Jackson Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 8/2/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (48%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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.](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

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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	86%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Murphy, Melody	Principal	Instructional leader, evaluate and observe teachers for effectiveness, coach and mentor staff and students.
Oleskiewicz, Kim	Instructional Media	SAC Chair and media specialist. Mrs. O supports school wide literacy and technology at Jackson, leads the school advisory council, disaggregates student data to ensure student success.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/2/2022, Melody Murphy

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

479

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

10

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

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	81	85	64	87	83	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	31	22	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	38	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	31	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	11	38	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	31	43	72	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	198

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	16	8	17	28	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/23/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	74	67	80	100	63	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
Attendance below 90 percent	1	20	23	33	16	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
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	13	33	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	13	33	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	3	5	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	74	67	80	100	63	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
Attendance below 90 percent	1	20	23	33	16	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
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	13	33	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	13	33	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	3	5	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	24%	53%	56%				27%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						46%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%						53%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	41%	50%	50%				44%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						57%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%						40%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	26%	59%	59%				34%	50%	53%

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

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	22%	52%	-30%	58%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	55%	-22%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
05	2022					
	2019	27%	54%	-27%	56%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	37%	54%	-17%	62%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	47%	57%	-10%	64%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2022					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	33%	51%	-18%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	39	53	20	41	33	16				
ELL	17	49	58	43	64	71	24				
BLK	17	40	62	23	61	64	13				
HSP	23	56	62	47	69	72	30				
WHT	38	33		61	64						
FRL	25	53	65	43	67	62	26				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	13	55	64	13	55	54	13				
ELL	22	48	58	36	53	50	15				
BLK	10	27		13	45						
HSP	28	52	62	45	60	55	31				
WHT	50			41			55				
FRL	26	46	61	35	55	58	30				

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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	37
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	49
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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Trends are showing that students at Jackson are scoring below proficiency level in all core content. Based on iReady and FSA data students did not perform optimally on the Spring assessments.

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

Reading, math and science proficiency.

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

Teachers are not planning lessons that are rigorous and meet the grade level standards. Content planning with coaches to ensure rigorous curriculum is being taught with fidelity by all teachers. Coaches will include aggressive monitoring within their planning with teachers. Coaches will actively model and use side by side coaching to ensure teachers understand how to use aggressive monitoring effectively.

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

Math learning gains and ELA Bottom Quartile gains have shown the most improvement.

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

Teacher attention to small group and prescriptive instruction.

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

Purposeful planning with content coaches, use of aggressive monitoring in the classroom and structured systems to drive meaningful instruction.

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.

Goal-setting with students to identify growth needs, aggressive monitoring training, coaching to improve content planning and implementation of lessons. Acceleration of content learning.

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

Walkthrough data, fidelity checks with coaches and administration that drives the needs of the teachers and students.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our Black/African-American students scored below 41% proficiency for three years based on 2022 FSA data.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	41% of Jackson's Black/African-American students will score a level 3 or higher on the reading, math and science FSA.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	ELA monthly PMAs, Math Monthly assessments and Science PMA will be monitored by teachers, coaches and administration each month with a focus on African-American student results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melody Murphy (melody.murphy@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Content area coaches will plan with teachers to accelerate instruction and to aggressively monitor student work in the classroom. Students will track their learning using data folders to self-monitor their learning through ELA monthly PMAs, Math Monthly assessments and Science PMA. They will also complete two lessons in iReady reading and math with 70% or higher each week.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Coaching and supporting teachers on a daily basis ensures that implementation of rigorous content is being done with fidelity. Experts in each content area can support teachers by ensuring the standards are being addressed with students. Students taking ownership of their data helps them to develop goal setting and helps them to hold themselves accountable for their own learning.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

During planning (all subjects) teachers/coaches will plan questions/miconceptions that will drive student discussion.
PD's will be provided on the following topics: Data Trackers, Feedback, Robust Science Journals, Intentional Group Discussion.
Aggressive monitoring review training during common planning with teachers.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our SWD students scored below 32% proficiency for three years based on 2022 FSA data.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	40% of Jackson's Students with Disabilities will score a level 3 or higher on the reading FSA.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	ELA monthly PMAs will be monitored by teachers, coaches and administration each month with a focus on SWD student results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melody Murphy (melody.murphy@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The reading resource teacher and classroom ELA teachers will plan to accelerate instruction and to aggressively monitor student work in the classroom. Teachers to ensure implementation of rigorous on grade level standards. Students will use iReady reading by completing 2 lessons a week with 2 70% accuracy score to improve foundational skills needed to close the gap for unfinished learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Coaching and supporting teachers on a daily basis ensures that implementation of rigorous content is being done with fidelity. iReady being used with fidelity for at least 45 minutes a week with close monitoring helps students to improve foundational skills needed.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

During planning teachers/coaches will plan questions/misconceptions that will drive student discussion.
PD's will be provided on the following topics: Data Trackers, Feedback, Robust Reading Journals, Intentional Group Discussion.
Aggressive monitoring review training during common planning with teachers.
iReady PD to use diagnostic data to support instruction for SWD.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

66% of Jackson First Grade students were not on track for level 3 proficiency based off of the final iReady
Diagnostic of 2022. The affect this has on student literacy is according to iReady data, 14% of these students are tier 2 students that are in need of remediation of phonics/foundational skills, 44% fall in the tier 3 range
based on this data.

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

Jackson's 4th and 5th Grade students only showed 22% proficiency on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment. The effect this has on student literacy is profound. More students need tier 2 and 3 remediation of foundational skills necessary to comprehend complex grade level text.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Student proficiency will increase by 10% in all areas from the 21-22 school grade data. This will be measured by increases in the percentage of students who are proficient according to iReady, Wonders Screener and STAR assessments. During weekly walkthroughs beginning in October, 50% of the teachers will implement aggressive monitoring during whole group instruction. The data will be used to determine if additional training is needed.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Student proficiency will increase by 10% in all areas from the 21-22 school grade data. This will be measured by increases in the percentage of students who are proficient according to iReady, Achieve 3000 and district based
assessments and FASST. During weekly walkthroughs beginning in October, 50% of the teachers will implement aggressive monitoring during whole group instruction. The data will be used to determine if additional training is needed.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The administrative team will pull monthly reports from all sources to determine student's progress. The administrative team will meet with the students who are not progressing to discuss the data. The administrative
team will conduct walk-throughs to gather and analyze data as it relates to student engagement. By October, 50% of the classroom teachers will implement aggressive monitoring as evidenced by classroom walkthroughs.
Administration will be attend common planning to ensure aggressive monitoring laps/success criteria are embedded into the planned lessons.

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

Murphy, Melody, melody.murphy@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Aggressive monitoring strategies will be implemented with fidelity in all content areas to promote student learning and accountability that is data driven and immediate feedback is given.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Making in the moment observations and about student learning and giving immediate feedback shifts the focus to checking for student mastery of content.
Getting Better Faster- Paul Bambrick-Santoyo

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Teachers will receive professional development on Aggressive Monitoring strategies. During this training, the teachers will have the opportunity to practice these strategies and learn how to develop success criteria and laps.	Murphy, Melody, melody.murphy@hcps.net

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

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. Jackson consults with various
stakeholders through a variety of means to ensure all aspects of our culture and environment are properly addressed for the betterment of all who step foot on campus. We gather information from our TELL data,

Panorama data and hold individual feedback meetings with teachers and ILT to recognize our areas of strength and our areas which we need work on. This information is then reflected on and systems are put into place to ensure that all voices and concerns are heard. Giving all stakeholders a voice fosters a positive environment that is conducive to a positive school environment.

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

Stakeholder groups that are an integral part of the school include the teachers, students, families of the students, volunteers, and school board members. Broader stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.
Stakeholders play a key part in school performance and addressing equity. Our PTA is comprised of any parents and family members that work together to hold events that build a sense of community and belonging with our students and staff. They also work with our Parent Family Engagement Liaison to meet the needs of our parents to connect with and understand the curricular aspect of their children. Through our Parent Family Engagement we will be hosting a PBIS Night, Tacos and Technology, STEM night, and more.
Students also have the opportunity to participate in activities such as Running Club, Art Club, Music Ensembles, Patrols, and Morning Show Crew, allowing them to build a sense of school belonging.
As for our adults on campus, our Social Sunshine Committee recognizes the need for teachers to enjoy their work environment by having mini monthly celebrations on as well as off campus to build a greater sense of team. Administration also support staff through random acts of kindness, treats, and special activities throughout the school year.
By working together, we create a safe, nurturing, and inclusive school community that allows for all students to become empowered to be lifelong learners and productive citizens.