Simmons (tamethea.simmons@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Collaborative planning will take place weekly to unpack standards to ensure alignment of tasks and instruction. Data analysis will be used to determine the effectiveness of standard aligned instruction and identify students' and teachers' needs. Professional Learning Communities will be used to review data and determine needed scaffolding and acceleration strategies to embed in standards aligned whole and group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/criteria

Consistent and frequent planning, data analysis, and PLCs that are centered around the standards-aligned instruction will provide teachers with clarity and have a high impact on student achievement. According to John Hattie, teacher clarity has a 0.75 effect size.

used for
selecting this
strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will engage in coaching cycles to increase knowledge of standards aligned instruction. The resource team will coach, model, and co-teach lessons to support teachers in implementing standards-aligned instruction. Saturday School will occur in the fall, winter, and spring for 5 days/sessions each season.

Person Responsible Tamethea Simmons (tamethea.simmons@hcps.net)

Resource teachers will facilitate on site of professional development around scaffolding strategies, acceleration, and other identified needs to build capacity around standards-aligned instruction.

Person Responsible Tamethea Simmons (tamethea.simmons@hcps.net)

Communicate with all stakeholders what standard aligned instruction looks like to better support students at home.

Person Responsible Tamethea Simmons (tamethea.simmons@hcps.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	<p>Students have started to focus on deficits rather than strengths, forming negative self-perceptions. Implementation of social distancing guidelines limited students' interaction with their peers and other adults. Teacher's inadvertently limited positive reinforcement of emotional empowerment and academic possibilities. Stakeholders lack of understanding regarding the correlation between social emotional needs and achievement. Stakeholders have limited knowledge around strategies to address social emotional needs. Resources for addressing social and emotional needs have not been readily available. Stakeholders are missing the foundational elements needed to support the mental health of themselves and students.</p>
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	<p>Currently, only 43% of Bryan's students believe that they can achieve academic success, as measured by the Panorama Educational Survey. By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, the percentage of students demonstrating a strong belief in self efficacy will increase to 75%.</p>
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	<p>We will maintain a social emotional team of 6 people. The team will lead in continuing the development of a more social emotional school. The team will create and lead professional development, provide resources and expertise around equity and SEL for all stakeholders. Funding is needed to compensate the team for creating and train professional development.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Tamethea Simmons (tamethea.simmons@hcps.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	<p>Professional development will occur on equity and social emotional learning. The instructional leadership team will engage a book study on to lead equity and SEL work in the school.</p>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Teachers will engage in a book study and professional development centered around SEL. Funds are needed to purchase 50 books and supplies. The books "We Got This" by Cornelius Minor, and "This Book is Anti-Racist" by Tiffany Jewell will be purchased.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Teachers in grades K-2 will teach foundational skills with fidelity during their reading block.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Teachers in grades 3-5 will use data to determine the foundational needs of the students and address the areas of deficit in during the reading block.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Spring iReady scores:

K = 73% at or above grade level

1 = 36% at or above grade level

2 = 36% at or above grade level

We will use the new STAR assessments to measure proficiency. 50% of students in grades K-2 will score at the 40th percentile or higher by PM3 in May.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Grades 3-5 Reading FSA: 41% of the students had a level 3 or higher.

Spring iReady Scores:

3 = 40% at or above grade level

4 = 37% at or above grade level

5 = 38% at or above grade level

45% of the students in grades 3-5 will show proficiency on PM3 in May.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The students will take the STAR and FAST progress monitoring three times a year. After each administration, we will look at the data and update our data walls. Students will be placed into targeted small groups to work on the areas of focus. We will implement ELP and Saturday school for the students that are receiving tier 2 interventions. During collaborative planning each week, teachers will include DI lessons to the students that need acceleration. By the end of the year, we see an increase in the number of students that are showing proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Simmons, Tamethea, tamethea.simmons@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

EL Education - Many of our students, including most students in the targeted subgroups, have foundational deficits. EL Education addresses foundational gaps in learning in a systematic and sequential format. Additionally, EL Education addresses comprehension needs by exposing students to grade level appropriate text. Through intense scaffolding students are able to comprehend complex text.

iReady - iReady provides adaptive instruction tailored to meet the specific needs of students in all domains of reading. Teachers can use the toolbox and assign specific coursework to students in the areas of need.

Achieve 3000 - Achieve 3000 builds students' comprehension of complex text on their grade level and builds vocabulary through scaffolded support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

All of the selected programs have been in use at Bryan for a few years. The teachers are familiar with the programs and use the programs with fidelity in the classroom. All of our focus areas within ELA have gradually increased with the use of the programs.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Coaching - our Reading coach and reading resource teacher will set up coaching cycles with the ELA teachers to ensure that teachers are using the intervention programs with fidelity during small group instruction.	Simmons, Tamethea, tamethea.simmons@hcps.net
Assessment - we will have regularly scheduled data chats to track the student's progress toward their proficiency goals.	

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Teachers will implement and leverage strategies to address Social Emotional Learning. Through collaboration, goal setting, and reflection, teachers will empower students to affirm their identities, accept and empathize with others, develop autonomy, and become self-aware of their feelings, and monitor their emotions.

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

Maintain the social emotional team of 6 people. The team will lead in continuing the development of a more social emotional school. The team will create and lead professional development, provide resources and expertise around equity and SEL for all stakeholders. Funding is needed to compensate the team for creating and train professional development.

Professional development will occur on equity and social emotional learning. The instructional leadership team will engage a book study on to lead equity and SEL work in the school. Teachers will engage in a book study and professional development centered around SEL. We will purchase 50 books and supplies. The books "We Got This" by Cornelius Minor, and "This Book is Anti-Racist" by Tiffany Jewell will be purchased.

Family engagement nights to educate families on the SEL and academic connection. These nights will also be used to communicate specific strategies for ELL and ESE students