James Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

James Elementary School

4302 E ELLICOTT ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Louis Murphy

Start Date for this Principal: 5/31/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (43%) 2018-19: F (22%) 2017-18: F (29%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

James Elementary School

4302 E ELLICOTT ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	95%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		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, to provide an education and the supports that enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Clemmie Ross James Academy will empower today's students to become tomorrow's leaders and to prepare students for life.

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, Louis	Principal	The principal is responsible for the overall direction of the school, including academic performance and school climate.
	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 5/31/2022, Louis 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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
30

Total number of students enrolled at the school
364

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
11

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	38	56	50	57	52	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	309
Attendance below 90 percent	0	30	21	30	17	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	7	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	36	26	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	41	28	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level 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	0	0	11	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	1	0	1	13	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 8/24/2022

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	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

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	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

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	25%	53%	56%				17%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	45%						30%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						41%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	28%	50%	50%				14%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	67%						14%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	81%						22%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	11%	59%	59%				16%	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	9%	52%	-43%	58%	-49%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	13%	55%	-42%	58%	-45%
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	20%	54%	-34%	56%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

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	14%	54%	-40%	62%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	11%	57%	-46%	64%	-53%
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2022					
	2019	5%	54%	-49%	60%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	11%	51%	-40%	53%	-42%
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	20	52	63	22	74	100	20				
ELL	28	53		41	76						
BLK	24	42	41	26	60	82	14				
HSP	20	50		34	83						
FRL	25	45	48	26	67	81	11				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	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				

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	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				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
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?

Student proficiency in math and reading low in all grade levels.

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

Increase math and reading 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?

Multiple vacancies, long-term subs and absences contributed to low proficiency scores.

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

Math Bottom Quartile increased from 29% in 2021 to 81% in 2022.

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

-

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

-

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.

-

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

-

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Description: Teachers will plan standards aligned instruction in both tier 1 core instruction and tiers 2 and 3 small group instruction. Teachers will use a variety of instructional strategies to engage students in rigorous complex learning experiences, that push students to mastery in grade-level benchmarks. Teachers will differentiate lessons to meet the diverse and unique needs of each of their students in reaching grade-level targets. Rationale: Due to the new state benchmarks and new district curriculum resources, teachers need support in developing a deeper content understanding. In addition, there is a high number of new teachers to both James and the field of teaching. Historical student data shows students struggle to meet proficiency targets in ELA, Math, and Science. According to FSA 2022 results, 25% of students were proficient in ELA, 28% of students were proficient in Math, and 11% of students were proficient in Science. This collective evidence shows instructional practice being an area of focus.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By May 2023 at least 85% of teachers will implement standards-aligned lessons with engaging core instruction and targeted small group instruction, developed during weekly common planning sessions, as measured by walkthrough data. This will result in grades 3-5 FAST proficiency increasing in ELA, Math, and Science (see breakdown below): -Increase ELA Proficiency from 25% to 44% (according to FAST PM3 results) -Increase Math Proficiency from 28% to 57% (according to FAST PM3 results) -Increase Science Proficiency from 11% to 40% (according to FAST PM3 results)
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	PM1 and PM2 FAST assessments results will be used to track progress toward reaching identified targets. -PM1 Proficiency Targets: (ELA: 31%, Math: 37%, Science: 20%) -PM2 Proficiency Targets: (ELA: 38%, Math: 47%, Science: 30%) Administration will collect instructional walkthrough data using the Power BI app to track progress toward reaching identified targets.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Louis Murphy (louish.murphy@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will engage in the use of comprehensive instructional programs, including Wonders and Stemscopes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for	Hattie's research indicates that a comprehensive instructional program for teachers has an effect size of 0.72.

selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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

Teachers will engage in weekly common planning, facilitated by content coaches and teacher leaders. Common planning will be designed to support grade-level teacher teams dive deeply into new state benchmarks and new district curriculum resources to plan daily lesson plans in both tier 1 core instruction and tier 2 small group instruction. Teachers will also use weekly common planning time to plan complex tasks and collaborative learning activities for students to engage in (in ELA, Math, and Science) and exit/ entrance tickets to use as formative instruction to gauge student mastery of concepts taught.

Person Responsible   Louis Murphy (louish.murphy@hcps.net)

Teachers will engage in content PLC and differentiated professional development, to build both content and pedagogical practices. Administration and coaching teams will work together to facilitate internalization sessions of both ELA (Wonders) and Math (Stemscopes) curriculum resources to support teachers in familiarizing themselves in said resources, in order to better prepare for common planning of daily lessons. Additional supports around the newly released BEST benchmarks will be incorporated in content PLC and PD sessions to support building teacher capacity.

Person Responsible   Louis Murphy (louish.murphy@hcps.net)

As district assessment data is released, teachers will engage in data PLCs to review school-, grade-level, and class data sets. Teachers will engage in data chats with their grade level teams, facilitated by content coaches and teacher leaders, in order to gauge student mastery of benchmarks taught. Teachers will look at individual student data to determine future instruction, necessary reteaching, and targeted small group instruction.

Person Responsible   Louis Murphy (louish.murphy@hcps.net)

Identified teachers will engage in coaching cycles, in collaboration with assigned content coaches, in order to receive an additional level of support. Teachers will be identified according to teacher needs, classroom walkthrough data, and teacher evaluation data. Teachers engaging in coaching cycles will receive additional planning support as needed, as well as in-class coaching support including, but not limited to, modeling, co-teaching, side-by-side coaching, etc. with their assigned content coach to build capacity and confidence.

Person Responsible   Louis Murphy (louish.murphy@hcps.net)

Administration and content coaches will engage in classroom walkthroughs to collect observational data, and provide specific and targeted feedback to teachers according to identified look-fors and the 4 principles of excellent instruction. Feedback will be used to build capacity and pedagogical practices in teachers, in order to strengthen overall instruction in all tiers (core and small group).

Person Responsible   Louis Murphy (louish.murphy@hcps.net)

The academic services team and student support team, in collaboration with school administration, will redesign and facilitate the MTSS system, in efforts to support students who are not meeting grade level expectations (both academically and behaviorally). Teachers will be trained in the three tiers of instruction, how to support students, and how to refer students needing additional supports.

Person Responsible   Louis Murphy (louish.murphy@hcps.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Description: All stakeholders will create an inclusive and supportive school-wide culture that allows all children to thrive. Teachers will create nurturing and structured classroom environments with developmentally appropriate rituals and routines to support all students in meeting classroom and school-wide expectations. Students social-emotional needs will be met, with intentional supports in both interpersonal and intrapersonal skill building opportunities. All stakeholders will respond to undesirable behaviors with trauma-sensitive regulation strategies, and process with children post-incident to build problem solving skills.

Rationale: James students exhibit a need for social-emotional supports and problem solving skill building.
Historical student data shows students struggle to meet school-wide behavioral and attendance targets. According to absenteeism/suspension/behavioral data from the 2021-2022 school year:
-86.2% of students were present 90% or more of the school year
-83 suspension incidents (OOS, IS, Bus)
-97 behavior incident student referrals
In addition, there is a high number of new teachers to both James and the field of teaching. This collective evidence shows positive culture and environment being an area of focus. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | By May 2023 at least 95% of teachers will utilize PBIS strategies and demonstrate nurturing and structured classroom environments, that allow students to meet school-wide and classroom expectations, as measured by walkthrough data. This will result in:
-Decrease the number of student referrals from 97 to 70
-Decrease the number of suspensions from 83 to 60
-Increase in student attendance from 86.2% to 90% |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | -Student referral data and monthly attendance data will be used to track progress toward reaching identified targets.
-Administration will collect monthly PBIS fidelity walkthrough data to monitor implementation and track progress toward reaching identified targets.
-Monthly attendance meetings with identified point person to review attendance data, and identify families in need of additional services.
-Student Services Team Meetings to discuss the number of students with referrals and identify additional supports (referral to MTSS team if needed). |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Louis Murphy (louish.murphy@hcps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented** | Teachers will support the development of student self-efficacy (positive beliefs, attitudes, and dispositions), through the use of weekly lessons from the Second Steps curriculum. |

for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Hattie's research indicates that student self-efficacy has an effect size of 0.92.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will engage in PBIS training, and receive additional coaching supports if needed, to set up classroom rituals, routines, and physical classroom environment space to support student success. Teachers will implement tier 1 student supports when developing classroom expectations. Teachers will create emotionally safe and structured classroom environments where students are encouraged to express their emotions appropriately, build problem solving skills, and access taught and practiced self-regulation strategies.

Person Responsible Louis Murphy (louish.murphy@hcps.net)

School administration and student support team members will support tier 1 school-wide student support with the use of PBIS systems and structures and weekly Second Steps lessons. School-wide rewards and intrinsic/extrinsic motivations will be used with classroom and school-wide rewards. Teachers will utilize Second Steps curriculum resources to build social-emotional skills within the classroom.

Person Responsible Louis Murphy (louish.murphy@hcps.net)

School administration and student support team members will support tier 2 school-wide student support with the use of connecting family and community supports with identified students and families.

Person Responsible Louis Murphy (louish.murphy@hcps.net)

School administration and student support team members will support tier 3 school-wide student supports by identifying emotionally fragile students and providing differentiated and strategic social-emotional supports to identified students. Teachers of identified students will be provided additional supports from student support team members to support students both in and out of the classroom.

Person Responsible Louis Murphy (louish.murphy@hcps.net)

RAISE

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

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

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

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

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

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

Description: Primary teachers will plan specific and targeted small group instruction and independent centers, that support phonemic awareness and phonics skill development to support overall comprehension of grade-level text.

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

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

Description: Intermediate teachers will plan specific and targeted small group instruction and independent centers, that support phonics, vocabulary, and fluency skill development to support overall comprehension of grade-level text.

Rationale: According to FSA 2022 results, 25% of students in grades 3 through 5 were proficient in ELA. This data indicates 75% of students in grades 3 through 5 are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

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)

By May 2023, at least 50% of grades K-2 students will fluently and accurately read and comprehend grade-level text, as measured by proficiency on the PM3 FAST assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By May 2023, at least 50% of grades 3-5 students will fluently and accurately read and comprehend grade-level text, as measured by proficiency on the PM3 FAST assessment.

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.

PM1 and PM2 FAST assessment results will be used to track progress toward reaching identified targets.

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

Murphy, Louis, louish.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. §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?

Teachers will utilize a small group instructional structure to deliver high quality phonics instruction and vocabulary acquisition strategies.

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?

Hattie's research indicates that the use of phonics instruction has an effect size of 0.70, and the use of vocabulary programs have an effect size of 0.62.

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 engage in weekly common planning, facilitated by content coaches and teacher leaders. Common planning will be designed to support grade-level teacher teams to plan tier 2 small group instruction. Tier 2 small group instruction will include differentiated teacher-directed lessons with identified students of like needs, and targeted independent student centers for students to engage in to further develop reading skills.	Murphy, Louis, louish.murphy@hcps.net
Teachers will engage in data PLCSs, facilitated by content coaches and teacher leaders, to review class data sets from formal and informal assessments in order to determine small groups for tier 2 instruction.	Murphy, Louis, louish.murphy@hcps.net
Teachers will engage in professional development in the area of small group instruction. Professional development will include, but is not limited to, setting up small group instruction rituals and routines in the classroom, designing teacher-led small group instructional plans, designing differentiated independent student centers, tracking and monitoring student progress in small group instruction, etc.	Murphy, Louis, louish.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.

James is striving to establish a school culture of respect, responsibility, and safety. To achieve these goals, teachers will engage in professional development centered around school climate, culture, social-emotional learning, and motivating all students. All stakeholders will support building a positive school culture and environment through use of PBIS strategies and Second Steps curriculum resources.

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

PBIS Strategies & Second Steps: Administration, School Support Team, Guidance Counselor, RtI Behavior Resource, Teachers