

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Sheehy Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Sheehy Elementary School

6402 N 40TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Delia Gadson Yarbrough

Start Date for this Principal: 1/5/2014

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (43%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: D (38%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Sheehy Elementary School

6402 N 40TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	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	97%

### School Grades History

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

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

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

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

Sheehy will empower students to be great.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 1/5/2014, Delia Gadson Yarbrough

**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.*

**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.*

#### Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

#### Total number of students enrolled at the school

308

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

12

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

6

### 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	53	49	49	59	44	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	289
Attendance below 90 percent	0	24	23	27	24	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	8	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	30	39	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116

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	1	6	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	0	2	3	8	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	5	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/16/2022

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

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**



Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

## 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	27%	53%	56%				32%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						58%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						67%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	28%	50%	50%				39%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	53%						63%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						54%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	26%	59%	59%				38%	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	22%	52%	-30%	58%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	34%	55%	-21%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

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	35%	54%	-19%	62%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	57%	-18%	64%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2022					
	2019	37%	54%	-17%	60%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	35%	51%	-16%	53%	-18%
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	19	40	42	31	44		21				
ELL	20			40							
BLK	27	51	56	25	50	57	22				
HSP	28	71		40	65						
FRL	26	52	58	27	52	58	25				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	9	53	64	12	61	67					
ELL	15			23							
BLK	17	39	64	20	29	50	15				
HSP	28			22							
FRL	18	37	53	21	30	47	18				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	4	42		17	83						
ELL	36	83		38	55						
BLK	29	53	59	37	59	50	35				
HSP	42	91		45	70						
FRL	31	59	67	38	62	54	34				

### 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	41
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	51
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
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?**

During the 2021-2022 school year, Sheehy Elementary saw gains across all grade levels and content areas. The school had a total gain of 71 points, earning the school a state grade of a C. In reading the percentage of students that scored a Level 3 or higher in ELA was 27% which was an increase of 8 from the previous year. In Math, the percentage of students scoring a 3 and above was 28%, which was an increase of 7 points from the previous year. In Science, 26% of our fifth graders scored a Level 3 or above which was an increase of 8 points. ELA gains increased by 16 points, Math gains increased by 22 points. ELA bottom quartile increased by 2 points, and Math Bottom quartile increased by 8 points.

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

Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners were the two subgroups with the highest need for improvement. During the 21-22 school year Students with Disabilities proficiency rate was 33% with a rate below 41% for the past 3 years. During the 21-22 school year English Language Learners' proficiency rate was 39%.

#### **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. Although they may be making gains, they are still not reaching proficiency. They are receiving on grade level core instruction. Teachers will benefit from additional support with targeted strategies to use with both of these subgroups during small group instruction.

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

Both Math and ELA had comparable proficiency rates and gains.

Math Proficiency = 28%

ELA Proficiency = 27%

Math BQ = 58%

ELA BQ = 58%

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

Factors that contributed to these gains focused on collaborative planning, data dives, goal setting, and small group targeted instruction.

#### **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 for our ELL students. In grades 3 - 5 vocabulary and word work lessons need to be implemented with fidelity.

**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.**

iReady Toolbox resources  
Vocabulary and word work PD  
Foundational skills focusing on phonics  
Data Driven Instructional Planning  
Unpacking new standards/benchmarks throughout the year  
SWD and ELL strategies

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

Teachers will be used to teach our extended learning program in grades 3 - 5. We will also reach out to regional coaches for support due to our instructional coach vacancies. Our ESOL Resource Teacher will work with all ELL students to support the core learning and to provide support for skills not yet mastered.

### **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 that will ensure there is teacher clarity, standards-aligned tasks, and checks for comprehension. During baseline walkthroughs Teacher clarity was identified as an area of critical need. The goal is for teachers to provide verbal and visual learning targets to students so they are able to answer the following three questions: What am I learning? Why am I learning it? and How will I know when I have learned it? A focus on learning targets and their alignment to the instructional tasks and checks for understanding will be a focus during collaborative planning to ensure tasks are aligned to the rigor of the grade level benchmark.

**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 work to increase the following areas:  
 ELA Proficiency - 30%  
 Math Proficiency - 30%  
 Science Proficiency - 30%

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

Weekly leadership meetings will be held to analyze data and adjust next steps. Monthly assessments,, IReady diagnostics, progress monitoring assessments, and informal assessments will be used to measure student progress towards proficiency across content areas. Data Dives and goal setting sessions will follow each diagnostic, unit, and Progress Monitoring assessment period.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Delia Gadson Yarbrough (delia.gadson-yarbrough@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 benchmarks and ensure alignment of tasks to the rigor of the grade level benchmarks.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Collaborative Planning is needed to ensure alignment the rigor of the grade level benchmark. Planning will focus on establishing the learning target based on the benchmark and ensuring the task and checks for understanding are all aligned. All of

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**

**Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.** these components support the importance of Teacher Clarity which has a .75 effect size according John Hattie.

**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.

Weekly Collaborative Planning time scheduled by content for each grade level.

Wednesday - Math

Thursday - ELA

Friday - Science

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

Unpacking of the grade level benchmark (focus standard) and collaboratively writing the Learning Target and Success Criteria to align to the rigor of the grade level benchmark.

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

On site professional development will be developed based on needs gathered from trend data based on walkthroughs that support our Instructional Priorities. Topics will include: Teacher Clarity, Learning Targets, Checks for Understanding.

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

Weekly walkthroughs will be conducted by AP and Principal to gather trend data to report back to ILT to determine needs and movement to phase two of instructional priorities.

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



## #2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

### Monitoring:

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

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

### Evidence-based Strategy:

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

### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria 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.

*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

Students will be assessed in September using baseline assessments. Data will be analyzed in PLCs to ensure students receive targeted interventions based on needs through the MTSS process. Foundational skills lessons will be implemented within the ELA block to ensure student learning gaps are targeted early. Students will use iReady reading to provide additional targeted support. Data will be tracked every two weeks during PLCs to ensure students needs are met. Our VE and ESOL Resource teacher will also provide small group instruction to identified students.

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

Students will be assessed in September using baseline assessments. Data will be analyzed in PLCs to ensure students receive targeted interventions based on needs through the MTSS process. Foundational skills lessons will be implemented within the ELA block to ensure student learning gaps are targeted early. Students will use iReady reading and Achieve 3000 to provide additional targeted support. Data will be tracked every two weeks during PLCs to ensure students needs are met. Our VE and ESOL Resource teacher will also provide small group instruction to identified students.

### **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)**

All students in grades K-2 will achieve their typical growth gains by May 2023 based on the iReady Reading Assessment.

40% of all K-2 students will be on grade level based on the Spring iReady Reading Diagnostic in May.

### **Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

All students in grades 3-5 will achieve their typical growth gains by May 2023 based on the iReady Reading Assessment.

40% of all 3-5 students will be on grade level based on the Spring iReady Reading Diagnostic 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.

iReady diagnostics assessments will take place in September, January, and May.

PLCs will monitor and analyze data every two weeks.

Achieve 3000 Level sets will take place 3 times a year for students in grades 3 - 5.

Wonders unit assessments will also be analyzed to monitor progress.

### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Gadson Yarbrough, Delia, [delia.gadson-yarbrough@hcps.net](mailto:delia.gadson-yarbrough@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?

Students will use iReady Reading in grades K - 5 and Achieve 3000 in grades 3- 5 on a daily basis as part of their Reading Rotations during the ELA block. Students who have phonics deficiencies will receive targeted small group instruction. This is in addition to the grade level (core) curriculum provided using the Wonders Curriculum and iReady tool box resources.

**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?

The evidenced based practices/programs are matched to the reading areas of need for students with reading deficits based on their diagnostic assessments.

iReady toolkit lessons and resources and Achieve 3000 have proven to be successful and are researched based. These will be used for goal setting and student data chats.

**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
Identify students who are not reading on grade level and develop a schedule for support and intervention.	
Assess and analyze diagnostic results to develop a plan of action for intervention (WIN TIME)	Gadson Yarbrough, Delia, delia.gadson-
Group students based on needs and who will provide the interventions. Analyze data every six weeks with PSLT to determine MTSS next steps and response to interventions.	yarbrough@hcps.net

### 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.

Dr. P.L. Sheehy Elementary School builds a positive culture and environment by establishing and promoting our schoolwide expectations to all stakeholders. These guidelines for success were created after analyzing schoolwide behavior and discipline data through the 2019-2020 school year. The guidelines for success are: Be Safe, Be Respectful, and Be Your Best!

Sheehy's Dream Team meets every 4 weeks to promote a positive schoolwide culture and climate at Sheehy. Each member of the team represents a stakeholder group to promote open lines of communication. Feedback is welcome to enhance the learning experience at Sheehy. Our Student Services Team provides services, support, and resources to our families. We also have a food pantry that is open for all families.

Attendance is a focus area this school year. Our goal is to increase opportunities to meaningfully engage with our families, parents and stakeholders with a focus on improving our schoolwide attendance rate to 96%.

This year the Dream Team will also continue to work with 7 Mindsets to implement the program schoolwide. We will meet regularly with Kirk Jones to promote and monitor progress with the program implementation. A schoolwide time has been designated for Mindset Mondays from 7:40 - 8:00 to introduce the weekly lesson, Teachers will continue to integrate the SEL into instruction throughout the rest of the week. Fidelity checks will be conducted monthly.

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

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

Principal/AP

- Increase school to home communication to target parents' beliefs about the importance of attendance.

- Implement quarterly parent engagement virtual meetings to educate parents about the importance of attendance.

Social Worker

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

School Counselor

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