Bryan Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Bryan Elementary School

2006 W OAK AVE, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;   2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;   3. Have a school grade of D or F; or   4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

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.
Barone, Lara	Assistant 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.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The process for involving stakeholders includes the Bryan Administrative, Resource, Leadership, Teacher, Staff, and SAC Teams all have opportunities to review and suggest revisions and additions to the SIP including, but not limited to action steps and goals.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The Bryan SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap within monthly SAC meetings and weekly Leadership meeting. Action steps will be reviewed throughout the school year and will be revised as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement and student success.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	89%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	34	31	26	14	24	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	2	6	0	0	0	11
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	45	20	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	38	24	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	45	20	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	38	24	0	0	0	0	62
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	5	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	8	15	0	0	0	25

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	33	26	22	18	160	0	0	0	260
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	32	28	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	24	24	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	6	12	12	14	12	0	0	0	57
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	33	26	22	18	160	0	0	0	260
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	32	28	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	24	24	0	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	5	3	9	1	12	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	39	50	53	42	53	56	35		
ELA Learning Gains				59			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			57		
Math Achievement*	47	56	59	56	50	50	46		
Math Learning Gains				75			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			47		
Science Achievement*	42	50	54	44	59	59	47		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	66	59	59	58			55		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	236
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	24	Yes	1	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	22	Yes	1	1
HSP	47			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	46			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	45			
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	59			
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	57			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	39			47			42					66
SWD	15			22			12				5	48
ELL	32			46			36				5	66
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			13			27				3	
HSP	36			49			45				5	65
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	64			58							3	
FRL	37			46			42				5	65

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	42	59	53	56	75	65	44					58
SWD	9	48	60	34	69	67	13					58
ELL	39	59	48	53	70	57	40					58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47	71		43	75							
HSP	42	58	51	57	74	63	45					57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	27			60								
FRL	42	59	57	56	74	65	41					59

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	35	44	57	46	51	47	47					55
SWD	13	32	45	25	41	32	21					42
ELL	33	40	54	44	51	48	43					55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	34	43	59	47	51	44	44					54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	44			38								
FRL	35	44	57	45	51	47	45					55

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	36%	53%	-17%	54%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	54%	-7%	58%	-11%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	46%	-8%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	40%	55%	-15%	59%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	59%	-12%	61%	-14%
05	2023 - Spring	61%	53%	8%	55%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	42%	47%	-5%	51%	-9%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Overall in the 21/22 school year, the lowest performance was in ELA. 41% of the students in grades 3-5 scored at a level 3 or higher. FAST was a new test that covered the BEST standards. The test was the baseline and it had not been piloted anywhere before it had been given.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Proficiency in math dropped from 56% proficient to 51% proficient. FAST was a new test that covered the BEST standards. The test was the baseline and it had not been piloted anywhere before it had been given.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

3rd grade state data 27% were not proficient and Bryan's data has 43% not proficient. Many of the students at Bryan are ELL students. Vocabulary is typically an area of focus for the students. We changed curriculum from EL to Wonders.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Based on the new FAST test, we did not see improvement in academic performance.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

One of the main concerns that we are continually working on from EWS are attendance and tardies.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Improving proficiency in ELA/Math
Learning gains ELA/Math
Bottom quartile ELA/Math
Improve attendance

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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 2023-2024 school year, We will be working towards improving our proficiency.
Math = 62%
ELA = 50%
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, Bechmark assessments, iReady diagnostic, DIBELS, Wonders Spotlight and Unit Assessments will be used 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 Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. ELP will be implemented fall, winter and spring.

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

By When: Immediately and throughout the year.

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)

By When: By December.

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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 Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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 needs and achievement. Stakeholders have limited knowledge around strategies to address social needs. Resources for addressing social needs have not been readily available. Stakeholders are missing the foundational elements needed to support the mental health of themselves and students.

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

27% of Bryan students feel confident in completing the hardest work assigned in their class. By the end of the year, 40% of the Bryan students will feel confident in completing the hardest work assigned.

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

The Panorama survey will be given 3 times per year. We will monitor the results.
We will maintain a team of people that will work on building the student's confidence. The team will lead in continuing the development of a greater understanding of developing confidence in their students. The team will create and lead professional development, provide resources and expertise around equity for all stakeholders. Funding is needed to compensate the team for creating and train professional development.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tamethea Simmons (tamethea.simmons@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Professional development will occur on equity. The instructional leadership team will engage a book study on to lead equity work in the school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will engage in a book study and professional development. Funds are needed to purchase the books and supplies. The book "We Got This" by Cornelius Minor.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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 related 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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Spring STAR scores:
Star Early Literacy Kindergarten = 63% meeting or exceeding grade level standards
STAR Reading Grade 1 = 51% meeting or exceeding grade level standards

STAR Reading Grade 2 = 58% meeting or exceeding grade level standards
We will use the STAR assessments to measure proficiency. 58% of students in grades K-2 will meet or exceed grade level standards by PM3 in May 2024.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3-5 Reading FAST: 41% of the students scored a level 3 or higher.
Spring FAST Scores:
3rd Grade = 38% at or above grade level
4th Grade = 45% at or above grade level
5th Grade = 37% at or above grade level
50% of the students in grades 3-5 will show proficiency on FAST PM3 in May 2024.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

The students will take the STAR and FAST progress monitoring three times a year. After each administration, we will review the data and update our data walls. Based upon data, students will be placed into targeted small groups to work on the areas of focus. We will implement weekly ELP for students that are receiving Tier 2 interventions. During collaborative planning each week, teachers will plan for DI (Direct Instruction) lessons to meet the needs of students that need acceleration. By the end of the year, we see an increase in overall learning gains for 4th and 5th grade students, in the number of students that are scoring at a level of proficiency of 50% or higher with a targeted focus on our bottom quartile.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Simmons, Tamethea, tamethea.simmons@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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?

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?

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

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

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 outlined programs with fidelity during whole and small group instruction. Assessment - School Leadership, Reading Coach, Reading Resource Teacher, and Classroom Teachers will host regularly scheduled data chats to track student progress towards school proficiency goals.	Simmons, Tamethea, tamethea.simmons@hcps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

A Blackboard Message will be sent to all Bryan stakeholders to share access to SIP, UniSIG budget, and SWP. Access to include printed copies n Bryan office and an electronic copy available for stakeholders who request a copy through school created Google form. Both printed and electronic copies will be available in both English and Spanish.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Bryan Elementary will build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress through F.A.C.E., monthly SAC meetings, monthly PTA meetings, monthly PTA sponsored Family Nights, Parent-Teacher conferences scheduled three times per school year, quarterly Student Progress Alerts, and Report Cards.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Bryan plans to strengthen the academic program in the school by developing benchmark aligned lessons with the support of the school's resource and leadership teams, increase the amount and quality of learning time by providing students with 90 uninterrupted minutes during academic instructional times and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum through before and after school ELP.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No