
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Jackson Elementary School

502 E GILCHRIST ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Melody Murphy

Start Date for this Principal: 1/27/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Jackson Elementary School

502 E GILCHRIST ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	94%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	87%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	D	D

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The staff, parents, and community will inspire and prepare students for a future with endless possibilities through culture building, rigorous instruction and student leadership opportunities.

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:

Jackson students will take ownership of their learning.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wyatt, Dina	Principal	Instructional Leader at Jackson Elementary.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/27/2020, Melody Murphy

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	66	79	89	77	75	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	461
Attendance below 90 percent	12	23	36	17	18	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	11	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	11	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	30	51	31	19	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	11	17	7	2	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	11	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	27%	52%	57%	32%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	55%	58%	44%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	50%	53%	49%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	44%	54%	63%	35%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	57%	62%	45%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	46%	51%	24%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	50%	53%	39%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	22%	52%	-30%	58%	-36%
	2018	35%	53%	-18%	57%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	55%	-22%	58%	-25%
	2018	30%	55%	-25%	56%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	27%	54%	-27%	56%	-29%
	2018	27%	51%	-24%	55%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	37%	54%	-17%	62%	-25%
	2018	47%	55%	-8%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	57%	-10%	64%	-17%
	2018	38%	57%	-19%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	40%	54%	-14%	60%	-20%
	2018	33%	54%	-21%	61%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	33%	51%	-18%	53%	-20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	36%	52%	-16%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	11	46	58	32	46	25	18				
ELL	19	43	61	40	65	43	19				
BLK	17	38	36	24	41	36	14				
HSP	27	44	60	49	66	42	37				
WHT	41	61		53	48		50				
FRL	26	46	53	43	58	40	30				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	6	20	31	19	40	30					
ELL	22	38	32	38	43	27	21				
BLK	15	32	38	20	26		31				
HSP	29	43	33	44	48	23	27				
WHT	54	56		47	44		44				
FRL	29	40	34	38	42	31	32				
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	6	21	31	13	26	9					
ELL	13	35	56	26	36	22	10				
BLK	25	44	46	27	44	29	32				
HSP	27	42	55	34	45	25	36				
WHT	42	50		44	46		46				
FRL	29	44	49	33	42	24	36				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
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	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
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	51
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The ELA achievement level for 2019 showed that only 27% of our students in Grades 3 through 5 were proficient based on the FSA. This is a negative difference of 25% compared to our District, and 30% compared to the state. Our current i-Ready data shows that 40% of our students were at least one year Below Level in Reading based on the most recent diagnostic. The mid-year form data continued to show a deficit in reading proficiency with a rate of 13% with our students enrolled in 3rd through 5th grade.

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

The area that showed the greatest decline based on the FSA data is Reading proficiency. This area dropped by 5% based on the FSA data comparison from 2018 to 2019. This Reading proficiency area continued to show the greatest decline when looking at Form tests used as mid-year data in the Spring of 2020. At that time only 13% of our students in Grades 3 through 5 were projected to score proficiency in Reading.

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.

The area that showed the greatest gap in compared to the state in the spring of 2019 was Reading proficiency. There was a 30% gap compared to the state. Additionally, we performed 19% lower in the areas of Mathematics proficiency and Science proficiency as compared to the state.

A trend that is noticed is that for the most part our students exit Kindergarten ready for 1st grade. The gaps begin during the 1st grade year and continue through the grades. There is a high turnover of staff at Jackson, and this can contribute to the lack of success. Our Reading Coaches work closely with teachers, and this impedes their ability as they continue to add new teachers. There is a lack of building teacher leadership capacity at this site.

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

The area that showed the most improvement based on the FSA data comparison of 2018 and 2019 is the bottom quartile in Reading. There was an increase of 18% in this specific area. The school leadership team has worked to identify the bottom quartile at the beginning of the year and to continually update it throughout the year. The data is shared with teachers and strategies are implemented to support those students in the area of deficit.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

In this area we identified the number of students who are still showing deficits in Reading and Math. We used i-Ready data to identify students scoring a Level 1 on the 2019 assessment. There is a significant number of children below level by 1 or 2 years in Reading and / or Math based on this data.

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

1. Reading Proficiency
2. Small group Standards-based planning
3. Use assessment to drive instruction
4. Support instructional planning to improve learning gains in Reading and Math
5. Implement Cross-Content Learning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our students with disabilities showed a greater deficit in the area of math when looking at the overall learning gains. Additionally, only 11% of our students with disabilities made proficiency in language arts based on the FSA in 2019.

Measurable Outcome: We will monitor progress of our students in mathematics and language arts through formative assessments, common assessments, and i-ready data. Our primary students will also take part in SIPPS, and our intermediate students will have monthly assessments, and standards based small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dina Wyatt (dina.wyatt@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students with disabilities will be pulled in small groups in language arts and / or math based on their specific needs addressed in their IEP.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 1. Coaching as a Vital Component of Standards Based Planning. <https://www.education.pa.gov/Documents/Teachers-Administrators/Instructional%20Coaching%20in%20PA/White%20Paper%20Coaching%20PA.pdf> 2. Using Data to Differentiate Instruction in the Classroom. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/wwc_rti_pg_rec02.pdf 3. Leveled Literacy Interventions https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/InterventionReports/wwc_levelledliteracy_091917.pdf

Action Steps to Implement

Chart student progress from assessment to assessment on Office 365 to see trends. ESE Teachers will be responsible to enter data.

Person Responsible: Dina Wyatt (dina.wyatt@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Communicate with the General Education teachers and make sure that everyone is teaching to the strength of each child. (ESE Teachers will be responsible to have that communication with teachers. General Education teachers will be reminded to review the students' IEP's.

Person Responsible: Dina Wyatt (dina.wyatt@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Use planning time to determine best "next steps" to meet the needs of learners based on their needs. This will support the need for Differentiated Instruction for all learners. ESE Teachers will dialogue with General Education Teachers regularly.

Person Responsible: Dina Wyatt (dina.wyatt@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our black students show a deficit in language arts and mathematics when looking at their overall scores. The bottom quartile of black students in language arts and mathematics showed a similar learning gain as compared to all black children.

Measurable Outcome: We will monitor progress of our students in mathematics and language arts through formative assessments, common assessments, monthly assessments, SIPPS, and i-Ready. Students will work in standards based small groups and instructional leaders will look for specific data that shows a positive trajectory.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will have their progress monitored and pulled into small groups in language arts and / or math based on their specific needs identified with their individual data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 1. Coaching as a Vital Component of Standards Based Planning. <https://www.education.pa.gov/Documents/Teachers-Administrators/Instructional%20Coaching%20in%20PA/White%20Paper%20Coaching%20PA.pdf> 2. Using Data to Differentiate Instruction in the Classroom. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/wwc_rti_pg_rec02.pdf 3. Leveled Literacy Interventions https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/InterventionReports/wwc_levelledliteracy_091917.pdf

Action Steps to Implement

Track student data to identify trends in areas of deficits.

Person Responsible Dina Wyatt (dina.wyatt@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Resource Teachers will meet with General Education teachers to analyze data and look at the best "next steps" to strengthen areas of deficits.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Implement with fidelity the curriculum provided by the district to support standards based teaching in the classroom.

Person Responsible Dina Wyatt (dina.wyatt@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

One of our priorities is to have our reading and math coaches support our teachers with teacher led small group planning. They have focused on supporting grade levels with core instruction, but we recognize the need with supporting our teachers with identifying the needs of children in reading and math. Small group instruction should take place daily and be fluid based on students academic needs in both of these areas.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

There was a recent change in administration at this school. The Assistant Principal started in August 2019, and the principal was appointed January 27, 2020.

The district's climate survey did not have enough of a response, therefore we do not have current data. When possible, staff input is gathered in order to collaborate decisions that are being made.

Jackson has a PBIS system in place. This Positive Behavior Intervention System supports our students and teachers in the classroom. Events are held regularly to motivate students to do their best. We recognize that systems will need to be consistent this next year especially since our children are returning after being out several months due to the pandemic.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00