Alachua County Public Schools

Stephen Foster Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Stephen Foster Elementary School

3800 NW 6TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32609

https://www.sbac.edu/foster

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Roberson

Start Date for this Principal: 9/8/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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

Stephen Foster Elementary School

3800 NW 6TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32609

https://www.sbac.edu/foster

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	94%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

All Steamers take the LEAD to succeed.
Live safely
Exhibit kindness
Act responsibly
Demonstrate respect.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Steamers are Leaders!

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wakeley, Wanza	Principal	Instructional Leader
Rodriguez, Mistie	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader
Yocum, Todd	Dean	
Pearson, Karen	School Counselor	
	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 9/8/2020, Jennifer Roberson

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
38

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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.	

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	39	56	57	91	102	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	435
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	12	10	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	1	0	6	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	1	1	9	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
	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	2	1	6	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/14/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	64	62	61	97	98	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	474
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	3	16	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	9	4	7	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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

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

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	3	3	2	3	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	

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	
Number of students enrolled	64	62	61	97	98	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	474
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	3	16	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	9	4	7	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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

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

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	3	3	2	3	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	

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	63%	59%	57%	64%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	57%	58%	63%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	49%	53%	55%	48%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	60%	63%	62%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	61%	62%	60%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	49%	51%	40%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	57%	53%	64%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(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.

ELA							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	62%	57%	5%	58%	4%	
	2018	64%	56%	8%	57%	7%	
Same Grade Comparison	-2%						
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	66%	55%	11%	58%	8%	
	2018	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%	
Same Grade Comparison	5%						
Cohort Comparison	2%						
05	2019	61%	55%	6%	56%	5%	
	2018	62%	55%	7%	55%	7%	
Same Grade Comparison	-1%						
Cohort Comparison	0%						

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	68%	58%	10%	62%	6%	
	2018	67%	60%	7%	62%	5%	
Same Grade Comparison	1%						
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	70%	60%	10%	64%	6%	
	2018	69%	60%	9%	62%	7%	
Same Grade Comparison	1%						
Cohort Comparison	3%						
05	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%	
	2018	62%	61%	1%	61%	1%	
Same Grade Comparison	3%						
Cohort Comparison	-4%						

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	58%	55%	3%	53%	5%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	64%	55%	9%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	11	31	38	18	37	35	7				
ASN	100	92		100	83						
BLK	32	49	38	39	46	36	24				
HSP	65	71		73	71		55				
MUL	76	65		80	88						
WHT	80	65		87	76		83				
FRL	40	49	35	48	51	39	23				

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	18	8	11	22	22	18					
ASN	100	77		100	86						
BLK	36	39	24	42	45	31	45				
HSP	76	62		80	67		90				
MUL	78			72							
WHT	83	66		85	69		81				
FRL	45	40	28	50	48	35	51				

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	6	33	38	15	46	39	9				
ASN	100	71		95	79						
BLK	35	55	50	32	45	41	26				
HSP	79	86		76	64						
MUL	57	47		67	67						
WHT	87	68		85	71		96				
FRL	45	58	55	43	46	40	38				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	94
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	77
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	78
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Students with disabilities and Black/African American students are performing below their same aged peers who are not in these categories in ELA, Math and Science. Contributing factors to low performance include:
lack of prerequisite skills and prior knowledge, targeted assistance with deficit skills, further need for professional development for teachers, supports for school personnel related to class size and need for targeted instruction.

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

Science Achievement showed the largest decline from the prior year. .
Factors that contribute to declines include: lack of prerequisite skills and knowledge,

targeted assistance with deficit skills, supports for school personnel related to class size and the need for targeted instruction in Science.

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.

There are gaps when looking specifically at the lowest quartile students in regards to learning gains in ELA and Math. Stephen Foster students scored lower than the district and the state in these categories. While there were improvements from 2018 to 2019, these students are still struggling. A contributing factor is the criteria to make a learning gain for this category is very steep, even if progress is shown year to year.

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

The lowest quartile for both ELA and Math showed improvement along with ELA and Math learning gains. An increase in the intervention minutes and a direct focus on best practices with instructional delivery are contributing factors.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

A large number of students have below a 90% attendance record. There are also a large number of students who are scoring below a level 3 in ELA and/or Math.

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

1. Improve outcomes for Students with Disabilities.
2. Improve outcomes for African American Students.
3. Improve learning gains in ELA for students in the lowest quartile.
4. Improve learning gains in Math for students in the lowest quartile.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There is a demonstrated achievement gap when comparing the academic achievement between African American students and their White and Hispanic peers.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the academic performance of African-American students to meet or exceed the ESSA federal index target of 41%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Wanza Wakeley (wakelewt@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Explicit communication of high expectations for all students, engaging all students in rigorous, standards-based curricula, and the use of varied strategies to instruct diverse learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of curricula and teaching practices that are developmentally and culturally appropriate, and are based on the needs of the students, are those that yield the best results while recognizing cultural differences and continuing to set high expectations for all children.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Push in support from Title 1 teachers in general education classroom.
2. Strategic scheduling of Title 1 teachers
3. Use of culturally relevant and grade level appropriate text and materials for all instruction
4. Standards-based lesson planning among teams

Person Responsible	Mistie Rodriguez (rodriguezms@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities are not making academic gains when compared to their non-disabled peers.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the academic performance of students with disabilities to meet or exceed the ESSA federal index target of 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Wanza Wakeley (wakelewt@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instruction within the general education classroom, building positive relationships with students, adaptive grading scales, requiring test to be corrected for grade or retaken; chunking of test in several parts or shortening test for SWD,
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with disabilities that receive support in general education placements achieve higher than students that are serviced in resource rooms or self-contained placements.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Support facilitation in general education classrooms
2. Strategic scheduling of ESE teachers and paraprofessionals
3. Use of grade level text and materials
4. Standards-based lesson planning based on assessment data

Person Responsible	Mistie Rodriguez (rodriguezms@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improve the achievement level for students in the Lowest Quartile.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of students in the lowest quartile who achieve an annual learning gain on the FSA assessment by 3 percentage points: to 41% in ELA and 43% in math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Wanza Wakeley (wakelewt@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Frequent progress monitoring, reteaching and remediation informed by standards-based formative assessments, and targeted instruction to students who are in the lowest quartile.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Struggling students require more direct instruction within smaller groups for targeted skill focus. This allows for smaller groups and more one to one time with struggling learners.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Push in Title 1 support in general education classrooms.
2. Strategic scheduling of Title 1 teachers.
3. Use of grade level appropriate text and curriculum materials.
4. Standards-based lesson planning based on assessment data
5. Targeted instruction tailored to individual student needs

Person Responsible	Mistie Rodriguez (rodriguezms@gm.sbac.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Stephen Foster Elementary is in the second year of implementation of the Leader in Me. The Leader in Me is a school-wide school culture initiative targeting improved outcomes for all students through direct instruction in the 7 Habits of Highly Successful Students.The Leader in Me Lighthouse Team identified multiple priorities based on the LIM End of Year Measurable Results Assessment. Priorities include improving student attendance, improving a supportive environment, increasing student led achievement, increasing family involvement, and improving student behavior. These priorities are the main focus of our school's leadership Lighthouse Team. The Lighthouse Team is comprised of the leaders of Action Teams

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Stephen Foster is in the third year implementation of the Leader in Me. The Leader in Me (LIM) is a school-wide culture initiative involving a process that empowers students with leadership and life skills to thrive in the 21st Century. The process embodies the belief that every child is a leader with unique talents and strengths. The LIM serves as a foundational operating system for Foster, teaching leadership principles, creating a leadership culture, and aligning academics. It impacts all stakeholders starting first with staff training, then moving out to students, their families, and the community.
Teaching leadership starts with staff training in the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People, so they can model and teach the students. The training is ongoing throughout the year. Teachers teach leadership principles through direct instruction and integrated approaches in the 7 Habits of Highly Successful Students. Students are known for sharing these habits with their parents. Additionally, the LIM principals are communicated and displayed at all parent events.
A leadership culture is readily created by improving relationships, promoting positive classrooms, building a supportive physical environment, and intrinsically motivating staff and students. Students are assigned leadership roles within every classroom. Leadership student roles are also available school wide, as they take the lead on existing programs and traditions. There is an intentional focus hearing every person's voice and affirming their potential.
Deliberate planning based on data, assists Foster in aligning academic systems within all programs. Foster's school goals, team goals and individual goals support the leadership principles with a focus on reading and math proficiency as well as the promotion of teaching efficacy and student-led learning. The objective is to engage students who will be equipped to achieve and lead their own learning.

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American				$249,291.40
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0041 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		$237,891.90
			Notes: Personnel Cost			

			Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0041 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		$1,049.50
			Notes: Reading A-Z			
			0041 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		$10,350.00
			Notes: Leader in Me Consultant			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**				**$5,365.85**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0041 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		$1,725.00
			Notes: Leader in Me conference			
			0041 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl			$3,640.85
			Notes: Leader in Me Symposium			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**				**$16,103.07**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0041 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		$5,700.75
			Notes: Ready Florida			
			0041 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		$2,636.00
			Notes: Reflex Math			
			0041 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		$5,806.00
			Notes: Achieve 3000			
			0041 - Stephen Foster Elementary Schl	Title, I Part A		$1,960.32
			Notes: Lead Teacher Supplement			
					Total:	**$270,760.32**