Hillsborough County Public Schools

James Elementary School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

James Elementary School

4302 E ELLICOTT ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[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.

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, 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, Louis	Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others in regard to progress monitoring, curriculum, and successful implementation of schoolwide systems, structures, and procedures.

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.

Met with stakeholders to discuss possible areas of focus based on the current needs. Staff votes on specific areas of focus.

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))

Monthly meeting will be held to monitor implementation and make revisions, as needed.

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 PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	95%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: F 2018-19: F 2017-18: F
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	0	36	25	29	24	17	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	12
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	6	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	10	0	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 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	0	0	0	3	16	13	0	0	0	32

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	0	3	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	30	21	30	17	29	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	7	3	6	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	26	46	0	0	0	108
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	41	28	35	0	0	0	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	11	11	2	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	13	22	2	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	30	21	30	17	29	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	7	3	6	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	26	46	0	0	0	108
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	41	28	35	0	0	0	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	11	11	2	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	13	22	2	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	28	50	53	25	53	56	19		
ELA Learning Gains				45			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			47		
Math Achievement*	29	56	59	28	50	50	16		
Math Learning Gains				67			25		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				81			29		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	29	50	54	11	59	59	9		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	66	59	59	56			41		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	177
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	26	Yes	1	1
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	35	Yes	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	50			
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	44			

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	28			29			29					66
SWD	33			42			40				4	
ELL	32			39							3	66
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			26			26				4	
HSP	36			40			38				5	58
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	29			27			31				5	63

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	25	45	47	28	67	81	11					56
SWD	20	52	63	22	74	100	20					
ELL	28	53		41	76							56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	42	41	26	60	82	14					
HSP	20	50		34	83		0					59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	25	45	48	26	67	81	11					48

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	19	38	47	16	25	29	9					41
SWD	11	23		16	23							
ELL	11			18	20							41

| **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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17	29	33	16	27	30	11					
HSP	17			17								41
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	19	38	47	15	25	29	9					39

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	24%	53%	-29%	54%	-30%
04	2023 - Spring	35%	54%	-19%	58%	-23%
03	2023 - Spring	17%	46%	-29%	50%	-33%

| **MATH** | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	15%	55%	-40%	59%	-44%
04	2023 - Spring	27%	59%	-32%	61%	-34%
05	2023 - Spring	34%	53%	-19%	55%	-21%

| **SCIENCE** | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	21%	47%	-26%	51%	-30%

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.

3rd grade proficiency showed the lowest performance. ELA 20% and Math16%; teacher's depth of knowledge on grade level content, students lacking necessary foundational skills, lack of consistent small group instruction,

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

3rd grade Math proficiency went from 26% to 16%; teacher's depth of knowledge on grade level content, students lacking necessary foundational skills, lack of consistent small group instruction,

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

The component with the greatest gap compared to the state average was with the difference between the percentage of proficient students and the percentage of level 1 students; 27% more students were proficient statewide, and our percent of level 1 students was 27% more that the state. Gaps in students' learning, lack of necessary foundational skills, lack of consistent small group instruction.

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

5th grade Math proficiency 42%; targeted lesson planning focused on grade level standards, math coach planning and modeling lessons, consistent small group instruction, ELP,

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

Attendance is our biggest area of concern. If our student attendance improves, we believe there will also be an improvement in our academic performance.

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

Attendance
ELA Proficiency
Math 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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

Employ high leverage instructional practices/structures that allow students to master grade level benchmarks/standards. Specific focus will be placed on:
- Develop and implement structures for aggressive monitoring of student mastery toward grade-level concepts that allow for all students to receive appropriate scaffolds within tier 1 instruction. These structures will include opportunities for professional development for teachers in how to plan for, implement, and utilize results of aggressive monitoring to differentiate the instruction to meet the immediate needs of the students.
- Provide guidance to all teachers in their planning and execution of high-quality small group instruction. This support will specifically target instructional delivery methods that require students to actively engage in the learning process, as well as tier 2 instruction aimed at narrowing the achievement gap and achieving proficiency on grade-level benchmarks.

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

By October 2023, at least 80% of teachers will be:
- utilizing aggressive monitoring during core instruction, and
- providing opportunities for students to engage in small group lessons, as measured by walkthrough look-for trend data.
By December 2023, 100% of teachers will be:
- utilizing aggressive monitoring during core instruction, and
- providing opportunities for students to engage in small group lessons, as measured by walkthrough look-for trend data.
This will result in grades 3-5 FAST/FSSA proficiency scores increasing in ELA, Math, and Science (see breakdown below):
-Increase ELA proficiency from 26% to 35%
-Increase Math proficiency from 28% to 35%
-Increase Science proficiency from 23% to 30%

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

School administration team will regularly attend weekly common planning and PLC sessions to ensure planning and teacher support are in alignment with teacher needs in the focus areas of aggressive monitoring and small group instruction. In addition, walkthrough look-for trend data will be collected and shared with teachers regularly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Louis Murphy (louish.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.)

The evidenced-based strategy being used to support this area of focus is Teacher Clarity. According to John Hattie's Visible Learning Indicators, strong Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75, which falls in the "Zone of Desired Effects". Teacher Clarity is described as helping students gauge their own progress through the use of success criteria, and intentional and deliberate feedback. In addition, strong teacher clarity is evident when the teacher and students are partners in explaining the intended learning targets.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This evidenced-based strategy was selected to support the target area of focus because with strong teacher clarity on all learning targets (both core and small group instruction), students will be more in alignment with their own learning goals. In addition, according to John Hattie's research, actions falling in the range of 0.40 and above, learning extends beyond that which was expected from attending school for one school year. Due to the significant gaps our students demonstrate, we need to employ evidence-based strategies that will support larger than one year's growth.

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.

Teachers will be provided with personalized in-classroom coaching that focusses on addressing their unique needs, their identified tier, and the school improvement plan. By analyzing both qualitative and quantitative data, the appropriate coaching support, and tiers for teachers will be determined. Identified teachers will be provided specific coaching in the outlined areas of focus: aggressive monitoring, small group instruction.

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

By When: Administration will consistently monitor the impact of coaching schedules and caseloads and collaborate with coaches, to ensure teachers are receiving the appropriate level of support.

Teachers will engage in two weekly common planning periods; one focused on whole group instruction and one focused on small group instruction. Teachers will also engage in content PLCs/unit internalizations facilitated by a coach or lead teacher. Based on identified teacher caseloads, weekly common planning periods and ongoing (content PLCs/unit internalization sessions) will be facilitated by identified coaches.

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

By When: Administration will attend planning sessions regularly to ensure fidelity of coach-facilitated implementation and teacher engagement. Administration will conduct walkthroughs (using walkthrough schedule) to ensure transfer of plans to practice and provide specific teacher feedback in reference to planned lessons.

Coaches, Resource Teachers, Lead Teachers, and Administration will design and implement ongoing professional development opportunities for teachers to build capacity in the two identified areas of focus: aggressive monitoring, and small group instruction (other identified areas as well, if needed).

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

By When: Administration will conduct walkthroughs (according to walkthrough schedule) to ensure transfer of professional development to practice and provide specific teacher feedback in the focus areas.

Teachers will participate in coach/teacher-lead facilitated ongoing formative and summative Data Chats. Data Chats will include an analysis of various assessment data sets, student work, and action planning for future instruction.

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

By When: Administration will conduct accountability walks to ensure teachers are held accountable for implementation of action plans drafted during Data Chats.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

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.

Increase teacher attendance

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

By May 2024, teacher absences will decrease by 5%.

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

Administration will regularly collect teacher attendance data. Monthly data will be reviewed with staff members at a designated monthly faculty meeting. Individual teacher attendance data will be reviewed with the teacher at quarterly report cards data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Louis Murphy (louish.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.)

The evidenced-based strategy being used to support this area of focus is Time on Task. According to John Hattie's Visible Learning Indicators, consistent Time on Task has an effect size of 0.49, which falls in the "Zone of Desired Effects". Time on Task is described as the engaged, elapsed, allocated, or total time on a task. It could also relate to number of days on a lesson or attendance at these lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This evidenced-based strategy was selected to support the target area of focus because with consistent Time on Task, teachers would be attending school regularly and would be present to ensure they are maximizing their time on task and their students' time on task. In addition, according to John Hattie's research, actions falling in the range of 0.40 and above, learning extends beyond that which was expected from attending school for one school year. Due to the significant gaps our students demonstrate, we need to employ evidence-based strategies that will support larger than one year's growth.

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.

Administration will regularly collect teacher attendance data. Monthly data will be reviewed with staff members at a designated monthly faculty meeting.

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

By When: Monthly

Individual teacher attendance data will be reviewed with the teacher at quarterly report cards data chats.

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

By When: Quarterly

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

Description: Primary teachers will develop and implement structures for aggressive monitoring of student mastery toward comprehension of grade-level text that allow for all students to receive appropriate scaffolds within tier 1 instruction and allows for teachers to plan and execute high-quality small group instruction that supports phonemic awareness and phonics skills to support overall comprehension of grade level texts and meet the immediate needs of the students.

Rationale: The percentage of students of students in Kindergarten through Grade 2, based on 2022-2023 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, are not on track to score Level l3 or above on the statewide standardized ELA assessment.

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

Description: Intermediate teachers will develop and implement structures for aggressive monitoring of student mastery toward comprehension of grade-level text that allow for all students to receive appropriate scaffolds within tier 1 instruction and allows for teachers to plan and execute high-quality small group instruction that supports phonemic awareness and phonics skills to support overall comprehension of grade level texts and meet the immediate needs of the students.

Rationale: According to FAST 2023 results, 26% of students in grades 3 through 5 were proficient in ELA. This data indicates that 74% of students in grades 3 through 5 are not on track to score a 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 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

By May 2024, at least 50% of students in kindergarten through grade 2 will fluently and accurately read and comprehend grade-level text, as measured by proficiency on the PM3 FAST assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By May 2024, at least 50% of students in grade 3 through grade 5 will fluently and accurately read and comprehend grade-level text, as measured by proficiency on the PM3 FAST assessment.

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.

PM1 and PM2 FAST assessment results will be used to track progress towards 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

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?

The evidenced-based practice being used to support this area of focus is Teacher Clarity. According to John Hattie's Visible Learning Indicators, strong Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75, which falls in the "Zone of Desired Effects". Teacher Clarity is described as helping students gauge their own progress through the use of success criteria, and intentional and deliberate feedback. In addition, strong teacher clarity is evident when the teacher and students are partners in explaining the intended learning targets.

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?

This evidenced-based strategy was selected to support the target area of focus because with strong teacher clarity on all learning targets (both core and small group instruction), students will be more in alignment with their own learning goals. In addition, according to John Hattie's research, actions falling in the range of 0.40 and above, learning extends beyond that which was expected from attending school for one school year. Due to the significant gaps our students demonstrate, we need to employ evidence-based strategies that will support larger than one year's growth.

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 be provided with personalized in-classroom coaching that focusses on addressing their unique needs, their identified tier, and the school improvement plan. By analyzing both qualitative and quantitative data, the appropriate coaching support, and tiers for teachers will be determined. Identified teachers will be provided specific coaching in the outlined areas of focus: aggressive monitoring, small group instruction.	Murphy, Louis, louish.murphy@hcps.net
Teachers will engage in two weekly common planning periods; one focused on whole group instruction and one focused on small group instruction. Teachers will also engage in content PLCs/unit internalizations facilitated by a coach or lead teacher. Based on identified teacher caseloads, weekly common planning periods and ongoing (content PLCs/unit internalization sessions) will be facilitated by identified coaches.	Murphy, Louis, louish.murphy@hcps.net
Coaches, Resource Teachers, Lead Teachers, and Administration will design and implement ongoing professional development opportunities for teachers to build capacity in the two identified areas of focus: aggressive monitoring, and small group instruction (other identified areas as well, if needed).	Murphy, Louis, louish.murphy@hcps.net
Teachers will participate in coach/teacher-lead facilitated ongoing formative and summative Data Chats. Data Chats will include an analysis of various assessment data sets, student work, and action planning for future instruction.	Murphy, Louis, louish.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.

https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/james

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))

Teacher Meet and Greet: August 7th
Conference Nights: September 21st, November 9th, February 15th
https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/james
Parentlink messages sent out with reminders for families (food pantry, events, testing, school policies, and any other important information)

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))

James Elementary is going to develop and implement structures for aggressive monitoring of student mastery toward grade-level concepts that allow for all students to receive appropriate scaffolds within tier 1 instruction. These structures will include opportunities for professional development for teachers in how to plan for, implement, and utilize results of aggressive monitoring to differentiate the instruction to meet the immediate needs of the students.

James Elementary is also going to provide guidance to all teachers in their planning and execution of high-quality small group instruction. This support will specifically target instructional delivery methods that require students to actively engage in the learning process, as well as tier 2 instruction aimed at narrowing the achievement gap and achieving proficiency on grade-level benchmarks.

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

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: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Attendance	$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