

Polk County Public Schools

James E. Stephens Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

James E. Stephens Academy

1350 MAPLE AVE N, Bartow, FL 33830

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/stephens>

Demographics

Principal: Nadia Lewis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (32%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	CS&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 Polk 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

James E. Stephens Academy

1350 MAPLE AVE N, Bartow, FL 33830

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/stephens>

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 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	79%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Provide high quality education in a supportive environment that will develop life long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide a supportive environment where students will perform to their fullest potential and students will leave with the necessary tools to become productive, caring and responsible citizens.

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
Bracey, James	Principal	Oversee all school operations; budget management; data management and analysis; staffing plan; instructional leadership; PLC and collaborative planning facilitation; coordinate work roles of leadership team; school improvement planning.
Breiter, Lee	Instructional Coach	All academic coaching responsibilities related to science and math; lead collaborative planning; mentor new teachers; facilitate campus induction for new hires; model and co-teach effective strategies; manage math materials; data management and analysis of student performance on school and district assessments; provide student intervention; lead classroom technology integration effort; oversee the set up and use of the science lab.
Hubbard, Jennifer	School Counselor	Responsible for all school guidance services; leads MTSS process; provides first-responder crisis intervention; provides in-class support to teachers on social-emotional learning and instruction; coordinates community and social-service outreach efforts; ELL testing and placement;
MacEachern, Melissa	Teacher, ESE	Responsible for the management and coordination of all ESE services; provides professional learning to ESE teachers; monitors ESE service minutes; schedules and coordinates IEP meeting
Towles, Alatheia	Assistant Principal	Instructional leadership; PLC and Collaborative Planning facilitation; manage school discipline; assist with master scheduling; oversees extended learning; coordinates with school transportation department; serves as TTI resource; co-manages PBIS and MTSS processes
Blanton, Christopher	Other	Mr. Blanton is our Behavior Interventionist. He oversees the implementation of PBIS and provides in-class support to teachers and students for behavior management.
Cortes Vega, Shaime	Instructional Coach	All academic coaching responsibilities related to reading; lead collaborative planning; mentor new teachers; facilitate campus induction for new hires; model and co-teach effective strategies; manage ELA materials; data management and analysis of student performance on school and district assessments; provide student intervention; lead classroom technology integration efforts.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Nadia Lewis

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.*

1

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (32%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING

ESSA Status	CS&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	62	60	58	72	47	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	359
Attendance below 90 percent	13	16	16	16	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	11	8	11	18	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in ELA	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	14	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on Dec 2019 STAR ELA	0	0	3	23	14	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on Dec 2019 STAR Math	0	33	37	35	18	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160

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	6	11	23	13	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 5/20/2020

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	63	74	78	70	68	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	417
Attendance below 90 percent	18	24	15	16	15	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	6	5	13	19	9	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	39	40	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

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	3	3	24	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	7	9	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	63	74	78	70	68	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	417
Attendance below 90 percent	18	24	15	16	15	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	6	5	13	19	9	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	14	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	39	40	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

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	3	3	24	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	7	9	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	30%	51%	57%	35%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	36%	51%	58%	51%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	24%	49%	53%	68%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	33%	57%	63%	45%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	40%	56%	62%	55%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	47%	51%	45%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	24%	47%	53%	23%	46%	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	30%	52%	-22%	58%	-28%
	2018	25%	51%	-26%	57%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	31%	48%	-17%	58%	-27%
	2018	31%	48%	-17%	56%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	24%	47%	-23%	56%	-32%
	2018	27%	50%	-23%	55%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	30%	56%	-26%	62%	-32%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	32%	56%	-24%	62%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	25%	56%	-31%	64%	-39%
	2018	45%	57%	-12%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	39%	51%	-12%	60%	-21%
	2018	35%	56%	-21%	61%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	25%	45%	-20%	53%	-28%
	2018	36%	51%	-15%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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	7	18	12	2	24	22					
ELL	14	27		14	18						
BLK	18	29	17	26	40	30	17				
HSP	41	42		33	28		42				
WHT	41	48		44	52		26				
FRL	26	36	27	27	36	41	17				
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	7	47	65	16	57	53	18				
ELL	14	55		36	64						
BLK	21	45	64	26	39	38	17				
HSP	31	53	64	43	63		40				
WHT	46	34		59	59		57				
FRL	30	48	64	38	51	54	41				

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	13	41		22	36						
ELL	24	55		44	73						
BLK	25	50		23	42	40	8				
HSP	40	67		61	76		41				
WHT	42	30		51	40						
FRL	35	54	83	45	56	45	17				

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	304
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	12
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	25
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	42
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	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

FSA data from 2019 shows James E. Stephens Elementary performed below state and district averages in all school-grade cells. In ELA cells, 4th and 5th grade achievement levels were unchanged from 2018. Learning gains in ELA were negative. The cohort trend in ELA was -7%. In mathematics, the gap between the school district/state averages increased from 2018, with 4th grade (same grade) having a 20% drop in proficiency. Analysis of sub-group data shows ELA decreases in all areas for SWD, ELL, and African-American students. African-American students performed better in math, but SWD and ELL decreased similarly to ELA results.

James E. Stephens Elementary School's lowest performing area for the 2019-2020 year was discipline referrals and out-of-school suspensions. One of the SIP Areas of Focus was related to office discipline referrals (ODR). The goal was to reduce ODRs from 522 to 261. This goal was not met. As of school closure in March 2020, there were 353 ODR's. Factors contributing to the low performance include the late addition of a Behavior Interventionist and a delay in providing PD on behavior management strategies due to the late release of UniSig funds. We had a fifth grade class with long-term subs (2) for the first semester. Due to the loss of 3 units in September, there were several shifts in student and teacher placements that disrupted routines. We had 8 first-year teachers who were learning effective management strategies.

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

Review of STAR test data among ESSA subgroups, the greatest decline was among Hispanic students. The major factor contributing to this drop was student attendance among Hispanic students. 50% of our Hispanic population had attendance rates lower than 95%.

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.

FSA data from 2019 shows a 30% gap in Math Achievement between the school and the state averages. This gap increase from 20% in 2018 due to the rezoning of a failing school within our district. Stephens Elementary absorbed 120 students (1/3 of our total population) from the closed school, all of whom were below grade level.

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

The most improved data component was in Math Learning Gains among the bottom 25%. In 2019, the FSA percentage in this cell was 37%. STAR data from February 2020 showed learning gains in this cell at 64%, with an April prediction of 68%. The main action that influenced this success was the realignment of services for ESE students in 5th grade. We had 6 students in fifth grade who were self-contained and in the bottom 25% in math. These students were transitioned to an inclusion classroom for 60 minutes of math daily. Their self-contained teacher traveled with them and served as an inclusion teacher during that time. These students sat with general ed peers and received the same instruction and participated in the same learning tasks. All 6 of these students demonstrated learning gains in math. In addition, our school-based and regional math coaches provided coaching cycles with our fourth and fifth grade math teachers.

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

Our biggest areas of concern are the number of OSS days, and low attendance rate (which is caused, in part, by suspensions)

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

1. Improve behavior management campus-wide to decrease ODRs and OSS days
2. Increase engagement in learning tasks to decrease minor disruptive behaviors
3. Increase attendance rates
4. Lower teacher turnover rate

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	For two consecutive years, office discipline referral (ODR) numbers at James E. Stephens Elementary have been among the highest of all elementary schools in Polk County. In 2018, there were 522 ODR's. Our 2019 SIP included a goal to decrease this number by 50% This goal was not achieved. There were 353 ODR's written as of our last day on campus, March 13, 2020. The out-of-school suspension days associated with this high number of ODR's contributed to an overall attendance rate of 92%. There was a total of 327 days of out-of-school suspension. Eighty-two students received at least 1 day of OSS, with 60 students receiving multiple days. Multiple-days of OSS were issued for major offenses as outlined by Polk County Public Schools Student Code of Conduct.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal for this area of focus is to reduce OSS days by 50% (from 327 to 163) in 2020-2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	James E. Stephens will implement a school-wide system of management using CHAMPS. CHAMPS is a "Proactive & Positive Approach to Classroom Management" produced by Safe & Civil Schools. CHAMPS allow teachers and other school staff to develop uniform, systematic expectations for students. CHAMPS expectations are posted for visual reference in all areas of the campus. These expectations are also communicated verbally at each transition time in the classroom and across campus. CHAMPS expectations are set for multiple classroom situations (whole group, small group, independent work, assessment), for the cafeteria, for walking in hallways, etc. The acronym CHAMPS stands for Conversation level, How to ask for help, Activity, Movement, Product, and Success. For every part of the school day, staff communicates to students the expectation for each part of the acronym. The communication is routine and a part of the daily lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	CHAMPS was adopted as a district-wide initiative by Polk County Public Schools. James E. Stephens Elementary will use the CHAMPS text published by Safe & Civil Schools. The students we serve have high levels of socio-emotional behavior responses. There is a high degree of disruption in their family lives. Research by Safe & Civil Schools and others demonstrates the positive behavioral outcomes associated with high-structure in schools for students in low-structure homes.

Action Steps to Implement

During pre-planning week, school support services staff (guidance counselor, behavior interventionist, and school psychologist) will facilitate professional development for teachers on defining behavior and the 'why' behind behavior. This will include developing skills among teachers to increase MTSS Level 1 supports with the goal of intervening in the classroom to keep students in class. Specific attention will be given to ESSA sub-groups (African-American, Hispanic, ESE, and SED).

Person Responsible Jennifer Hubbard (jennifer.hubbard@polk-fl.net)

A team of teachers (School-based CHAMPS Team) will work collaboratively with administration to review the CHAMPS research and develop school-wide structures and expectations. This team will develop a set of common area (hallways, restrooms, etc.) expectations. Teachers will work in grade-level teams to develop classroom routines.

Person Responsible James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)

Our music and art teachers will use non-student contact times during their schedules to provide social-emotional lessons to small-groups of targeted students.

Person Responsible Christopher Blanton (christopher.blanton@polk-fl.net)

UniSig funds will be used to retain our Behavior Interventionist. He will assume responsibility for tracking behaviors and working with teachers to develop plans to proactively manage behaviors. He will also manage our PBIS program.

Person Responsible Alatheia Towles (alatheia.towles@polk-fl.net)

The school-based CHAMPS team will provide an overview of the re-boot to the staff during pre-planning week and will assist teachers with on-going support throughout the year.

Person Responsible Alatheia Towles (alatheia.towles@polk-fl.net)

The CHAMPS team will prepare a schedule for teaching school-wide expectations at the beginning of the year and after extended breaks.

Person Responsible James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will be given a standardized list of possible interventions for common behaviors. This tool will be used in conjunction with behavior tracking forms to provide teachers and administrators MTSS data.

Person Responsible Alatheia Towles (alatheia.towles@polk-fl.net)

Monthly PLC's will focus on behavioral MTSS data and interventions. ESSA sub-group data will be analyzed.

Person Responsible James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)

To impact ESSA sub-group needs, staff will participate in a book study on Ruby Payne's Framework for Understanding Poverty.

Person Responsible James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)

During the fall Family Engagement event during which the SIP will be covered, student attendance will be addressed and the school-wide expectations will be explained to families.

Person Responsible Christopher Blanton (christopher.blanton@polk-fl.net)

Extended learning (after-school) will include time allocated for use of social-emotional curriculum.

Person Responsible Jennifer Hubbard (jennifer.hubbard@polk-fl.net)

Tiered support for teachers who struggle with classroom management.

Person Responsible Alatheia Towles (alatheia.towles@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Student engagement is an area of focus for James E. Stephens Elementary School for multiple reasons. The focus will be on refining lesson plans across all classrooms to include best practices for engaging students. This area of focus impacts student learning by increasing student interest in learning tasks, by allowing for more opportunities for differentiation, and by reducing off-task behaviors related to boredom, frustration, and lack of interest. This area of focus was identified as a critical need based upon the number of calls for administrators to provide support for minor classroom disruptions. Most of these minor behaviors stem from disengagement. By using research-based strategies for engagement when developing learning tasks, not only can we expect to see measurable learning gains, we also support our primary area of focus, which is reducing absenteeism.

Measurable Outcome:

This area of focus will be measured using learning gains in STAR Reading and Math. The goal is that 50% students taking STAR Reading and/or Math tests in August will demonstrate learning gains using the STAR-to-FSA equivalency chart by April.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The evidence-based strategy we will use to support increased engagement is "20 Strategies for Increasing Student Engagement." This research was authored by William Bender, Ph.D. and published by Learning Sciences International in 2017.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Polk County Public Schools partners with Learning Sciences International as our model for instructional planning and delivery. The strategies on which we will focus align to the body of LSI research and are a logical step in our LSI implementation.

Action Steps to Implement

A new position, Reading Interventionist, will be added using TTI funding to support the in-class implementation of engaging lessons. This position will be filled by and experience grade 3-5 teacher with verifiable experience in ELA planning and success in small group interventions.

Person Responsible

James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)

Collaborative planning led by instructional coaches, and supervised by administrators, will focus on revamping lesson plans to include LSI research-based engagement strategies. At least one strategy will be included in every lesson.

Person Responsible

Alathea Towles (alathea.towles@polk-fl.net)

PLC's will be held to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of engagement strategy implementation. Based upon discussion and review of learning data, teachers will be tiered for support in this effort.

Person Responsible

James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)

Administrative observations focused on engagement.

Person Responsible

James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)

Effective engagement strategies taught and practiced to students in Extended Learning.

Person Responsible Alatheia Towles (alatheia.towles@polk-fl.net)

Administrative observations focused on engagement.

Person Responsible James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)

Effective engagement strategies taught and practiced to students in Extended Learning.

Person Responsible Alatheia Towles (alatheia.towles@polk-fl.net)

Hire a paraprofessional using UniSig funds to provide in-class support to teachers and students in implementation of engaging tasks.

Person Responsible James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)

Use of TTI funds to employ Teacher Media Specialist to increase student engagement in library and media services.

Person Responsible James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)

Use UniSig and TTI funds to purchase iPads and carts to increase opportunities for digital student engagement. This aligns to our research-based engagement strategies (LSI).

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team will address teacher turnover through the following steps:

- 1. Administrators will be transparent with candidates in interviews regarding the social-emotional needs of our students.**
- 2. Instructional coaches will provide in-class support to teachers new to James E. Stephens and to returning teachers with a history of classroom management issues**
- 3. New and struggling teachers will have the opportunity to participate in voluntary support training after-school**
- 4. One-to-one problem solving sessions between teachers and school psychologist**

The leadership team will address the number of office discipline referrals by:

- 1. Providing training in Tier 1 Behavior Supports**
- 2. Creating a high-structure system of school wide expectations**
- 3. Drumbeat for social-emotional learning**
- 4. Increased efforts for open communication between teachers and parents (postive calls)**
- 5. Use of Positive Referrals (Kind Kid of the Week, etc.)**

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.

To build a positive school culture among internal stakeholders (teachers, paras, staff), school administrators assembled a team of teachers (classroom and non-classroom) to work collaboratively to develop a system of school-wide expectations and culture. This team will lead our positive culture initiatives. Included on this team are our Campus Induction leader and Teacher Engagement Ambassador. The goal of this group is to facilitate and support staff and students in the roll out of a school-wide system of expectations that lead to a positive culture and learning environment.

James E. Stephens Elementary school utilizes parents and community members on its School Advisory Council. The SAC members work school leaders to provide for a variety of needs for both staff and students. Our partnerships provide food for distribution to needy families (Kidspack), clothing and uniforms available to students through parent donations and community partner donations, school supply donations (Coca-Cola, Baycare), and social-emotional learning supports from external mental health agencies. By meeting these needs, students and families are supported and students are more likely to attend school with a positive outlook.

The school promotes a positive culture to families and the community using social media. Our Positive Behavior Interventions and Support system is widely promoted so external stakeholder can help us celebrate the great things happening with our students. Student celebrations are used to recognize both academic and non-academic achievements.

Community partners are used to help with campus beautification efforts. We have received donations of paint from Home Depot to brighten the physical environment. A local landscaper is volunteering time to assist with maintenance and upkeep of a garden area. A parent volunteer assists with grounds keeping efforts.

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: Culture & Environment: Discipline				\$64,598.44
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG	1.0	\$46,918.56
			<i>Notes: Other Certified Instructional - School based/District paid Interventionist who work with small groups of students in need of remediation - Behavioral Interventionist</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$4,691.86
			<i>Notes: Retirement - 10% - Instructional Personnel</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$3,589.27
			<i>Notes: Social Security - 7.65% - Instructional Personnel</i>			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$9,288.00
			<i>Notes: Health and Hospitalization - Instructional Personnel</i>			
	5100	232-Life Insurance	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$21.60
			<i>Notes: Life Insurance - Instructional Personnel</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$89.15
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation - .19% - Instructional Personnel</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				\$98,122.51
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	150-Aides	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG	1.0	\$13,474.95
			<i>Notes: Salaries - Classroom Paraprofessionals - who work under the direct supervision of a teacher to work with small groups of students in need of remediation - 1 Classroom Para</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$1,347.50
			<i>Notes: Retirement - 10% - Instructional Personnel</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$1,030.83
			<i>Notes: Social Security - 7.65% - Instructional Personnel</i>			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$9,288.00
			<i>Notes: Health and Hospitalization - Instructional Personnel</i>			
	5100	232-Life Insurance	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$21.60
			<i>Notes: Life Insurance - Instructional Personnel</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$25.60
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation - .19% - Instructional Personnel</i>			
	5900	120-Classroom Teachers	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$7,222.00
			<i>Notes: Classroom Teachers- Provide stipends to Teachers to provide supplemental after school, before school or Saturday tutoring 40 students, 5 teachers, 350 hours</i>			

	5900	210-Retirement	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$1,243.73
			<i>Notes: Retirement - 10% - Instructional personnel for extended learning</i>			
	5900	220-Social Security	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$951.43
			<i>Notes: Social Security - 7.65% - Instructional personnel for extended learning</i>			
	5900	240-Workers Compensation	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$23.63
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation - .19% - Instructional personnel for extended learning</i>			
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$17,371.82
			<i>Notes: Classroom Teachers - Stipends for Classroom Teachers participating in curriculum planning after contract hours *14 teachers at approximately 38 hours each * 3 teachers at approximately 10 hours each</i>			
	6300	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$5,811.86
			<i>Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - Stipends- participating in curriculum planning after contract hours - Guidance Counselor, Network Mgr., and Interventionists *6 IPs at approximately 38 hours each *5 IPs at approximately 10 hours each</i>			
	6300	210-Retirement	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$2,427.12
			<i>Notes: Retirement - 10%- Curriculum Planning</i>			
	6300	220-Social Security	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$1,856.75
			<i>Notes: Social Security - 7.65% - Curriculum Planning</i>			
	6300	240-Workers Compensation	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$46.12
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation - .19% - Curriculum Planning</i>			
	6300	140-Substitute Teachers	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$1,087.52
			<i>Notes: Substitute Teachers - Stipends for Provisional Substitutes Teachers participating in curriculum planning after contract hours. (Working on certification)</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$7,248.81
			<i>Notes: Supplies - Instructional; consumable supplies such as paper, pencils/pens, markers/ highlighters, folders; all for direct instructional use</i>			
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$3,798.10
			<i>Notes: Technology-Related Supplies; 38 iPad cases with keyboards (\$99.95/each)</i>			
	5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$15,012.00
			<i>Notes: Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized - \$250.00 to \$999.99 - 38 iPads (\$394/each)</i>			
	5100	648-Technology-Related Capitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$1,617.91

			<i>Notes: Technology-Related Capitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment -greater than or equal to \$1,000; 1 iPad Mobile-AC SYNC cart (\$1,617.91/each)</i>			
	6200	610-Library Books	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Library Books - Supplemental media materials and books - Level books, science books</i>			
	5900	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$3,715.23
			<i>Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - Stipends- to provide supplemental after school, before school or Saturday tutoring 20 students, 2 IPs, 150 hours</i>			
	5900	140-Substitute Teachers	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$1,500.00
			<i>Notes: Provisional Teachers - Stipends- to provide supplemental after school, before school or Saturday tutoring 16 students, 1 provisional, 75 hours</i>			
Total:						\$167,865.00