

The School District of Lee County

J. Colin English Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

J. Colin English Elementary School

120 PINE ISLAND RD, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

<http://jce.leeschools.net/>**Demographics****Principal: Joe Williams**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/18/2008

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: C (53%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

J. Colin English Elementary School

120 PINE ISLAND RD, North Fort Myers, FL 33903

<http://jce.leeschools.net/>

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	59%

School Grades History

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

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 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.

At J. Colin English Elementary, our mission is to inspire young people to become Internationally-minded "World Changers" by providing them with an inquiry-based learning environment that promotes global understanding and respect.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At J. Colin English Elementary, our vision is to develop "Learners for Life".

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
Williams III, Joe	Principal	Principal- PLC facilitator
Mett, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten team leader
Ellis, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	ESE teacher
Moneghan, Shanell	Teacher, K-12	4th grade team leader
Wait, Christina	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade team leader
Stevens, Monica	Assistant Principal	PLC facilitator
Stanley, Theresa	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/18/2008, Joe Williams

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

17

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: C (53%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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 .	

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	45	53	60	44	57	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	299
Attendance below 90 percent	6	8	14	9	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	4	4	2	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	3	2	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 10/24/2020

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	60	72	59	65	47	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	352
Attendance below 90 percent	16	8	8	9	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	3	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	21	12	8	14	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	9	10	1	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
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	60	72	59	65	47	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	352
Attendance below 90 percent	16	8	8	9	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	3	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	21	12	8	14	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	9	10	1	4	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
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	52%	57%	57%	48%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	56%	58%	59%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	50%	53%	81%	49%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	60%	62%	63%	48%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	65%	62%	54%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	54%	51%	54%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	52%	53%	27%	51%	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	49%	58%	-9%	58%	-9%
	2018	37%	55%	-18%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
	2018	48%	53%	-5%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
	2018	47%	52%	-5%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	71%	61%	10%	62%	9%
	2018	57%	58%	-1%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	62%	-14%	64%	-16%
	2018	53%	58%	-5%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	45%	58%	-13%	60%	-15%
	2018	54%	57%	-3%	61%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	50%	-7%	53%	-10%
	2018	44%	52%	-8%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	22	24		48	47						
ELL	33	45		44	45						
BLK	36	50		50	40						
HSP	54	69	40	63	58		50				
WHT	53	62		63	53	31	54				
FRL	48	63	63	60	58	45	47				
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	23	52	67	23	40	40	20				
ELL	8			15							
BLK	53	55		47	58						
HSP	38	50	38	52	70	56	35				
WHT	51	53	72	57	43	31	54				
FRL	40	46	53	54	53	45	40				
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	27	61		19	48	55	25				
ELL	30	65		35	47						
BLK	59	50		53	40						
HSP	37	55	71	40	53	47	14				
WHT	52	65	91	52	59		35				
FRL	46	58	76	46	58	64	26				

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	57
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	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	453
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
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	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	53
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	58
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.

Science achievement level for 2019 was 47%, which is a 2% increase from 2018 school year. The lowest performing data component is 5th grade science. Last school year we improved in that component by nearly 20 percentage points using a non-state adopted curricula. This year we were required to use a different curriculum and had only minimal gains compared to last school year.

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

Math L25 learning gains for 2019 was 42%, which is a 1% increase from 2018 school year. The component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was the math L25's. I believe the

decline can be attributed to our highly mobile population. We have many students who enrolled in our school who are not familiar with our academic standards, and they have moved multiple times during the school year.

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.

4th grade Math achievement level for 2019 was 48%, which is 16% lower than the state average of 64%. The component with the greatest gap when compared to the state is with our 4th grade math. This is attributed to our students not learning their math facts. This is a skill we continue to reinforce with our students each day. Learning math facts is an essential building block for intermediate aged students.

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

ELA achievement level for 2019 was 52%, which is 8% higher than 2018. The data component that showed the most improvement was the ELA Proficiency. This past school year a highly effective Academic Coach was assigned to each teacher on a grade level who did not make adequate ELA Learning Gains last year. These teachers were given assistance with lesson planning and lesson presentation.

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

Attendance in all grade levels is an area of concern. 13% of our students have missed 10% or more days of the school year. All grade level averages are above the district average.

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

1. Improve levels of proficiency for students with disabilities from 35% to 41% or higher.
2. Improve levels of ELA proficiency from 52% to 59%.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA proficiency levels for students in grades 3-5 are 52%, which is below the district average of 55%.
Measurable Outcome:	JCE will increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency in ELA in grades 3-5 from 52% to 59% as measured by the FY21 ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joe Williams III (joewil@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	JCE teachers will engage students in activities using higher order thinking skills and questioning techniques (e.g. Kagan and Thinking Maps). Teachers will implement a variety of evidence-based strategies to reach all learners.
Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy:	Lesson plan expectations include planning for Kagan and Thinking Maps and will be reviewed weekly through OnCourse. Student data will be reviewed at PLC meetings by teachers, admin, and coach to ensure effectiveness of strategies and adjust as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will meet in PLCs to review and discuss findings in student data.
2. Track standards for individual student intervention plans.
3. Develop of highly engaging, rigorous classroom activities.
4. Develop of discussion and tasks using higher order thinking skills and questions.
5. Continue to use Kagan structures school wide and continue Structure of the Month.
6. Develop lessons and activities incorporating Thinking Maps.
7. Provide professional development and coaching opportunities for teachers as needed.
8. Progress monitoring of all students including the ESSA subgroup, students with disabilities, will include the use of a data collection tool in the school Google drive.
9. Teachers will use data protocols to analyze data and plan for differentiated instruction to remediate areas of need for each student.

Person Responsible Joe Williams III (joewil@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: ELA L25 learning gains dropped from 55% to 54% during the 2018- 2019 school year.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the percentage of L25 students achieving learning gains from 54% to 60% as measured by the FY21 ELA FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joe Williams III (joewil@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will utilize our academic coach and ESE resource teachers to push into classrooms with the most needs. They will help lead PLC groups, grade level meetings, provide both small & large group instructional as well as coaching as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will implement a variety of evidence-based strategies to reach all learners. Lesson plan expectations include planning for Kagan and Thinking Maps and will be reviewed weekly through OnCourse. Student data will be reviewed at PLC meetings by teachers, admin, and coach to ensure effectiveness of strategies and adjust as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will meet in PLCs to review and discuss findings in student data.
2. Track standards for individual student intervention plans.
3. Develop of highly engaging, rigorous classroom activities.
4. Develop of discussion and tasks using higher order thinking skills and questions.
5. Continue to use Kagan structures school wide and continue Structure of the Month.
6. Develop lessons and activities incorporating Thinking Maps.
7. Provide professional development and coaching opportunities for teachers as needed.
8. Progress monitoring of all students including the ESSA subgroup, students with disabilities, will include the use of a data collection tool in the school Google drive.
9. Teachers will use data protocols to analyze data and plan for differentiated instruction to remediate areas of need for each student.

Person Responsible Joe Williams III (joewil@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	JCE school data shows a drop in learning gains for math students in grades 3-5 of the lowest 25% from 46% in 2018 to 42% in 2019.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of the lowest 25% students making learning gains in math from 42% to 47% as measured by the FY21 Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our academic coaches and ESE resource teachers will guide PLC groups targeting standards. During the 2nd semester, 3rd-5th grade will be divided into smaller groups during interventions. We will use one of our academic coaches, ESE resource teachers and our administrators to provide additional instructional using material from Florida Ready.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will implement a variety of evidence-based strategies to reach all learners. Lesson plan expectations include planning for Kagan and Thinking Maps and will be reviewed weekly through OnCourse. Student data will be reviewed at PLC meetings by teachers, admin, and coach to ensure effectiveness of strategies and adjust as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will meet in PLCs to review and discuss findings in student data.
2. Track standards for individual student intervention plans.
3. Develop of highly engaging, rigorous classroom activities.
4. Develop of discussion and tasks using higher order thinking skills and questions.
5. Continue to use Kagan structures school wide and continue Structure of the Month.
6. Develop lessons and activities incorporating Thinking Maps.
7. Provide professional development and coaching opportunities for teachers as needed.
8. Progress monitoring of all students including the ESSA subgroup, students with disabilities, will include the use of a data collection tool in the school Google drive.
9. Teachers will use data protocols to analyze data and plan for differentiated instruction to remediate areas of need for each student.

Person Responsible Joe Williams III (joewil@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student behavior and school culture at JCE is positive. Referral data shows a decrease of referrals from 11% to 5% in the 2018-2019 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease or maintain the percentage of students receiving 1 or more referrals from 5% to 4% as measured by the CASTLE early warning system by May 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joe Williams III (joewil@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The PBiS team will meet monthly to review all referrals. The team will address trends and make adjustments for individual student per their action plan
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The PBiS team will ensure the school-wide PBiS activities are used with fidelity. As the team meets, members will discuss the needs of their teams to ensure all stakeholders have what it takes to succeed. The referral data will be organized by student name, type of referral, and frequency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. At risk students will be assigned a 1:1 mentor from our community partners.
2. School counselor will meet with at- risk students.
3. Tier 3 students will have a action plan in place for interventions.

Person Responsible Joe Williams III (joewil@leeschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Based on school data, 20% of JCE students have less than 90% attendance.

Measurable Outcome: Decrease the percentage of chronically absent students (below 90% attendance) from 20% to 15% as measured by the CASTLE early warning system by May 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joe Williams III (joewil@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: JCE staff will utilize the schoolwide ROCK STAR program, recognizing classes with perfect attendance. Parent/ student meetings will be held for students who are chronically absent to develop a plan for improvement. The identified students will be rewarded for every 5 consecutive days of attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The home-school connection is vital to improving student attendance. Weekly and quarterly attendance records will be used as evidence of improvement or need further interventions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review attendance record of students with absences greater than 20 days.
2. Develop attendance contract based on student data.
3. Develop an incentive plan for students who improve attendance.
4. Schedule meetings with parents.
5. Monitor student attendance weekly.
6. Review ROCK STARS program with teachers.
7. Review ROCK STARS program with students at Back to School PBIS kick off and on the morning news.
8. Recognize ROCK STARS classes on the morning news.

Person Responsible: Theresa Stanley (theresams@leeschools.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible: Joe Williams III (joewil@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All priorities were addressed in the Areas of Focus.

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.

At the beginning of the school year, families and students were invited to a virtual open house and a virtual 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 meeting with parents at our School Advisory Council meeting to discuss school wide data, invite parents to attend curriculum nights to meet with teachers and delve deeper into curriculum.

Stakeholders will participate as the result of invitations through the school newsletter, flyers sent home, School Messenger, outdoor marquis, flexible meeting times. Community and business partners will be contacted to support the needs of the students and families to provide volunteer hours and donations.

Input from stakeholders will be collected through surveys open discussions. These communications will be flexible in format; 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. Parents and community members will be invited to review school data and set goals for the School Improvement Plan through SAC monthly meetings. SAC members will vote on the use of 1% set aside for parent involvement. Progress monitoring and review of data will occur at SAC meetings when appropriate. Strategies to increase family engagement are included in the PFEP.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00