

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Jackson Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	28

Jackson Elementary School

502 E GILCHRIST ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Murphy, Melody	Principal	Instructional leader
Oleskiewicz, Kim	Instructional Media	SAC Chair, Media Specialist
Edelblute-Caggia, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Facilitates MTSS/Rtl, Testing Coordinator, monitors instruction through walkthroughs and observations.
Redman, Melissa	Reading Coach	Collaborates with teachers for planning instruction.
Putnam, Joanne	Math Coach	Collaborates with teachers for planning and instruction
Rudd, Allen	Behavior Specialist	PBIS, student culture, MTSS/Rtl

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The school leadership team which is comprised of the academic leadership team, faculty, staff and parents share in the input of the development of the SIP. Data from FAST, iReady and district assessments are used to determine the needs of the students and what is appropriate for academic, and behavior needs.

SIP Monitoring

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

As a Transformation school we meet on a weekly basis to monitor student learning and adjust instruction for all learners. We target our bottom quartile to ensure continued growth in deficit areas. Students are held accountable for understanding their data and discussing growth expectations quarterly with the academic leadership team.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	86%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	5	25	16	13	21	18	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	2	1	11	0	0	0	21
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	40	41	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	39	36	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	29	20	0	0	0	49

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	1	1	15	21	0	0	0	39

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	13	18	10	12	20	0	0	0	80
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	2	31	22	23	20	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	47	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	38	25	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	31	22	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	11	38	25	0	0	0	74

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	2	31	22	23	20	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	47	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	38	25	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	31	22	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	11	38	25	0	0	0	74

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	20	50	53	24	53	56	27		
ELA Learning Gains				51			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			61		
Math Achievement*	29	56	59	41	50	50	36		
Math Learning Gains				65			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			58		
Science Achievement*	25	50	54	26	59	59	33		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	49	59	59	37			51		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	29
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	144
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	14	Yes	4	2
ELL	32	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	13	Yes	4	1
HSP	32	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	37	Yes	1	
FRL	29	Yes	1	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	30	Yes	3	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	3	
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	47			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	20			29			25					49
SWD	5			7			6				5	43
ELL	22			37			29				5	49
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	15			15			8				4	
HSP	21			36			29				5	49
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	37			37							2	
FRL	20			29			24				5	51

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	24	51	65	41	65	64	26					37
SWD	15	39	53	20	41	33	16					21
ELL	17	49	58	43	64	71	24					37
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17	40	62	23	61	64	13					
HSP	23	56	62	47	69	72	30					36
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	38	33		61	64							
FRL	25	53	65	43	67	62	26					34

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	27	49	61	36	57	58	33					51
SWD	13	55	64	13	55	54	13					48
ELL	22	48	58	36	53	50	15					51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	10	27		13	45							
HSP	28	52	62	45	60	55	31					52
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50			41			55					
FRL	26	46	61	35	55	58	30					51

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	28%	53%	-25%	54%	-26%
04	2023 - Spring	19%	54%	-35%	58%	-39%
03	2023 - Spring	19%	46%	-27%	50%	-31%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	19%	55%	-36%	59%	-40%
04	2023 - Spring	35%	59%	-24%	61%	-26%
05	2023 - Spring	43%	53%	-10%	55%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	29%	47%	-18%	51%	-22%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Proficiency in ELA showed the lowest performance for Jackson with only 22% of 3-5 students showing proficiency in ELA on the FAST assessment. The major contributor to the low performance is the lack of fundamental reading skills such as phonological and phonemic awareness. Too much time in the primary grades has been dedicated to the art of reading rather than the fundamentals of reading.

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

Proficiency in math showed the greatest decline from the prior year, only 32% of 3-5 students showed proficiency in math based on the FAST assessment compared to 41% of 3-5 students showing proficiency the year before on the FSA. One of the factors for the decline could have been beginning small group targeted instruction with the math resource teacher later in the year than the prior year. Additionally, we had several new teachers to 4th and 5th grade that needed to learn and teach standards they were unfamiliar with.

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

Proficiency in ELA showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Jackson had only 22% of 3-5 students showing proficiency in ELA on the FAST assessment. The major contributor to the low performance is the lack of fundamental reading skills such as phonological and phonemic awareness. Too much time in the primary grades has been dedicated to the art of reading rather than the fundamentals of reading.

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

The data component with the most improvement was in the area of science proficiency. Science instruction was used as a special area activity for 5th grade during the 22-23 school year, so teachers were able to have planning/collaboration time with coaches. This may have helped student proficiency in science.

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

African American student proficiency and SWD student proficiency continue to be serious areas of concern for Jackson. Based on data these students struggle due to their lack of background understanding and vocabulary development. We must meet them at their level by providing strong opportunities for them to gain deficit skills that lead to success in school.

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

ELA Proficiency, ELA gains, ELA bottom quartile gains, Math Proficiency, Science Proficiency

Area of Focus

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

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

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

Data driven planning support for teachers in reading. Reading proficiency continues to be an area of concern at Jackson Elementary. FSA results for reading proficiency was only 24% of students reading on level. This score is significantly below the district (56% proficiency). According to Jackson's ESSA data our reflects that our SWD (scored 30%) and our African American students (scored 40%) continue to struggle to make gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As measured by school-wide walk throughs, observations and progress monitoring data, teachers will use student data to support planning for differentiation with an emphasis on developing strong tier one instruction to create meaningful scaffolded lessons. These lessons will include student assessments that will be used to determine tiers two and three support. This will result in grades 3-5 FAST ELA proficiency to increase from 22% to 35% in Spring 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Data/progress monitoring meetings held quarterly. Walkthroughs with look fors focused on standards-based planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melody Murphy (melody.murphy@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers will use UFLI to instruct for all students in the fundamentals of reading, so they have the skills to decode and read proficiently on grade level. We will use SIPPs and Rewards during our RtI/MTSS small group instruction to ensure students in tier 2 and tier 3 groups are making adequate progress towards closing the achievement gap.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data shows that students are struggling in with phonics and high frequency words based on iReady diagnostic data. It is our belief that the problem lies in students not having a strong phonetic base and the inability to understand base and root words. Focusing on the fundamentals of reading instruction will give students the groundwork to being more successful in reading as they get older.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Hire a literacy coach/resource teacher who will support lesson planning with teachers. The literacy coach/resource teacher will meet with 1st-5th grade reading teachers weekly to plan data driven, effective lessons and assist in progress monitoring and pulling small groups in order to meet the needs of all students.

Person Responsible: Melody Murphy (melody.murphy@hcps.net)

By When: August 2023- May 2024

#2. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Data driven planning support for teachers in reading. Reading proficiency continues to be an area of concern at Jackson Elementary. FSA results for reading proficiency was only 24% of students reading on level. This score is significantly below the district (56% proficiency). According to Jackson's ESSA data our African American students (scored 40%) and continue to struggle to make gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As measured by school-wide walk throughs, observations and progress monitoring data, teachers will use student data to support planning for differentiation with an emphasis on developing strong tier one instruction to create meaningful scaffolded lessons. These lessons will include student assessments that will be used to determine tiers two and three support. This will result in Jackson's African American students in grades 3-5 to increase ELA proficiency and our ESSA data to move from 40- 42.

Monitoring:

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

Data/progress monitoring meetings held quarterly. Walkthroughs with look fors focused on standards-based planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sandra Butte (sandra.butte@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Hire a literacy coach/resource teacher who will support lesson planning with teachers. The literacy coach/resource teacher will meet with 1st-5th grade reading teachers weekly to plan data driven, effective lessons and assist in progress monitoring and pulling small groups in order to meet the needs of all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data shows that students are struggling in with phonics and high frequency words based on iReady diagnostic data. It is our belief that the problem lies in students not having a strong phonetic base and the inability to understand base and root words. Focusing on the fundamentals of reading instruction will give students the groundwork to being more successful in reading as they get older.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Hire an interventionist to support students needing tier 3 instruction in reading in grades 1-3

Person Responsible: Melody Murphy (melody.murphy@hcps.net)

By When: August 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Data driven planning support for teachers in math. Math proficiency continues to be an area of concern at Jackson Elementary. FSA results for math proficiency was only 41%. This score is significantly below the district (60% proficiency). Jackson's subgroups that fell below the school proficiency were SWD (scored 20%) and our African American students (scored 23%). Both continue to struggle to make gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As measured by school-wide walk throughs, observations and progress monitoring data, teachers will use student data to support planning for differentiation with an emphasis on developing strong tier one instruction to create meaningful scaffolded lessons. These lessons will include student assessments that will be used to determine tiers two and three support. This will result in grades 3-5 FAST Math proficiency to increase from 41% to 51% in Spring 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Data/progress monitoring meetings held quarterly. Walkthroughs with look fors focused on standards-based content collaboration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melody Murphy (melody.murphy@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Jackson will use iReady math, Stemsscopes and Cpalms for math. Stemsscopes is for use with tier one instruction and iReady will be used for tier two instruction. Cpalms and iReady lessons will be used for tier three instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students struggling with concepts need to have the foundational skills from previous learning at be successful. Using tier 2 and tier 3 intervention strategies with small groups of students affords them the opportunity to work on deficit skills they may be lacking due to unfinished learning in the previous grades.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Hire a math resource teacher who will support lesson planning with teachers. The math resource teacher will meet with 1st-5th grade math teachers weekly to plan data driven, effective lessons and assist in

progress monitoring and pulling small groups in order to meet the needs of all students. Purchase substitutes to be used during progress monitoring meetings and planning sessions.

Person Responsible: Melody Murphy (melody.murphy@hcps.net)

By When: August 2023- May 2024

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Data driven planning support for teachers to review discipline data, PBIS, Structures, expectations, and rules. Discipline data and office call log data indicates that teachers need behavior support within the classrooms. Jackson has 106 referrals to date (22-23 school year) and over 700 office call incidents so far for 22-23 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As measured by school-wide call out log and discipline referrals, teachers need to learn how to use PBIS effectively and with consistency. Teachers will use daily lessons to support students and use classroom structures, rules and school-wide expectations to support a positive classroom environment. Jackson's referral rate will drop from 106 to 76 by May of 2024. The office call log will decrease from 700+ to 300.

Monitoring:

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

Observations/Walkthroughs, Data/progress monitoring and Culture Walks

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melody Murphy (melody.murphy@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Jackson is a PBIS school and we are implementing the basic tenants of PBIS to be used in conjunction with CHAMPs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need to learn strategies and skills that help them cope with difficult situations. PBIS and CHAMPs are structured to support students and help them learn to regulate their emotions and make informed choices as they relate to self-control.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Behavior data that reflects students and teachers struggle with classroom behavior and effective classroom management. Behavior data that reflects students and teachers struggle with classroom behavior and effective classroom management.

Person Responsible: Melody Murphy (melody.murphy@hcps.net)

By When: August 2023- May 2024

#5. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Data driven planning support for teachers in reading. Reading proficiency continues to be an area of concern at Jackson Elementary. FSA results for reading proficiency was only 24% of students reading on level. This score is significantly below the district (56% proficiency). According to Jackson's ESSA data our SWD students (scored 30%) and continue to struggle to make gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As measured by school-wide walk throughs, observations and progress monitoring data, teachers will use student data to support planning for differentiation with an emphasis on developing strong tier one instruction to create meaningful scaffolded lessons. These lessons will include student assessments that will be used to determine tiers two and three support. This will result in Jackson's SWD students in grades 3-5 to increase ELA proficiency and our ESSA data to move from 30%- 35%.

Monitoring:

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

Data/progress monitoring meetings held quarterly. Walkthroughs with look fors focused on standards-based planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Edelblute-Caggia (128039@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers will use Brainspring to instruct SWD students in the fundamentals of reading, so they have the skills to decode and read proficiently on grade level. We will use SIPPs and Rewards during our RtI/MTSS small group instruction to ensure students in tier 2 and tier 3 groups are making adequate progress towards closing the achievement gap.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data shows that students are struggling in with phonics and high frequency words based on iReady diagnostic data. It is our belief that the problem lies in students not having a strong phonetic base and the inability to understand base and root words. Focusing on the fundamentals of reading instruction will give students the groundwork to being more successful in reading as they get older.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Ensure all VE teachers are trained in Brainspring in order to teach ESE students using this scripted program. Do fidelity checks weekly to ensure Brainspring is being implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Melody Murphy (melody.murphy@hcps.net)

By When: September 2023- May 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Meeting held weekly with academic leadership to discuss how students and faculty are being served in order to support instruction. Jackson's areas of focus include improving reading and math proficiency for students.

Hire a literacy coach/resource teacher who will support lesson planning with teachers. The literacy coach/resource teacher will meet with 1st-5th grade reading teachers weekly to plan data driven, effective lessons and assist in progress monitoring and pulling small groups in order to meet the needs of all students.

Hire an interventionist to support students needing tier 3 instruction in reading in grades 1-3.

Hire a math resource teacher who will support lesson planning with teachers. The math resource teacher will meet with 1st-5th grade math teachers weekly to plan data driven, effective lessons and assist in progress monitoring and pulling small groups in order to meet the needs of all students.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

Data driven collaborative support for teachers in reading. Reading proficiency continues to be an area of concern at Jackson Elementary. STAR results for reading proficiency were only 24% of students reading on level. This score is significantly below the district (56% proficiency). According to Jackson's ESSA data our reflects that our SWD (scored 30%) and our African American students (scored 40%) continue to struggle to make gains.

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

Data driven planning support for teachers in reading. Reading proficiency continues to be an area of concern at Jackson Elementary. FSA results for reading proficiency was only 24% of students reading on level. This score is significantly below the district (56% proficiency). According to Jackson's ESSA data our reflects that our SWD (scored 30%) and our African American students (scored 40%) continue to struggle to make gains.

Measurable Outcomes

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

On the STAR 22-23 Spring PM3 assessment data Jackson 1st and 2nd grade students continue to fall below the 40%ile in reading (1st grade-67% of students fell below the 40%ile, and 2nd grade-68% fell below the 40%ile). During the 2023-24 school year on the Spring PM3, we will improve 1st and 2nd grade overall percentage of students scoring at the 40%ile by 10 points.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

On the FAST 22-23 Spring PM3 assessment data Jackson 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students continue to fall below a level 3 proficiency in reading (3rd grade-79% of students fell below a level 3, 4th grade 80% of students fell below a level 3 and 5th grade 73% fell below a level 3). During the 2023-24 school year on the Spring PM3, we will reduce the overall percent of students scoring below proficiency by 10 points.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Data/progress monitoring meetings held quarterly. Walkthroughs with look fors focused on standards-based planning. Student data chats to include student buy-in and understanding of academic and data growth expectations.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Murphy, Melody, melody.murphy@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

UFLI and Flamingo are research-based programs that HCPS has purchased and trained teachers to use Whole group UFLI Instruction for students in grades K-3, iReady Toolbox (Magnetic reading) for tier 2 instruction and SIPPS small group instruction for tier 3.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

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

HCPS has purchased and trained teachers on UFLI and Flamingo instruction. Data shows that students are struggling in with phonics and high frequency words based on iReady diagnostic data and STAR assessment. It is our belief that the problem lies in students not having a strong phonetic base and the inability to understand base and root words. Focusing on the fundamentals of reading instruction will give students the groundwork to being more successful in reading as they get older.

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
Hire a literacy coach/resource teacher who will support lesson planning with teachers. The literacy coach/resource teacher will meet with 1st-5th grade reading teachers weekly to plan data driven, effective lessons and assist in progress monitoring and pulling small groups in order to meet the needs of all students. Hire an interventionist to support students needing tier 3 instruction in reading in grades 1-3	Murphy, Melody, melody.murphy@hcps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

We disseminate information concerning the SIP and SWP to all stakeholders through ParentLink messages, PTA meetings, open invitation to SAC meetings where the SIP and student outcomes are discussed. We also present the SIP and SWP at Parent Involvement events.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We hold parent involvement nights so that families can learn about the different programs and activities their students are learning in school. We purchase home/school planners, teachers communicate with parents by using messaging apps and Google text. We send ParentLink message reminders for all PI activities. We invite parents to help with PBIS events, field trips and school events.

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

Our plan is to use remediation (WIN) time in ELA and Math so there is specific time developed into the master schedule to use spiral learning, address unfinished learning, and focus on BQ students to lift the learning with all resource teachers, including an interventionist that was hired this year. Our PE teacher is a former 4th grade math teacher, and he will also be pulling small groups to help increase learning time for enrichment and accelerated learning.

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

n/a

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

n/a

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

n/a

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

n/a

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

n/a

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

n/a

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No