James E. Stephens Academy

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
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	
* 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

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 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	77%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		D	D	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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bracey, James	Principal	Role of Principal
Towles, Alathea	Assistant Principal	Master scheduling, PBIS, MTSS, office discipline
Breiter, Lee	Math Coach	Campus induction, coaching and mentoring, lead facilitator of math planning and instruction
Cortes Vega, Shaime	Reading Coach	Campus induction, coaching and mentoring, lead facilitator of ELA planning and instruction
Blanton, Christopher	Behavior Specialist	PBIS, Tier II SEL, coaching for behavior and classroom mgmt.
MacEachern, Melissa	Other	ESE Facilitator

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.*
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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

306

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	15	53	58	51	51	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	288
Attendance below 90 percent	0	13	23	20	26	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	11	11	12	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Course failure in ELA	0	3	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	24	39	31	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	0	0	22	24	22	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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

Wednesday 7/21/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				30%	51%	57%	31%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				36%	51%	58%	44%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				24%	49%	53%	61%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				33%	57%	63%	41%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				40%	56%	62%	53%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	47%	51%	54%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				24%	47%	53%	38%	53%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	30%	52%	-22%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	31%	48%	-17%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
05	2021					
	2019	24%	47%	-23%	56%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	30%	56%	-26%	62%	-32%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	25%	56%	-31%	64%	-39%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	51%	-12%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	25%	45%	-20%	53%	-28%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, STAR Math, District Science Quarterly Assessments

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	31%	47%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	45%	30%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	33%	11%
	English Language Learners	0%	29%	29%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	40%	38%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40%	33%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	22%	11%	22%
	English Language Learners	33%	43%	43%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	6%	29%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3%	20%	29%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	14%	12%	2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	8%	3%
	Students With Disabilities	0	11%	0
	English Language Learners	10%	0	9%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29%	33%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27%	33%	35%
	Students With Disabilities	0	5%	6%
	English Language Learners	0	11%	25%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29%	32%	20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23%	27%	17%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	5%	5%
	English Language Learners	33%	33%	33%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22%	29%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	23%	19%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	23%	29%	21%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	24%	19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	17%	16%
	Students With Disabilities	19%	10%	0
	English Language Learners	31%	21%	29%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34%	41%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	36%	315
	Students With Disabilities	22%	30%	8%
	English Language Learners	20%	33%	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38%	33%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39%	30%	37%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	0	17%
	English Language Learners	20%	0	14%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42%	61%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	56%	65%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	78%	50%
	English Language Learners	36%	54%	72%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	5	8		11	25						
ELL	19			19							
BLK	13	30		11	25		36				
HSP	22	42		26	42		36				
WHT	37	45		50	64		70				
FRL	18	32		22	30		40				
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				

| | 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
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	31
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	261
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	23
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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

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

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	23
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	33
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	25
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

a. Social-emotional and behavior barriers continue to result in missed learning time (see data below about office referrals)
b. Low math and ELA performance among SWD population
c. Underperforming in 5 ESSA subgroups (White over 42%; Hispanic 45%)
d. Low learning gains among bottom quartile in ELA and math

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

a. Issues addressing Social Emotional learning
b. ELA and Early literacy proficiency
c. Performance among bottom quartile in ELA and Math
d. Black, Hispanic, ELL, and SWD subgroups

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

a. Students with multiple Adverse Childhood Experiences and need for more intensive SEL
b. Student attendance rate was low. Only 53% of students had 90%+ attendance
c. Increasing SWD enrollment and staffing
d. Teachers' difficulties adapting to teaching with social-distancing guidelines (no student-led small groups)
e. Lack of substitutes, vacancy, teacher on LOA that took interventionists and coaches away from their normal duties as school-wide support

a. Implement new school wide SEL program
b. Refine role of Behavior Interventionist
c. Staff development focus on SEL
d. Revamp PBIS to include attendance and SEL measures
e. Monitoring plan for bottom quartile
f. Increase ESE supports – push in by LEA
g. Addition of a third ESE separate class unit with an emphasis on EBD

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based upon STAR Math data, most improvement was made in the area of Math Learning Gains. Using the STAR Unified Scale Score, 82% of students taking STAR in September 2020 and April 2021 demonstrated a learning gain.

Fifth grade performance on Science Quarterly exams point toward large increase potential for this cell on school grade.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Factors contributing to this improvement included new math teachers in 4th and 5th grades; teacher coaching on implementation of district math tasks; monitoring use of high effect-size strategies; integrated spiral review of standards missed during Q4 of SY1920; flex-grouping of students for targeted intervention based upon ongoing progress monitoring results.

Fifth grade science tasks were cognitively complex and included deep literacy tasks.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

a. Ability grouping for intervention
b. Flex grouping of targeted intervention groups serviced be leadership team and teachers
c. After-school PLCs for deeper data review and work sample analysis
d. Staff development on SEL and PBIS
e. Tiering and mentoring of teachers in need of academic and classroom mgmt. supports
f. SEL time built into daily schedules with a framework of activities developed by PBIS team
g. Emphasis on acceleration of grade-level comprehension for all students

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

a. 3 pre-planning days on Zones of Regulation and SEL expectations
b. ½ day pre-planning on PBIS updates/changes
c. Pre-planning on management of minor disruptive behaviors
d. Ongoing development on BEST Standards
e. Weekly PD/PLC on responding to leading data

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

a. Increase use of LEA to service ESE students to 30% of her time
b. Revise PBIS reward system
c. Increase attendance monitoring and parent contact (principal)
d. Facilitate collaborative planning to focus on acceleration tasks (depth and quality)
e. School-wide attention to BEST standards

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Social Emotional Learning (SEL) and Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACES) result in students not having self-regulation skills. Disengagement in learning due to issues with self-regulation frequently manifests as behavorial and results in loss of instructional time for discipline. Over 50% of our students have at least two ACES and experience difficulty engaging both behaviorially and academically. For three 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 SY1819, there were 522 ODR's. In SY1920, there were 353 ODRs in the abbreviated school year. In SY2021, there were 398 office discipline referrals. Of these 398 ODRs, 229 were coded at Minor Disruptive Behaviors (MIN) resulting in 51 OSS days.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal for this area of focus is to reduce referrals for Minor Disruptive behavior from 229 to 160 (30%).
Monitoring:	Discipline data will be monitored weekly by administration. Data will be shared with staff weekly. MTSS documentation will be monitored by administration, behavior interventionist, and guidance counselor monthly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alathea Towles (alathea.towles@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidenced-based strategy we will implement is "The Zones of Regulation" by Leah M. Kuypers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	"The Zones of Regulation" was chosen for its depth of resources to address Tier 1 and 2 social emotional learning issues. It provides background and lesson plans to address executive functioning and cognitive control, social thinking, emotional self-understanding and regulation, and sensory integration and regulation. Tier 2 SEL is supported through the Superflex companion program. "The Zones of Regulation" is an approved and recommended Tier 1 SEL program.

Action Steps to Implement

Purchase "The Zones of Regulation" curriculum

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

Prepare PD on Zones for staff

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

Present PD in 3-day session in July 2021

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

Prepare classroom materials for all classrooms and distribute during preplanning week

Person Responsible	Lee Breiter (lee.breiter@polk-fl.net)

Develop updated MTSS tracking form and plan for minor behaviors

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

Weekly monitoring of behavior tracking and interventions

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

Schedule SEL time into master schedule.

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

Monthly MTSS team reviews of implementation and data

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

Regular, on going monitoring of Zones used in classrooms

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

Present overview of Zones during Title I Family Engagement/Building Capacity

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

Evaluate and plan for retraining throughout the year. Teachers in need of classroom mgmt. support will go through coaching with an assigned mentor

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

Behavior Interventionist will facilitate Tier 2 SEL groups and provide social skills lessons for students needing these services per their IEP

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

Behavior Interventionist will facilitate Tier 2 SEL groups and provide social skills lessons for students needing these services per their IEP

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2019 ESSA data was as follows: Overall 38% White 42% Black 25% Hispanic 45% SWD 12% ELL 31% SED 36% 2021 April STAR Data for ESSA Subgroups was as follows: Overall 36% White 47% Black 27% Hispanic 21% SWD 23% ELL 17% SED 32% This data indicates a need for attention to Black, Hispanic and SWD subgroups. As all ELL students at Stephens Elementary are Hispanic, and 100% of students are SED, focusing on these three subgroups will positively impact ELL and SED. Black and Hispanic students comprise 73% of the population. Our current ESE percentage is 24%.
Measurable Outcome:	Our measurable goal is to increase Black, Hispanic and SWD subgroup performance to at least 41%. Improvement across these subgroups will positively impact ELL and SED.
Monitoring:	ESSA subgroup demographic data for all students will be provided to teachers. This data will be used as partial criteria for intervention and acceleration flex grouping. Ongoing progress monitoring (STAR, district quarterlies) will be disaggregated by subgroup. Classroom assessment data will be reviewed in PLCs and disaggregated by subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Stephens Elementary will use the Learning Sciences International instructional model. This model is based on the research of Dr, Robert Marzano.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	LSI is the approved, district-wide model.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly collaborative planning and PLC

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

Addition of a new separate class ESE unit

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

Addition of a ESE paraprofessional

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

Schedule 30% of ESE Facilitator's time as direct student academic support

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

Utilize team from Student Services department to support teachers

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

Include attendance as a PBIS goal

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

Work with teachers on scaffolding, flex grouping, and use of differentiated instruction to meet needs of all students

Person Responsible Lee Breiter (lee.breiter@polk-fl.net)

Utilize leadership team as push in supports to facilitate small group acceleration

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

Teacher planning with Reading and Math coaches to ensure target-task alignment, quality assessments, and understanding of standards

Person Responsible Shaime Cortes Vega (shaime.cortesvega@polk-fl.net)

Reading Interventionist support to remediate and accelerate

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

Retain teacher media specialist to support literacy and accelerated reader.

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

Through weekly, advance review of lesson plans and weekly collaborative planning, Tier 1 instruction will be monitored to ensure all tasks are meeting grade-level expectations and are aligned to state standards.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2021 FSA ELA proficiency results: 3rd grade 23% 4th grade 22% 5th grade 24% Overall 23%
Measurable Outcome:	Overall proficiency on 2022 FSA ELA will increase by 12% to 35%.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored via classroom observation, student work samples, student assessment scores, on-going progress monitoring, and PLC/data chats with teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Common formative and/or summative assessments will be administered weekly. Data will be analyzed by grade-level teams in PLC with administration and/or content coaches. Intervention groups will be determined by leading data from weekly PLC. STAR Reading assessment reports will provide further detailed information on students' specific reading deficiencies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was determined in collaboration with consultants from Educational Directions. The rationale is that common assessments, developed by content coaches, provide an objective measure of student learning. Teachers do not have access to the assessments prior to administration. This objective data can then be used to analyze both student learning deficiencies and teaching practice issues.

Action Steps to Implement	
Meet with leadership team to develop plan for weekly common assessments	
Person Responsible	James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)
Disseminate plan to teachers	
Person Responsible	James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)
School-based coaches work with district coaches to create/locate valid assessments	
Person Responsible	Shaime Cortes Vega (shaime.cortesvega@polk-fl.net)
Review weekly data with instructional coaches and leadership team	
Person Responsible	Alathea Towles (alathea.towles@polk-fl.net)
Meet with teachers in weekly PLC to analyze data and work samples and plan for interventions	
Person Responsible	Alathea Towles (alathea.towles@polk-fl.net)
Monitor lesson plans for target-task alignment, standards-based instruction, intervention planning, acceleration planning, and implementation.	
Person Responsible	James Bracey (james.bracey@polk-fl.net)

Review STAR data at each assessment window to track individual student growth

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

James E. Stephens Elementary ranks 1006 out of 1395 elementary schools and has a School Incident Rating of High. The school earned a "Very High" ranking on Drug/Public Order Incidents in SY1920. There were two incidents (one drug, one weapon. The primary area of concern is a very high number of suspensions. This was reduced by 40% in SY2021 due to a school-wide PBIS reboot. Behavior and discipline is the primary concern for SY2122 as evidenced in our first Area of Focus. Social Emotional Learning will be tracked and monitored through MTSS meetings, Tier I and II SEL lessons, and classroom observation.

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.

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, 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.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

James E. Stephens has community partnerships with:
Pallet One - donation of sanitizing materials to assist with COVID-19 disinfection
Wendy's of Bartow - donations of breakfast for teachers during Teacher Appreciation Week; works with our teachers to provide coupons and discounts for student rewards
Great Commission Worship Center - donations of backpacks and supplies
Boys and Girls Club of Bartow - coordinates with the school to align after-school tutoring with state standards and school day learning. Provides SEL to students that supports are mission.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$1,770.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	510-Supplies	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$1,770.00
			Notes: Zones of Regulation- Social Emotional Learning resources			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$151,918.26
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	510-Supplies	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$7,964.56
			Notes: Supplies- instructional (copy paper, folders, flip charts, pencils, file folders, spiral notebooks, binders)			
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$364.59
			Notes: Technology related supplies- headsets			
	5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$10,274.00
			Notes: Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized C - $250.00 to $999.99 - 26 ipads			
	5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$3,235.82
			Notes: Technology-Related Capitalized Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment -greater than or equal to $1,000- 2 ipad carts			
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$2,598.70
			Notes: Technology-Related Supplies (26 ipad cases/keyboard combo			

	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG	1.0	$50,193.12
			Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - School based/District paid Interventionist who work with small groups of students in need of remediation			
	5100	210-Retirement	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$5,430.90
			Notes: Retirement - 10.82% - Instructional Personnel -			
	5100	220-Social Security	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$3,839.77
			Notes: Social Security -7.65% -Instructional personnel			
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$9,288.00
			Notes: Health and Hospitalization - Instructional Personnel			
	5100	232-Life Insurance	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$21.60
			Notes: Life Insurance - Instructional personnel			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$95.37
			Notes: Workers Compensation - .19% - Instructional Personnel			
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$38,835.00
			Notes: Classroom Teachers - Stipends for Classroom Teachers participating in curriculum planning after contact hours, 26 teachers, 8 hours per month for 6 months at $19.43 per hour; 26 teachers, 2 days, 8 hrs. per day at $35 per hour			
	6300	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$9,885.13
			Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - Stipends- participating in curriculum planning after contact hours - Guidance Counselor, Network Mgr., and Interventionists- 6 support staff, 8 hours per month for 7 months at $19.42 per hour; 6 support staff, 2 days, 8 hours per day at $35 per hour			
	6300	210-Retirement	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$5,271.52
			Notes: Retirement - 10.82%- Curriculum Planning			
	6300	220-Social Security	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$3,727.09
			Notes: Social Security - 7.65% - Curriculum Planning			
	6300	240-Workers Compensation	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$92.57
			Notes: Workers Compensation - .19% - Curriculum Planning			
	5900	310-Professional and Technical Services	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		$800.52
			Notes: LRC Tutoring Contract			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$159,291.25**