

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# James Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>22</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>22</b> |

# James Elementary School

4302 E ELLICOTT ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Louis Murphy

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2020

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: F (22%)<br>2017-18: F (29%)<br>2016-17: D (39%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Table of Contents

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>22</b> |

## James Elementary School

4302 E ELLICOTT ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 94%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 97%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade |         | F       | F       | F       |

### 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.

Clemmie Ross James Academy will provide a safe nurturing environment that will instill social skills and academic excellence.

#### 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:

Clemmie Ross James Academy will empower today's students to become tomorrow's leaders.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name            | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| Bennett, Nicole | Principal           | The principal is responsible for the overall direction of the school, including academic and excellence and overall positive school climate. This includes progress monitoring, supervising content coaches and the overall curriculum, and successful implementation of behavior systems.                  |
| Cooley, Jeffrey | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal is responsible to support the overall direction of the school, including academic and excellence and overall positive school climate. This includes progress monitoring, supervising content coaches and the overall curriculum, and successful implementation of behavior systems. |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 6/15/2020, Louis 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.*

1

**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.*

9

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

32

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

490

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

5

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

1

**Demographic Data****Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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                              | 61          | 55 | 53 | 77 | 58 | 74 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 378 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 22          | 14 | 11 | 18 | 14 | 19 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 98  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 1  | 3  | 2  | 4  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 10 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10  |       |
| 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  | 70 | 28 | 36 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 134 |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 78 | 31 | 48 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 157 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0  | 1  | 14 | 36 | 31 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 112 |       |

**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           | 3 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |

**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 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| 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**

Wednesday 9/29/2021

**2020-21 - 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               | 57          | 68 | 69 | 77 | 81 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 403   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 18          | 29 | 21 | 23 | 31 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 140   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| 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 ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 41    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |

**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 | 1 | 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     | 5           | 12 | 2 | 17 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 54    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**2020-21 - 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               | 57          | 68 | 69 | 77 | 81 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 403   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 18          | 29 | 21 | 23 | 31 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 140   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| 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 ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 41    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |

**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 | 1 | 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     | 5           | 12 | 2 | 17 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 54    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 17%    | 52%      | 57%   | 24%    | 52%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 30%    | 55%      | 58%   | 33%    | 52%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 41%    | 50%      | 53%   | 35%    | 46%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 14%    | 54%      | 63%   | 27%    | 55%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 14%    | 57%      | 62%   | 36%    | 57%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 22%    | 46%      | 51%   | 33%    | 44%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 16%    | 50%      | 53%   | 18%    | 51%      | 55%   |

**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 |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 9%     | 52%      | -43%                       | 58%   | -49%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 13%    | 55%      | -42%                       | 58%   | -45%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 20%    | 54%      | -34%                       | 56%   | -36%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -13%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 14%    | 54%      | -40%                       | 62%   | -48%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 2019 | 11%    | 57%      | -46%                       | 64%   | -53%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -14%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 5%     | 54%      | -49%                       | 60%   | -55%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -11%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 11%    | 51%      | -40%                       | 53%   | -42%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

For ELA and Math we used iReady to progress monitor. For Science we used the district Baseline, Midyear, and Form 3.

| Grade 1               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 8    | 18     | 34     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      | 14     | 29     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 5    | 5      | 14     |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      | 14     | 29     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 10   | 18     | 43     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |      | 20     | 100    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 3    | 13     | 30     |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      | 20     | 100    |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

| Grade 2                  |                               |      |        |        |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 22   | 31     | 39     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 20   | 25     | 38     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 14   | 7      | 12     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 20   | 25     | 38     |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 7    | 19     | 31     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 16   | 25     | 38     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 11   | 7      | 2      |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 16   | 25     | 38     |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
| Grade 3                  |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students                  | 30   | 36     | 47     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 34   | 23     | 50     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 18   | 22     | 28     |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 32   | 24     | 55     |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students                  | 4    | 8      | 26     |
|                          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 10   | 8      | 23     |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities | 3    | 5      | 4      |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 13   | 11     | 29     |
|                          |                               |      |        |        |

| Grade 4               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 40   | 44     | 44     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 27   | 30     | 32     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 28   | 31     | 31     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 27   | 30     | 33     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 4    | 19     | 23     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 7    | 17     | 19     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 1    | 4      | 6      |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 7    | 16     | 18     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
| Grade 5               |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 38   | 45     | 48     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 37   | 41     | 46     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 33   | 41     | 43     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 37   | 41     | 46     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 6    | 8      | 11     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 33   | 38     | 38     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 9    | 11     | 10     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 3    | 0      | 2      |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               | 7.69 |        | 45     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 7.69 |        | 45     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |      |        |        |
|                       | English Language Learners  |      |        |        |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| <b>2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2019-20</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2019-20</b> |
| SWD  | 11              | 23            |                    | 16               | 23             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 11              |               |                    | 18               | 20             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 17              | 29            | 33                 | 16               | 27             | 30                  | 11              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 17              |               |                    | 17               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 19              | 38            | 47                 | 15               | 25             | 29                  | 9               |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b> |
| SWD  | 22              | 33            | 29                 | 22               | 30             | 27                  | 25              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 6               | 23            |                    | 10               | 14             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 16              | 28            | 43                 | 13               | 14             | 23                  | 12              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 23              | 30            |                    | 18               | 13             |                     | 30              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 10              |               |                    | 30               |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 17              | 30            | 41                 | 14               | 14             | 22                  | 16              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b> |
| SWD  | 15              | 31            | 27                 | 20               | 38             | 24                  | 27              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 28              | 36            |                    | 12               | 53             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 23              | 36            | 40                 | 24               | 35             | 32                  | 14              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 33              | 25            |                    | 39               | 46             |                     | 33              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 24              | 33            | 35                 | 27               | 36             | 33                  | 18              |                |                  |                          |                                |

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 28  |
| 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 | 41  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 224 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 98% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>  |     |

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 18  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      |     |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 23  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| 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%        |     |
| 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%                  |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 23  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| 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%               |     |
| 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%            |     |
| 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%       |     |

| 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%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 28  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

## Analysis

### 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?

Student proficiency in math and reading needs to be increased. Students in the BQ in math and reading did not make one year annual growth on iReady.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math Proficiency 14% and math gains 14%; teachers understanding of the content, lack of consistent small group instruction and planning with integration of standards. Math gains and BQ were significantly below the district and state average.

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

Depth of understanding of on grade level standards. Hired an additional math coach for support in instruction, modeling and lesson planning.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science achievement in 2019 was 16%. Based on district assessments 45% of students in 5th grade were proficient.

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

District planning support. Targeted planning in science focused on grade-level standards.

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

Planning sessions that focus on the HOW when delivering a lesson with emphasis on CRA in math. Data collection to progress monitor and determine coaching and modeling next steps through walkthrough look-for's. Focused professional development to help content building. Content

development that includes modeling and small group instruction. Learning walks where data is used to determine next steps in planning.

**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.**

ELA- the science of reading literacy study. Lesson Closures to determine student understanding of the lesson.

Math- Anticipate, monitor, select, sequence, connecting through the five practices for orchestrating productive mathematics discussions.

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

We will have two math coaches, two RtI resource teachers and one reading resource teacher. These additional supports will be used to pull small groups to decrease achievement gaps and increase capacity with our teachers to enhance tier one instruction. This will create a more sustainable system to address leaning gaps and proficiency needs.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | <p>Description/Instructional Priority: Teachers will plan standards aligned instruction utilizing scaffolding strategies in order to deliver instruction that demonstrates clarity and accelerates students towards the intended lesson outcomes. Teachers will aggressively monitor student progress towards standard mastery and provide timely feedback during student work time.</p> <p>Rationale: Through our walk throughs we identified that teachers lacked clarity of the intended learning outcomes based on the lessons implemented in the classroom, and students lacked an understanding of learning intentions and their success criteria needed for higher achievement. As a result, teachers did not know how to appropriately scaffold students. Additionally, there is a lack of teacher monitoring during the lesson and providing timely feedback to progressive student learning of the standards.</p>  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | <p>Increase Math Gains from 25% to 50%</p> <p>Increase Math BQ Gains from 29% to 60%</p> <p>Increase Science from 9% to 25%</p> <p>Increase ELA Gains from 38% to 55%</p> <p>Increase ELA BQ Gains from 47% to 65%</p>   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | <p>Based on learning walks, we want to see 80% of teachers putting students in small groups with tasks that are aligned to the standard by the end of the 1st nine weeks. In addition, we want to see 75% aggressively monitoring students during independent work time and giving timely and specific feedback. IXL math as well as iReady will be used to monitor student growth. iReady usage and pass rate will be monitored as well as district math monthlies and science and ELA PMA- Form Assessments and Quarterly Assessments.</p>   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | <p>Nicole Bennett (nicole.bennett@hcps.net)</p>  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | <p>Teachers will use student achievement data, student work and on grade level standards aligned task in order to determine effective scaffolding strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-ELA teachers will use the Reading Strategies book by Serravallo and the districts instructional guides to plan for core and small group lessons that accelerate students learning.</li> <li>-Math teachers will use the CRA model as an anchor strategy with in each unit of study. Questioning and discussion strategies will also be utilized to engage students in on grade level tasks.</li> </ul> <p>Teachers will use student achievement data, student work and on grade level standards aligned tasks in order to determine effective ways to aggressively monitor students in order to provide high quality feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Teachers will plan, within each unit of study, when aggressive monitoring should take place and what feedback should be provided. This will occur during students independent practice to ensure high quality practice is occurring.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-</b>                    | <p>According to John Hattie's research, feedback has an effect size of 0.7 and scaffolding 0.82. Small group instruction will support individual needs to accelerate learning.</p>   |

based

**Strategy:**

### Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will utilize effective planning protocols during common planning sessions lead by reading coaches in order to:

- Internalize the focus standards and text/task for the lessons being planned
- Identify scaffolding strategies that are appropriate within each unit of study
- Plan for periods of independent practice where the teacher will aggressively monitor students tasks/ responses and provide feedback
- Plan feedback that needs to be provided
- Ensure student tasks meet the rigor of the standards
- Plan for small group instruction
- \*Administrators will provide feedback to coaches to continue to strength the planning process

**Person Responsible** Nicole Bennett (nicole.bennett@hcps.net)

Teachers will utilize effective planning protocols during common planning sessions lead by math coaches in order to:

- Develop standards aligned tasks for instructional delivery and independent practice
- Task that take students through the CRA model
- Planning for student misconceptions to determine scaffolding strategies needed
- Plan for periods of independent practice where the teacher will aggressively monitor students and provide feedback
- Plan for small group instruction based on misconceptions and student entry points

**Person Responsible** Jeffrey Cooley (jeffrey.cooley@hcps.net)

Coaching cycles will also occur to strengthen teacher practice aligned to formative feedback cycles provide by the school based team. The feedback will build teacher capacity by providing in the moment feedback based on student academic ownership and the rigorous content aligned to the standards from the 4 Principals of Excellent Instruction. Coaching cycles and feedback will incorporate the lessons planned during common planning sessions further evaluate their effectiveness. Changes will occur if lessons being plan do not accelerate student learning of on grade level content. The resource teachers ( reading, math, and RTI) will support the coaching and planning models.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Bennett (nicole.bennett@hcps.net)

Initial and ongoing professional development will occur on instructional priorities and as needed based on walkthrough trends. PD will focus on scaffolding strategies, aggressive monitoring, data usage (DDI), and content development in reading, math and science. Content coaches in collaboration with Admin will develop and delivery the professional development opportunities. Professional development will address needs generated during planning sessions based on teachers content needs.

**Person Responsible** Nicole Bennett (nicole.bennett@hcps.net)

**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** We will implement a PBIS Tier 1 Behavior program. Discipline data reflects a decreased number of referrals from the previous year (89 to 35), however we need to continue to maintain that decrease. There is a need for a program that will help improve and provide incentives for behavior.

**Measurable Outcome:** Decrease the number of students with referrals from 27 students to 25 students and increase attendance from 88% to 89%.

**Monitoring:** Monthly PBIS fidelity walks to monitor implementation.  
Student Services Team Meetings to discuss the number of students with referrals or behavior infractions.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Nicole Bennett (nicole.bennett@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** PBIS fidelity walks.  
In PSLT and PLC, we will check behavior tracker data to determine trends in behavior to decrease the number of students with referrals.  
Implement PBIS Rewards and provide PD to teachers as needed based on observation data.  
Develop an attendance incentive program for students that rewards for daily, weekly, and monthly attendance.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Help decrease behaviors and promote positive interactions between students and staff.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Provide PD on PBIS, CHAMPS, and the House System  
Provide PD on PBIS Rewards  
Provide monthly behavior data to the staff which includes behavior tracker data, referrals etc.  
Provide PD on Closing the Attitude Gap

**Person Responsible** Nicole Bennett (nicole.bennett@hcps.net)

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** 6 ESSA subgroups fell below 41%. This includes, African American, Economically Disadvantaged, White, Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, and English Language Learners. This is the makeup of our student population and has a direct impact on schoolwide data.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase ESSA subgroup percentages to the following:  
 African American increase from 23% to 41%  
 Hispanic increase from 28% to 41%  
 Economically Disadvantaged Increase from 25% to 41%  
 Students with Disabilities increase from 27% to 41%  
 English Language Learners from 20% to 41%  
 Based on learning walks we want to see 80% of teachers putting students in small groups with tasks that are aligned to the standard by the end of the 1st nine weeks.

**Monitoring:** School Leadership Team will conduct learning walks and observations.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Nicole Bennett (nicole.bennett@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Create iReady subgroups to progress monitor usage and passage rates and review data monthly.  
 Increase teacher understanding of small group instruction both within math and ELA blocks  
 Adjusting iReady lessons to meet the needs of individual students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** iReady is a research-based program that can be utilized to set up specific groups in order to progress monitor based on Diagnostic assessments, usage rates (45 minutes weekly) and passage rates of 70% or higher on lessons.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Monitoring of iReady usage and passage rates  
 Monitoring data from common assessments to address what standards will be addressed  
 Intentional, targeted grouping of students  
 Restructuring planning and PLCs so teachers walk away with next steps to guide support for subgroups of students

**Person Responsible** Jeffrey Cooley (jeffrey.cooley@hcps.net)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

Description/Instructional Priority: Teachers will plan standards aligned instruction utilizing scaffolding strategies in order to deliver instruction that demonstrates clarity and accelerates students towards the intended lesson outcomes. Teachers will aggressively monitor student progress towards standard mastery and provide timely feedback during student work time.

Rationale: Through our walk throughs we identified that teachers lacked clarity of the intended learning outcomes based on the lessons implemented in the classroom, and students lacked an understanding of learning intentions and their success criteria needed for higher achievement. As a result, teachers did not know how to appropriately scaffold students. Additionally, there is a lack of teacher monitoring during the lesson and providing timely feedback to progressive student learning of the standards.

**Measurable Outcome:**

ELA Proficiency (2020) 20% to (2021) 51%

**Monitoring:**

We want to see 75% aggressively monitoring students during independent work time and giving timely and specific feedback. iReady will be used to monitor student growth. iReady usage and pass rate will be monitored as well as ELA PMA and biweekly assessments- Form Assessments and Quarterly Assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Nicole Bennett (nicole.bennett@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Teachers will use student achievement data, student work and on grade level standards aligned task in order to determine effective scaffolding strategies:

-ELA teachers will use the Reading Strategies book by Serravallo and the districts instructional guides to plan for core and small group lessons that accelerate students learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

According to John Hattie's research, feedback has an effect size of 0.7 and scaffolding 0.82. Small group instruction will support individual needs to accelerate learning.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers will utilize effective planning protocols during common planning sessions lead by reading coaches in order to:

- Internalize the focus standards and text/task for the lessons being planned
  - Identify scaffolding strategies that are appropriate within each unit of study
  - Plan for periods of independent practice where the teacher will aggressively monitor students tasks/ responses and provide feedback
  - Plan feedback that needs to be provided
  - Ensure student tasks meet the rigor of the standards
  - Plan for small group instruction
- \*Administrators will provide feedback to coaches to continue to strength the planning process

**Person Responsible**

Nicole Bennett (nicole.bennett@hcps.net)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**According the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org the average violent behaviors reported was .88 out of 100 students in the state of Florida. James Elementary was 15.7 out of every 100 students in 2019. We have implemented tier I behavior incentives. We will be using the panorama survey as well as monitoring discipline data to determine effectiveness of tier I behavior plan.**

### 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.

James Elementary is striving to establish a school culture of respect, responsibility, and safety. To achieve these goals, professional developments centered around school climate, culture, SEL, and motivating our students have been scheduled. We are also implementing programs such as BETA and GEMS Leadership Club. Men of Vision is also being reintroduced on campus. SEL is impeded throughout the instructional day. Students also receive collegiate exposure through the representation of collegiate logos throughout the school.

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

School guidance counselor - BETA Club  
 School guidance counselor and Media Specialist - GEMS Leadership Club  
 Assistant Principal - Men of Vision  
 RTI Resource - Positive Behavior Intervention Support

### Part V: Budget

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

|   |        |   |              |
|---|--------|---|--------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | \$184,540.94 |
|---|--------|---|--------------|



|  | Function | Object                          | Budget Focus  | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22     |
|--|----------|---------------------------------|---|----------------|-----|-------------|
|  | 5100     | 120-Classroom Teachers          | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$49,350.14 |
|  |          |                                 | Notes: *Math Resource Teacher will support teachers and new teacher math academy through specific coaching cycles from classroom observation data. Develop the before-during-after common planning protocol to support teacher clarity. Lead common planning sessions for standards-based planning and implementation. Support instruction during vacancies. Provide trainings for faculty as well student-family engagement support sessions around literacy in math. Support students and teachers for FSA increase in achievement level, bottom quartile, and gains, teacher retention in math, semester exam data. Utilize small instructional groups to intensely support student growth in the spring semester. |                |     |             |
|  | 5100     | 210-Retirement                  | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$5,339.68  |
|  |          |                                 | Notes: *Math Resource Teacher Retirement (10%)  |                |     |             |
|  | 5100     | 220-Social Security             | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$3,059.71  |
|  |          |                                 | Notes: *Math Resource Teacher FICA (6.2%)   |                |     |             |
|  | 5100     | 220-Social Security             | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$715.58    |
|  |          |                                 | Notes: *Math Resource Teacher Medicare (1.45%)  |                |     |             |
|  | 5100     | 230-Group Insurance             | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$9,376.53  |
|  |          |                                 | Notes: *Math Resource Teacher Health and Life Insurance (19%)   |                |     |             |
|  | 5100     | 240-Workers Compensation        | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$251.69    |
|  |          |                                 | Notes: *Math Resource Teacher Workers Comp (.51%)   |                |     |             |
|  | 5100     | 510-Supplies                    | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$12,080.40 |
|  |          |                                 | Notes: The school will purchase supplies for teachers to support students with their learning. The school will purchase notebook paper, pens, pencils, notebooks, file folders, two pocket folders, dividers, colored pencils, highlighters, chart paper, composition notebooks, and markers.   |                |     |             |
|  | 5100     | 519-Technology-Related Supplies | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$2,407.35  |
|  |          |                                 | Notes: Purchase toner, flash drives, surge protectors, and headphones for K-5 teachers for academic usage.  |                |     |             |
|  | 5100     | 120-Classroom Teachers          | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$50,245.02 |
|  |          |                                 | Notes: RTI Resource Teacher is a new position at James. The RTI teacher will provide model and coach teachers through the MTSS process. The teacher will provide specific interventions for Tier 2/3 students, assist teachers in establishing strong Tier 1 program, lead staff PD for behavior and academic interventions, PLCs and restorative practices.  |                |     |             |
|  | 5100     | 210-Retirement                  | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$5,436.51  |
|  |          |                                 | Notes: RTI Resource Teacher Retirement 10.82%   |                |     |             |
|  | 5100     | 220-Social Security             | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG         |     | \$3,115.19  |
|  |          |                                 | Notes: RTI Resource Teacher FICA 6.2%   |                |     |             |

|          |               |   |  |                |     |                    |
|----------|---------------|---|--|----------------|-----|--------------------|
|          | 5100          | 220-Social Security   | 4747 - James Elementary School   | UniSIG         |     | \$728.55           |
|          |               |   | Notes: RTI Resource Teacher Medicare 1.45%   |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 230-Group Insurance   | 4747 - James Elementary School   | UniSIG         |     | \$9,356.55         |
|          |               |   | Notes: RTI Resource Teacher Health and Life Insurance 19%  |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 240-Workers Compensation  | 4747 - James Elementary School   | UniSIG         |     | \$256.22           |
|          |               |   | Notes: RTI Resource Teacher Workers Comp .51%  |                |     |                    |
|          | 6300          | 120-Classroom Teachers  | 4747 - James Elementary School   | UniSIG         |     | \$22,559.94        |
|          |               |   | Notes: Instructional Duties Added Stipends   |                |     |                    |
|          | 6300          | 210-Retirement  | 4747 - James Elementary School   | UniSIG         |     | \$2,440.98         |
|          |               |   | Notes: Instructional Duties Added - Retirement (10%)   |                |     |                    |
|          | 6300          | 220-Social Security   | 4747 - James Elementary School   | UniSIG         |     | \$1,398.72         |
|          |               |   | Notes: Instructional Duties Added - FICA (6.2%)  |                |     |                    |
|          | 6300          | 220-Social Security   | 4747 - James Elementary School   | UniSIG         |     | \$327.12           |
|          |               |   | Notes: Instructional Duties Added -Medicare (1.45%)  |                |     |                    |
|          | 6300          | 240-Workers Compensation  | 4747 - James Elementary School   | UniSIG         |     | \$115.06           |
|          |               |   | Notes: Instructional Duties Added - Workers Comp (.51%)  |                |     |                    |
|          | 5100          | 649-Technology-Related Noncapitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment | 4747 - James Elementary School   | UniSIG         |     | \$5,980.00         |
|          |               |   | Notes: Purchase 20 document cameras for K-5 classrooms. The document cameras will be used in each classroom to have teachers and students participate in highly engaging standards aligned curriculum. The document camera will allow for students to share work and get feedback from their teachers and classmates. The cameras are 299 for 20 classrooms. The teachers will use the document cameras to demonstrate a variety of strategies to use within the lesson as well as demonstrate clarity to students surrounding specific standards. |                |     |                    |
| <b>2</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Discipline</b>            |  |                |     | <b>\$33,703.45</b> |
|          | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus   | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22            |
|          | 6150          | 150-Aides   | 4747 - James Elementary School   | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$16,824.15        |
|          |               |   | Notes: *Parent Liaison will support students and families with their social needs as well as academic needs. The PFE Liaison will work with the student services team to connect families with resources. PFE Liaison will partner with student services to offer monthly parent nights regarding standards-based instruction (ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies) and overall ways families can support their students to experience academic success. Improve culture with families.   |                |     |                    |
|          | 6150          | 210-Retirement  | 4747 - James Elementary School   | UniSIG         | 1.0 | \$1,820.37         |
|          |               |   | Notes: *Parent Liaison Retirement (10%)  |                |     |                    |



|   |        |   |   |        |        |              |
|---|--------|---|---|--------|--------|--------------|
|   | 6150   | 220-Social Security   | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG | 1.0    | \$1,043.10   |
|   |        |   | Notes: *Parent Liaison FICA (6.2%)  |        |        |              |
|   | 6150   | 220-Social Security   | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG | 1.0    | \$243.95     |
|   |        |   | Notes: *Parent Liaison Medicare (1.45%)   |        |        |              |
|   | 6150   | 230-Group Insurance   | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG | 1.0    | \$3,196.59   |
|   |        |   | Notes: *Parent Liaison Health and Life Insurance (19%)  |        |        |              |
|   | 6150   | 240-Workers Compensation  | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG | 1.0    | \$85.80      |
|   |        |   | Notes: *Parent Liaison Workers Comp (.51%)  |        |        |              |
|   | 5100   | 730-Dues and Fees   | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG |        | \$5,250.00   |
|   |        |   | Notes: To allow students to participate in grade level appropriate experiences to expand their knowledge of specific standards through hands-on experiences. K-3 will attend Lowry Park supporting the following standards:SC.K.N.1.2, SC.1.L.14.3, SC.1.L.17.1, SC.1.N.1.1, SC.1.N.1.4, SC.2.L.17.1, SC.2.N.1.1, SC.2.N.1.3. The cost is \$15.00 per student for a total of 350 students in K-3. |        |        |              |
|   | 7800   | 390-Other Purchased Services  | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG |        | \$1,200.00   |
|   |        |   | Notes: Transportation to ZooTampa (Lowry Park) for K-3 grade students. 8 buses at 150 per bus.  |        |        |              |
|   | 5100   | 648-Technology-Related Capitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment    | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG |        | \$2,847.49   |
|   |        |   | Notes: Purchase 2 Newline display boards to be placed into 2 classrooms in grades 5th grade. The display boards will enhance teaching in the classrooms for teachers. It will allow opportunities for students to enhance their learning through technology.  |        |        |              |
|   | 5100   | 649-Technology-Related Noncapitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment | 4747 - James Elementary School  | UniSIG |        | \$1,192.00   |
|   |        |   | Notes: Purchase 2 display stands for the Newline boards.  |        |        |              |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups          |   |        |        | \$0.00       |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA                             |   |        |        | \$0.00       |
|   |        |   |   |        | Total: | \$228,950.00 |