Graham Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Graham Elementary School

2915 N MASSACHUSETTS AVE, Tampa, FL 33602

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Eric Felder

Start Date for this Principal: 12/21/2021

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
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: D (37%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (40%)
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	CSI
* 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

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)	**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	93%

School Grades History

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

Create an Environment where Every Child is Successful.

Provide the school's vision statement.

SUCCESS is the Only Option.

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
Felder, Eric	Principal	Provide strategic direction to create an environment for all students and faculty to be successful.
Kagel, Stacie	Assistant Principal	Provide strategic direction to create an environment for all students and faculty to be successful.
Flaherty, Meghan	Reading Coach	Monitor, coach and plan ELA instruction.
Anderson, Chris	Math Coach	Monitor and coach instruction.
Hunter, Audra	SAC Member	5th grade math and science teacher. SAC chair.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 12/21/2021, Eric Felder

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.*
0

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.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
16

Total number of students enrolled at the school

210

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

9

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

9

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	25	36	36	41	32	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	203
Attendance below 90 percent	0	23	12	16	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	17	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	1	0	5	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/26/2022

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	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

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	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

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	21%	53%	56%				29%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	45%						51%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						64%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	18%	50%	50%				37%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	52%						50%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						63%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	11%	59%	59%				26%	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	16%	52%	-36%	58%	-42%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	55%	-22%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2022					
	2019	30%	54%	-24%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

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	39%	54%	-15%	62%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	30%	57%	-27%	64%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	23%	51%	-28%	53%	-30%
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	40			27						
ELL											
BLK	15	41	57	14	47	54	4				
HSP	31			19							
FRL	20	44	59	17	52	56	11				

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				

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	35
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	20
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	282
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	20
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	25
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Core instruction needs to strengthen as indicated by proficiency rate. Grades 3, 4, and 5 did not reach 50% proficiency for reading, math or science. TRENDS: Grades 3, 4, and 5 have not reach 50% proficiency for reading, math or science in the past 3 years. Our ESSA subgroups of SWD, ED, Black, Hispanic and ELL have not reach 50% proficiency for reading, math or science in the past 3 years.

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

The greatest need for improvement is our proficiency in Science; we maintained 11%, showing no growth.

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

Contributing factors include lack of science coach for intense planning, have one teacher in grade 5 teaching science and she took FMLA.

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

During the 2020-2021 school year, B. C. Graham did not have enough students in the bottom quartile to give a score. During the 2021- 2022 school year, ELA showed 59% growth in the bottom quartile and Math showed 56% growth in the bottom quartile. In addition, learning gains in math increased from 8% to 52% showing a 44% gain.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement include tracking students' progress monitoring assessments in math and reading, planning for small group intervention groups, common planning and push in groups by resource and administration to reteach.

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

Common planning time is during the day, learning targets are posted, ELP and aggressive monitoring strategies.

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.

A master schedule of common planning times with resource is established. Our school's instructional priorities are in 2 phases. These 2 phases allow us to train, practice, understand and implement intentional learning targets before moving into aggressive monitoring strategies. : Instructional Priorities: 1- Teachers will deliver instruction that demonstrates clarity around the intended lesson outcomes. 2- Teachers will aggressively monitor student progress towards standards mastery an provide timely feedback.

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.

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.	FSA indicates that proficient performance for 2021-2022 school year was Math 18%, ELA 21%, and Science 11%. B. C. Graham has 13 homeroom units K-5; of those 13 units one is unfilled, 4 teachers are new to B. C. Graham and 10 teachers are new to their grade level and/or content area. This data makes walk throughs by academic coaches and administration with on the ground coaching and immediate feedback important to instructional practice including planning needs.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our 2022- 2023 PM/FAST ELA data will improve by 10% in proficiency, Science data will improve by 14% and our PM/FAST Math data will improve by 10% in proficiency.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Teachers will leave ELA common planning with a plan to progress monitor the benchmarks for the week. Teachers will leave Math common planning had worked a plan to progress monitor the benchmarks for the math benchmarks for the week. - This is Stage 2- Day 45-90.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eric Felder (eric.felder@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Doug Fisher's "Feedback is .74 effect size" and aggressive monitoring by teachers and coaches.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Our students have unfinished learning, we want to use strategies to accelerate learning not just remediate their learning.

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.

1. Training for all instructional staff on what is aggressive monitoring Teachers will know data kept and discussed by ESSA groups (Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD) and will be able to progress monitor

them. All instructional staff will learn to what is aggressive monitoring, how to plan for aggressive monitoring and why aggressive monitoring is important to moving instruction forward daily. (Training)

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

2. Training for all instructional staff in Data Driven Instruction with a focus on how to aggressively monitor during Q2. An overall training in faculty meeting and then carried into weekly common planning with the planning of an exemplar. (Training) (Teacher Feedback on exemplar)

Person Responsible   Stacie Kagel (stacie.kagel@hcps.net)

3. 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. (Student Feedback)

Person Responsible   Meghan Flaherty (meghan.flaherty@hcps.net)

4. Aggressive monitoring will be planned weekly during common grade level content planning.

Person Responsible   Courtney Hayman (courtney.hayman@hcps.net)

5. Weekly walk throughs with feedback to teachers will occur around the work on aggressive monitoring starting quarter 2. (Teacher feedback)

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	FSA indicates that proficient performance for 2021-2022 school year was Math 18%, ELA 21%, and Science 11%. B. C. Graham has 13 homeroom units K-5; of those 13 units one is unfilled, 4 teachers are new to B. C. Graham and 10 teachers are new to their grade level and/or content area. This data makes walk throughs by academic coaches and administration with on the ground coaching and immediate feedback important to instructional practice including planning needs.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Teachers will post learning targets to use to refer learning "what? why? and how?" with fidelity by September 2022. Teachers will leave ELA common planning with an exemplar for the week. Teachers will leave Math common planning had worked an exemplar problem for the week
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Teachers will understand the content and post learning targets for all areas daily. Lesson target and success criteria will be posted and explicitly states the what, why and how (the how should not just be the task but the success criteria that goes along with it) (.75)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacie Kagel-Hothem (stacie.kagel-hothem@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	According to Hattie and Fisher, the effect size of students setting challenge goals is .59.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Teachers need to be able to explain to students what and why of their learning targets daily. Teachers will develop the practice of showing students exemplars for their work. Students engage in conversations about their learning via collaborative structures(.82)

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.

1- Preplanning training by principal of learning target importance and expectation schoolwide as our first instructional priority.

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

2- Common planning time built into the master schedule during the day

Person Responsible	Stacie Kagel (stacie.kagel@hcps.net)

3- Weekly common content planning time with school or district content coach.

Person Responsible	Courtney Hayman (courtney.hayman@hcps.net)

4- Feedback to instructional staff on their posted learning targets through coaching and instructional walks.

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

5- Instructional priorities developed to move instruction forward with staff along with look fors.

Person Responsible	Stacie Kagel (stacie.kagel@hcps.net)

6- Electronic walk through form created by administration to track data and performance to reflect on our practice.

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

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

Extended common planning time (50 minutes daily) facilitated by instructional coached in master schedule to stack benchmarks, develop learning targets and success criteria, deepening understanding of BEST instructional benchmarks, teaching practices and student application of their new learning. These practices will be enhanced by scheduled coaching cycle. As a result of common planning, teachers will post learning targets that state the what, why and how along with developing an exemplar for progress monitoring.

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

Extended common planning time (50 minutes daily) facilitated by instructional coached in master schedule to stack benchmarks, develop learning targets and success criteria, deepening understanding of BEST instructional benchmarks, teaching practices and student application of their new learning. These practices will be enhanced by scheduled coaching cycle. As a result of common planning, teachers will post learning targets that state the what, why and how along with developing an exemplar for progress monitoring.

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)

Our goals for 2022 - 2023 are that 50% or more of students in grades K, 1, and 2 will test on grade level as measured by STAR 2022- 2023. (Since this is the first year of STAR...)

2021 - 2022 Spring Reading Data on I Ready
K= 63% tested Early, Mid or Above Grade Level
1= 16% tested Early, Mid or Above Grade Level
2= 50% tested Early, Mid or Above Grade Level

2022 - 2023 Spring Reading Goals for I Ready
Raise each grade level by at least 10% (In addition to the STAR data)

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our goals for 2022 - 2023 are that 50% or more of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will test on grade level as measured by FAST 2022- 2023.

2021 - 2022 Spring Reading Data on I Ready
3= 49% tested Early, Mid or Above Grade Level
4= 17% tested Early, Mid or Above Grade Level
5= 26% tested Early, Mid or Above Grade Level

2022 - 2023 Spring Reading Goals for I Ready
Raise each grade level by at least 10% (In addition to the FAST data)

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 school will monitor all data on an electronic data wall and by setting personal reading goals with all students. The reading leadership team members will PLC with the teachers on common data. Plans will be made to revisit benchmarks not mastered.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Felder, Eric, eric.felder@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. §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?

WONDERS as Tier 1, i-Ready as Tier 2, and have SIPPS and/or BLAST foundations, teacher-led skills based groups as Tier 3.

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?

85.5% 3-5 learners are at least one grade below state's definition of proficiency according to 21-22 Spring FSA data.

56.4% K-5 learners are at least one grade level below as readers according to the 21-22 Spring i-Ready diagnostic data.

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 Leadership: 1- Common Planning Team with Resource- ESE, ELL Resource teachers will attend Common planning times. 2- ILT- with ELA teachers 3- Leadership Meeting Weekly to discuss trends and data-Data will be kept and discussed by ESSA groups (Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD) 4- Tiered teachers support Literacy Coaching: 1- Common Planning Weekly 2-PLC with Common Assessment Data- Data will be kept and discussed by ESSA groups (Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD) 3- Coaching Cycles Assessment: 1-PM1 STAR and FAST 2-IReady Diagnostics in the Fall, Winter and Spring 3- PLC on common data 4-WONDERS screeners/Easy CBM and spotlight checks to progress monitor depending upon student need Professional Learning: 1- ILT with ELA teachers 2- PD based on walk through data 3- In the Moment Coaching by Administration and Coaches 4- Intentional Coaching Cycles 5- Action Plan to support Tier 3 Teachers	Felder, Eric, eric.felder@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.

B. C. Graham has a clear vision and mission for building a positive school culture. B. C. Graham uses the PBIS system to recognize and reward students' effort. B.C. Graham uses schoolwide expectations for procedures in the classroom and in common areas. All student has been trained on using Social Emotional Learning strategies in everyday lessons. Our school will also participate in the 7 Mindsets grant.

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

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. As our school receives training in 7 Mindsets, we will implement class morning meetings.