James Stephens Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

James Stephens Elementary School

1333 MARSH AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33905

http://jsa.leeschools.net/

Demographics

Principal: Jaclyn Fantasia

Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: F (28%) 2014-15: D (32%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

James Stephens Elementary School

1333 MARSH AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33905

http://jsa.leeschools.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	93%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	B	F

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of James Stephens International Academy is to provide an educational experience that is rigorous and relevant for all students. We will cultivate and support an environment of trust, respect, and dedication with cultural understanding which will build a foundation of success for educational excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Focused on the Future: One Student at a Time!

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stedman, Kelly	Principal	Administrator over Pre-K through 5th elementary school. Works with parents, teachers, and students to achieve school goals.
Lebo, Misty	Administrative Support	Principal's secretary and assumes responsibility over staff attendance, processes new hires and helps with front office duties.
Garrison, Gwendelyn	Assistant Principal	Administrator over the Pre-K grant (SIG4).
Fantasia, Jacki	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum for grades K-5.
Cook, Megan	Teacher, ESE	Services a caseload of students that have IEPs in an inclusion setting. She monitors their goals and works with the general education teacher to help students with academic, social and emotional goals.
Urbank, Clemencia	Attendance/ Social Work	Works with parents, students and staff on school attendance and provides resources to parents that are in need.
Chistianson, Elizabeth	Other	Intervention Support Specialist that services all Tier 3 students with academic goals.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	95	98	76	72	49	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	479
Attendance below 90 percent	30	29	18	16	6	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	7	8	10	9	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	13	12	8	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	33	21	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	6	6	8	18	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
29

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/9/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	22	11	7	3	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	4	9	16	8	14	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Course failure in ELA or Math	15	7	19	5	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	32	38	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	20	27	23	24	38	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	22	11	7	3	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	4	9	16	8	14	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Course failure in ELA or Math	15	7	19	5	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	32	38	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	20	27	23	24	38	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	40%	57%	57%	33%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	56%	58%	52%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	50%	53%	48%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	46%	62%	63%	50%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	65%	62%	88%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72%	54%	51%	81%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	52%	53%	30%	51%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	95 (0)	98 (0)	76 (0)	72 (0)	49 (0)	89 (0)	479 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	30 (22)	29 (11)	18 (7)	16 (3)	6 (9)	19 (3)	118 (55)
One or more suspensions	7 (4)	8 (9)	10 (16)	9 (8)	8 (14)	12 (5)	54 (56)
Course failure in ELA or Math	10 (15)	13 (7)	12 (19)	8 (5)	5 (11)	10 (5)	58 (62)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	33 (32)	21 (38)	40 (23)	94 (93)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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

NOTE: 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	
03	2019	39%	58%	-19%	58%	-19%	
	2018	15%	55%	-40%	57%	-42%	
Same Grade Comparison		24%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	42%	55%	-13%	58%	-16%	
	2018	25%	53%	-28%	56%	-31%	
Same Grade Comparison		17%					
Cohort Comparison		27%					
05	2019	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%	
	2018	36%	52%	-16%	55%	-19%	
Same Grade Comparison		-5%					
Cohort Comparison		6%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	40%	61%	-21%	62%	-22%	
	2018	33%	58%	-25%	62%	-29%	
Same Grade Comparison		7%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	35%	62%	-27%	64%	-29%	
	2018	49%	58%	-9%	62%	-13%	
Same Grade Comparison		-14%					
Cohort Comparison		2%					
05	2019	48%	58%	-10%	60%	-12%	
	2018	46%	57%	-11%	61%	-15%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison		-1%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	36%	50%	-14%	53%	-17%	
	2018	24%	52%	-28%	55%	-31%	
Same Grade Comparison		12%					
Cohort Comparison							

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	33	57	70	28	64						

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ELL	28	59		41	53	64	33				
BLK	38	58	50	42	69	79	42				
HSP	42	57	64	48	60	67	39				
WHT	40										
FRL	38	59	64	45	60	70	42				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	8	36		7	50	60					
ELL	15	60		35	69						
BLK	28	48	45	40	48	50	32				
HSP	32	63	64	55	65		18				
WHT	19	20		29	64						
FRL	29	49	50	46	58	50	29				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD				10							
ELL	29	55		52	73						
BLK	27	43	31	47	89	86	20				
HSP	40	63		55	85		31				
WHT	38			53							
FRL	30	45	44	49	87	79	25				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	54
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Overall ELA proficiency has been a challenge and performed the lowest in the past three years. Specifically, decreased in our 5th grade ELA proficiency from last year. In the 2016-2018 year we had 35% of our students scoring proficient on the ELA FSA. In the 2018-2019 school year we increased to 12% of students proficient. However, low ELA proficiency has been a a historical trend since the school opened its' doors and we continue to score below the district and state averages.

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

In the 2018-2019 school year we increased in every category. However, we only increased 1% in math proficiency from the year before going from 45% to 46%. Mobility of students impacts our ability to give consistent instruction to the same students year to year, which I believe impacts our proficiency.

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 data component that had the biggest gap when compared to the state average was our proficiency in ELA. We achieved 40% of our students scoring proficient in comparison to the state at 50%. This is a difference of (insert state number when given)Increasing the number of proficient students is a continuous goal.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is our increase students proficient in Science. During the 18-19 school we achieved 42% students proficient. This was an increase of 13% from our 29% in 2017-2018. We spent a significant amount of time focusing on the science spiraling back through third and fourth grade standards. We also developed big idea assessments to let us know where students were scoring in each area throughout the year to help with instructional decisions.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance and ELA proficiency are still very big concerns for us at James Stephens.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. Attendance below 90%
3. Out of school suspension rate
4. Math Proficiency
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Attendance
Rationale	Kindergarten and first grade absences and tardies are an area of concern. These students are missing critical instruction in foundational skills which directly impacts their success throughout their school career.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 18-19 school year 23% of our students were considered chronically absent. For the 19-20 school year we will decrease chronically absent students from 23% to 11% as measured by our early warning sign data at the end of May. 27% of Kindergarten students were considered chronically absent and 33% of first graders were considered chronically absent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Clemencia Urbank (clemenciau@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	This year we have funded to have our school social worker 5 days a week instead of three. She is going to issue contracts with families with chronic absenteeism in the past and continue to provide resources to make sure that families can stabilize and focus on their child's education.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Parental misperception that attendance in the early grades is not as important as in high school. Parents believe that students have time to 'catch up' before high school. Lack of parental awareness regarding attendance policies. It will be important to utilize our social worker to engage families in their child's academics. She will be able to isolate students that have had prior history with chronic absences and meet with those families to communicate the importance of attending school on time, every day. We will also utilize our school counselor to initiate check in and check outs with students that may need support with coming to school on time. This process will help to gauge the root cause for students not coming to school or coming to school late. In an effort to reach our Kindergarten parents, we will orchestrate another parent night to acclimate families to the life of a kindergartner and give information on school attendance.

Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will identify students who are absent and reach out to the families. If unresolved, the student concern will be escalated to the social worker and communicated to administration. 2. Parent meetings will be held to discuss the importance of attendance and to resolve any factors impeding the family from sending the student to school. 3. A member of student services will meet with students who are chronically absent and on check in procedure working toward incentives. 4. Administration and the Social Worker will communicate twice a week about student attendance. 5. Attendance data and concerns will be communicated briefly at each PLC.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2	
Title	Behavior
Rationale	Inconsistent follow-through with interventions and relationship-building by staff members with students have contributed to our high percentage of out of school supensions. Other at-risk factors also contribute to this increased percentage (mental health, low SES, low educational attainment of parents, low parent involvement at school and at home, high mobility, trauma, domestic abuse, homelessness, etc.). During the 18-19 school year, 10% of the total population received one or more days of Out of School Suspension (OSS). This was a decrease from the 17-18 school year with an addition of adding two behavior intervention units.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Decrease the number of students receiving ISS and/or OSS from 10% to 8% as measured by SESIR reported to District Support Application System by May 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bridget McGill (bridgetam@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Continuation of a school-wide PBS initiative will help engage students in making appropriate decisions to meet high expectations. These expectations will be visible for students and their teachers will begin to teach what these expectations look like in the different school environments. We will also increase the support from our school counselor to teach character education lessons in the classrooms and she will open her office to students that continue to struggle with expectations for individualized support. Our student services team will look for other alternatives to suspension so that we can keep kids in their classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	At our leadership meeting, current data of student referrals and out of school suspension reports will be presented to the team. We will discuss types of referrals being written and look at time of day/time of month that these referrals are being issued to modify our action plan. If students need additional support, our intervention support specialist will start observations on students struggling behaviorally so that we can initiate appropriate interventions for students that need additional support. As we collect data based on these interventions, we will communicate their goals and progress at each leadership meeting.

Action Step	
Description	1. Reinforce PBIS expectations 2. Work with teachers on their behavior interventions 3. Work with behavior specialist and student services team to identify tier 3 students that need additional supports. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Class Performance - Below
Rationale	High student mobility impacts the retention of information and students consistently miss large chunks of instruction as they move from school to school which creates inconsistent instructional moments. Many of our incoming Kindergartners lack appropriate academic and developmental skills which has an academic impact during their school career. They are behind their peers and have a hard time catching up. During the 18-19SY, 60% of students in grades 3-5 are scoring below proficient as measured by the ELA FSA.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Decrease the students that are performing below proficient from 60% to 55% as measured by the FY20 ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	One important step is to use the extra instructional time built into the schedule to implement differentiated instruction through the guided reading framework. Teachers will prioritize opportunities to activate thinking and for higher order thinking activities, which should be evidenced in the planning process. As a school, we will continue to use standards-based formative assessments to identify student areas of need and teachers will put a strong emphasis on student feedback and/or data chats. The conversation in our PLC will be centered around student outcomes and instructional changes based on those outcomes. We will continue to monitor student progress and initiate interventions if we goals are not being met.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	At our PLC, student formative and summative data will be discussed along with instructional practices that have been utilized in the teaching of standards. Student data will drive instructional changes to meet the needs of these below proficient learners. We will use a continuous improvement movel to continue monitoring student outcomes and make instructional decisions based on that data.
Action Step	
Description	1. Identify structure for PLC to include better identification of standards and their progressive movement. 2. Work through deconstruction of standards with teachers to provide a more prescriptive intervention. 3. Identify areas of strength and weakness through summative and formative data. 4. Implement targeted instruction to remediate skills within the standards. 5. Analyze student samples in order to decide to proceed with additional intervention or move to a new target standard to remediate.
Person Responsible	Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)

#4	
Title	Class Performance- Proficient
Rationale	The low percentage of proficient students can be attributed to high student mobility which causes breaks in instruction and inconsistent instructional practices. In addition to high mobility, we also have incoming Kindergartners lacking appropriate academic and developmental skills. All students lack vocabulary and background knowledge which limits their ability to relate and engage with the text they are reading. During the 18-19 SY, 40% of students in grades 3-5 are performing at the proficient level on the ELA FSA.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase students scoring at a proficient level from 40% to 45% as measured by the FY20 FSA ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	To increase the amount of proficient students, we will use extra instructional time built into the schedule to implement differentiation through the guided reading framework. With these students we will prioritize opportunities for higher order thinking activities, which should be evidenced in the planning process. Teachers will continue to model the think aloud process to show students how to interact and think while reading text. Modeling this process will help students make connections to the text and build connections to what they are reading. We will have a strong emphasis on student feedback and/or data chats. Teachers will discuss student goals and outcomes with students and help them reflect on their progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	At our PLC, student formative and summative data will be discussed along with instructional practices that have been utilized in the teaching of standards. Student data will drive instructional changes to meet the needs of these below proficient learners. We will use the continuous improvement model to continue monitoring student outcomes and make instructional decisions based on that data. Data chats with students will be documented through the use of data folders/walls.
Action Step	
Description	1. Identify structure for PLC to include better identification of standards and their progressive movement. 2. Work through deconstruction of standards with teachers to provide a more prescriptive intervention. 3. Identify areas of strength and weakness through summative and formative data. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)

#5	
Title	Class Performance- Above
Rationale	Students lack of higher order thinking skills and the ability to connect to text create gaps in their comprehension. Students also lack vocabulary and the background knowledge to make the appropriate connections to text. During the 18-19 SY, only 9% of students in grades 3-5 are scoring above proficient levels on the ELA FSA.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the amount of students scoring above proficient from 9% to 11% as measured by the FY20 ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	To increase the number of above proficient learners, we will use extra instructional time built into the schedule to differentiate instructional pathways using the guided reading framework. Teachers will prioritize opportunities for higher order thinking activities, which should be evidenced in the planning process. Teachers will continue to increase the level of text as students increase their reading level. Differentiated tasks will engage students at a higher level and require higher order think. There will be a strong emphasis on student feedback and/or data chats.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	At our PLC, student formative and summative data will be discussed along with instructional practices that have been utilized in the teaching of standards. Student data will drive instructional changes to meet the needs of these below proficient learners. We will use the PDSA model to continue monitoring student outcomes and make instructional decisions based on that data. Data chats with students will be documented through the use of data folders/walls.

Action Step	
Description	1. Identify structure for PLC to include better identification of standards and their progressive movement. 2. Work through deconstruction of standards with teachers to provide a more prescriptive intervention. 3. Identify areas of strength and weakness through summative and formative data. 4. Focus on DBQs for students that need additional enrichment. 5.
Person Responsible	Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

At the beginning of the school year, families and students will be invited to an open house and the Annual Title I meeting where staff will share the vision, mission, and culture of the school.
Parents, teachers, students, community members and business partners will participate in the comprehensive needs' assessment by working with the School Advisory Council meetings for analyzing data and decision-making activities pertinent to the school, developing the annual School Improvement Program at School Advisory Council meetings through a collaborative decision making process and an annual Comprehensive Needs Assessment from which the results are used to drive decision making whenever appropriate. Stakeholders will participate as the result of invitations through the school newsletter, School Messenger, Peach Jar, and personal phone calls. These communications will be flexible in format (such as online, in person or on paper) allowing for all parents to give input. Formats will be in different languages and simple terms that parents can easily understand. Information gathered from this data will be used to identify school needs and create a plan. Describe how stakeholders will be involved in the design, implementation and evaluation of the school wide plan such as creating and reviewing during SAC/Title I quarterly meetings, how decisions will be made to spend 1% set aside for parent involvement, monitoring of plan progress, ongoing review of data). Strategies to increase family engagement are included in the PFEP.

School personnel from JSIA (Administration, Social Workers, Counselor, Nurse) reach out to members of the community to build and sustain partnerships. Through these interactions we are able to identify how each of these partners can uniquely support the students at James Stephens. Many of the organizations are local and understand the needs of our students. In response to their support, our students have written "thank you" notes.

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

James Stephens International Academy ensures that social emotional needs are being met by the school counselor who available for individual student referral as well as small group or whole class lessons. Teachers are able to sign up for whole group instruction with topics including self-control, bullying, character education, etc. We also participate in the mentoring program with Lehigh Senior High School students visiting James Stephens' campus quarterly. Those mentors/role models worked with selected students in class and during specials to build relationships and support social-emotional needs. The school behavior specialist works with individual students as well as small group and whole classes to incorporate mindfulness strategies, self-regulation, and behavior improvement plans.(i.e.: counseling, mentoring, guidance enrichment, etc.)

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

James Stephens implements multiple strategies to ensure kindergarten students and families are supported during the transition from pre-k to kindergarten. These strategies include providing an

opportunity for incoming kindergarteners to visit the school and develop positive relationships for the upcoming school year. We hold a Kindergarten Orientation which informs parents about the academic and developmental expectations and how they can support their child at home. Parents also get a glimpse into the daily routine and activities their children will experience. During fourth quarter, Pre-K students on to our campus practice getting ready for Kindergarten by transitioning to a full cafeteria routine that mirrors the Kindergarten students' routine. Additionally, external agency Pre-K classes are invited to visit a JSIA kindergarten class and tour the campus. Also, all levels are invited to an Open House prior to the start of school to meet teachers and acclimate to the school environment.
Our upcoming kindergarten students will be given a pre-assessment to identify areas of need. Teachers will use these results to group the students accordingly, and be sure their academic needs are being addressed and accommodated. Parents are also invited to attend a Kindergarten Orientation.(ie: kindergarten orientation, private and group tours, summer assessment screeners, summer-school program for incoming kindergarteners, take home curriculum to help prepare for academic success, review of pre-k records, etc).

Fifth grade students and families transitioning to Middle School are provided information regarding school enrollment open houses, we encourage their families to visit local middle schools to ask questions about their programs. Students in fifth grade work on a mock schedule of what their middle school schedule might look like based on their current level of academic performance, and also learn about the types of electives and extra-curricular activities are available.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The leadership team meets to analyze student achievement data from CASTLE, FOCUS and Performance Matters in order to identify support needed to maximize the outcomes of all students. Available resources are considered and are utilized to meet the needs of students based on the multi-tiered system of student supports as outlined in the district's MTSS Manual
After locally allocated funds are designated, additional funds from Title I, SAI, and ESE are reviewed to determine which source is appropriate for supplementary resources. These funds are used for supplemental personnel positions, extended day opportunities, and additional student materials. Also other federal, state, and local agency programs are coordinated by the District Title I, Part C- Migrant; Title I, Part D; Title II; Title III; Title IX- Homeless; Violence Prevention Programs; Nutrition Programs; Head Start; Adult Education; Career and Technical Education; Job Training to provide extensive opportunities for eligible participants to access services, as needed.
Principal and Assistant Principal schedules weekly meetings to review data, monitor student progress, and allocate resources. To ensure inventory is utilized to maximum impact, the District Resource Allocation Sheet, the Title I Workbook, Destiny, and PeopleSoft are maintained and reviewed to assign resources to classrooms, teachers, and/or individual students, as appropriate.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

James Stephens International Academy provides college and career awareness through partnering with local universities such as FGCU and FSW. The school also sponsors events such as career day and classroom career presenters.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Attendance					$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Behavior					$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Class Performance - Below					$256,941.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE		2019-20
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0592 - James Stephens Elementary School	Title, I Part A			$199,926.00
			Notes: Instructional leaders and Peer Collaborative Teachers				
	5100	750-Other Personal Services	0592 - James Stephens Elementary School	Title, I Part A			$27,500.00
			Notes: Long Term Substitute				
	6300	100-Salaries	0592 - James Stephens Elementary School	Title, I Part A			$29,515.00
			Notes: Peer Collaborative Teacher				
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Class Performance- Proficient					$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Class Performance- Above					$0.00
						Total:	$256,941.00