

The School District of Lee County

James Stephens Elementary School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

James Stephens Elementary School

1333 MARSH AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33905

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

Demographics

Principal: Jaclyn Fantasia

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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: B (54%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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 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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

James Stephens Elementary School

1333 MARSH AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33905

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	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	93%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Focused on the Future: One Student at a Time!

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stedman, Kelly	Principal	Administrator over Pre-K through 5th elementary school. Works with parents, teachers, and students to achieve school goals.
Fantasia, Jacki	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum for grades K-5.
Cook, Megan	Teacher, ESE	Serves a caseload of students that have IEPs in an inclusion setting. She monitors their goals and works with the general education teacher to help students with academic, social and emotional goals.
Urbank, Clemencia	Attendance/ Social Work	Works with parents, students and staff on school attendance and provides resources to parents that are in need.
McGill, Bridget	Dean	Student Discipline and Safety
Rathbun, Karie	Other	Intervention Support Specialist that services all Tier 3 students with academic goals.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Jaclyn Fantasia

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.*

2

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

434

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

7

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

16

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	58	72	72	73	68	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	416
Attendance below 90 percent	1	22	21	25	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	8	7	5	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	15	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	25	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	5	5	16	27	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Tuesday 8/31/2021

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	86	80	86	77	69	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	446
Attendance below 90 percent	49	24	16	8	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	1	8	29	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in Math	0	2	15	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	20	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	16	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	18	10	19	8	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	86	80	86	77	69	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	446
Attendance below 90 percent	49	24	16	8	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	1	8	29	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in Math	0	2	15	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	20	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	16	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	18	10	19	8	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 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				40%	57%	57%	28%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	56%	58%	50%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	50%	53%	52%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				46%	62%	63%	45%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	65%	62%	57%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				72%	54%	51%	52%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				42%	52%	53%	29%	54%	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	39%	58%	-19%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	55%	-13%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2021					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	40%	61%	-21%	62%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	62%	-27%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	58%	-10%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	36%	50%	-14%	53%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Diagnostic for ELA and Math.

District Science Progress Monitoring Tool for Grade 5 Science

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8%	14%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8%	14%	36%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	5%	5%	10%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	1%	13%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1%	13%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	20%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	5%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	5%	9%	22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5%	9%	22%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	3%	0%	3%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2%	5%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2%	5%	29%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	3%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15%	32%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	32%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	25%	38%
	English Language Learners	0%	11%	11%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2%	9%	17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2%	9%	17%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	8%	15%
	English Language Learners	5%	5%	0%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11%	31%	30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	31%	30%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	7%	21%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	5%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3%	29%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3%	29%	45%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	13%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	17%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	6%	19%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	19%	23%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	22%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	8%	8%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6%	15%	20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	15%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	11%	11%
	English Language Learners	0%	17%	13%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	3%	20%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3%	20%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	11%	22%
	English Language Learners	0%	8%	21%

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	21			32							
ELL	16	38	50	30	57	100	16				
BLK	29	33		27	25						
HSP	27	35	50	34	54	100	30				
FRL	31	34		37	35		13				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	33	57	70	28	64						
ELL	28	59		41	53	64	33				
BLK	38	58	50	42	69	79	42				
HSP	42	57	64	48	60	67	39				
WHT	40										

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
FRL	38	59	64	45	60	70	42				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	8	36		7	50	60					
ELL	15	60		35	69						
BLK	28	48	45	40	48	50	32				
HSP	32	63	64	55	65		18				
WHT	19	20		29	64						
FRL	29	49	50	46	58	50	29				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	348
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

Native American Students	
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	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
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?

Reading impacts all core content areas. All levels of students and subgroups struggle with reading therefore, there is a negative trend across the other content areas as well. Our English Learners and Student With Disabilities continue to struggle with reading and math concepts.

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

ELA is always an area that needs improvement. Even though in 2019 we increased our proficiency and our learning gains--we are still well below the state and district averages.

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

Students lack foundational reading skills, we have a high population of LY students that are consistently moving into the country without knowing even their home language and the high mobility of students creates academic gaps leaving children leaving two to three grade levels behind.

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

Science increased from 29% to 42% in 2019 and our ELA proficiency increased from 28% to 40% in 2019.

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

We spent an incredible amount of time intervening with students in the ELA classes and that ultimately helped with the science assessments. Students that were proficient readers were also most likely proficient on the science. Students were instructed on specific standards that were weak--using a deconstruction of the standard and students were able to show mastery upon remediation.

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

We have continued the intervention through all of the grade levels so that we can build on the lack of foundational skills in the primary grades and continue to remediate students in the intermediate grades. We have built in a significant amount of time in the schedule to hold purposeful interventions every day for students based on their data.

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.

We will continue to work with our Guided Reading consultant to build capacity with each teacher. We also continue to educate teachers on the deconstruction of the standard through our PLC process. We have a high quality group of resource teachers that are working with each grade level to increase understanding of standards, task development and data analysis.

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

We have continued to build capacity in teachers to support the academic rigor. We have added additional frameworks, such as the RISE framework, to give students additional instruction outside of the daily ELA core block so that they can close gaps at a much faster pace. These individuals that run the RISE framework understand the process and the data collection that needs to take place to help move these students in the right direction. They can continue to grow this framework as appropriate. We also have built in interventions that can continue at the intermediate level creating small group instruction specific to student needs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	High student mobility impacts the retention of information and students consistently miss large chunks of instruction as they move from school to school which creates inconsistent instructional moments. Many of our incoming Kindergartners lack appropriate academic and developmental skills which has an academic impact during their school career. They are behind their peers and have a hard time catching up. During the 18-19SY, 60% of students in grades 3-5 are scoring below proficient as measured by the ELA FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the students that are performing below proficient from 60% to 55% as measured by the FY21 ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	One important step is to use the extra instructional time built into the schedule to implement differentiated instruction through the guided reading framework. Teachers will prioritize opportunities to activate thinking and for higher order thinking activities, which should be evidenced in the planning process. As a school, we will continue to use standards-based formative assessments to identify student areas of need and teachers will put a strong emphasis on student feedback and/or data chats. The conversation in our PLC will be centered around student outcomes and instructional changes based on those outcomes. We will continue to monitor student progress and initiate interventions if we goals are not being met.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	At our PLC, student formative and summative data will be discussed along with instructional practices that have been utilized in the teaching of standards. Student data will drive instructional changes to meet the needs of these below proficient learners. We will use a continuous improvement model to continue monitoring student outcomes and make instructional decisions based on that data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify structure for PLC to include better identification of standards and their progressive movement.
2. Work through deconstruction of standards with teachers to provide a more prescriptive intervention.
3. Identify areas of strength and weakness through summative and formative data.
4. Implement targeted instruction to remediate skills within the standards.
5. Analyze student samples in order to decide to proceed with additional intervention or move to a new target standard to remediate.

Person Responsible Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus	Kindergarten and first grade absences and tardies are an area of concern. These students are missing critical instruction in foundational skills which directly impacts their success throughout their school career.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	During the 20-21 school year 32% of our students were considered chronically absent. For the 21-22 school year we will decrease chronically absent students from 32% to 25% as measured by our early warning sign data at the end of May. 30% of Kindergarten students were considered chronically absent.
Monitoring:	Weekly meetings between the social worker and the administration team will highlight students in all tiers. The focus will be to isolate students in the tier 3 and tier 2 ranges. Social workers will do home visits and contracts with families that are struggling to attend. We will continuously review that data to increase supports to families.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Clemencia Urbank (clemenciau@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	This year we have funded to have our school social worker 5 days a week instead of three. She is going to issue contracts with families with chronic absenteeism in the past and continue to provide resources to make sure that families can stabilize and focus on their child's education. The district has also funded an additional social worker to support only tier 3 families. In addition, eliminating the virtual instructional models will help to keep students at school for the face to face model only. Daily on the mustang news, students are asked to track their daily attendance and those students that regularly come to school are being rewarded through quarterly celebrations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Parental misperception that attendance in the early grades is not as important as in high school. Parents believe that students have time to 'catch up' before high school. Lack of parental awareness regarding attendance policies. It will be important to utilize our social worker to engage families in their child's academics. She will be able to isolate students that have had prior history with chronic absences and meet with those families to communicate the importance of attending school on time, every day. We will also utilize our school counselor to initiate check in and check outs with students that may need support with coming to school on time. This process will help to gauge the root cause for students not coming to school or coming to school late.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will identify students who are absent and reach out to the families. If unresolved, the student concern will be escalated to the social worker and communicated to administration.
2. Parent meetings will be held to discuss the importance of attendance and to resolve any factors impeding the family from sending the student to school.
3. A member of student services will meet with students who are chronically absent and on check in procedures working towards incentives.
4. Administration and the Social Worker will communicate once a week about student attendance.
5. Attendance data and concerns will be communicated briefly at each PLC.

Person Responsible Clemencia Urbank (clemenciau@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The low percentage of proficient students can be attributed to high student mobility which causes breaks in instruction and inconsistent instructional practices. In addition to high mobility, we also have incoming Kindergartners lacking appropriate academic and developmental skills. All students lack vocabulary and background knowledge which limits their ability to relate and engage with the text they are reading. During the 18-19 SY, 40% of students in grades 3-5 are performing at the proficient level on the ELA FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase students scoring at a proficient level from 40% to 45% as measured by the FY21 FSA ELA.
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase the amount of proficient students, we will use extra instructional time built into the schedule to implement differentiation through the guided reading framework. With these students we will prioritize opportunities for higher order thinking activities, which should be evidenced in the planning process. Teachers will continue to model the think aloud process to show students how to interact and think while reading text. Modeling this process will help students make connections to the text and build connections to what they are reading. We will have a strong emphasis on student feedback and/or data chats. Teachers will discuss student goals and outcomes with students and help them reflect on their progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	At our PLC, student formative and summative data will be discussed along with instructional practices that have been utilized in the teaching of standards. Student data will drive instructional changes to meet the needs of these below proficient learners. We will use the continuous improvement model to continue monitoring student outcomes and make instructional decisions based on that data. Data chats with students will be documented through the use of data folders/walls.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify structure for PLC to include better identification of standards and their progressive movement.
2. Work through deconstruction of standards with teachers to provide a more prescriptive intervention.
3. Identify areas of strength and weakness through summative and formative data.

Person Responsible Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Inconsistent follow-through with interventions and relationship-building by staff members with students have contributed to our high percentage of out of school suspensions. Other at-risk factors also contribute to this increased percentage (mental health, low SES, low educational attainment of parents, low parent involvement at school and at home, high mobility, trauma, domestic abuse, homelessness, etc.). During the 20-21 school year, 12% of the total population received one or more days of Out of School Suspension (OSS).
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of students receiving ISS and/or OSS from 12% to 8% as measured by SESIR reported to District Support Application System by June 2022.
Monitoring:	PBIS team meets bi-weekly to discuss student referral data and resultant actions. This data will be used to support individual students that are not being successful in and out of the classroom. The student services team, which includes school counselor, behavior specialist, dean of discipline, social worker and mental health specialist will work together to support tier 3 behavior students. We have also added incentives more frequently throughout the quarter to reward students that continuously use their mustang expectations at school.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bridget McGill (bridgetam@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	At every PLC, teams work to analyze student formative and summative data which is entered into a standards tracker by domain. Additionally we are completing an item analysis for each formative and summative assessment to look for trends and student performance on specific question stems and item types. We use that data to change the instructional plan for our intervention periods. We also move students within those intervention groups to better meet their needs. These groupings are based on the standards being taught---if students need enrichment in specific standards they are in one group but if next assessment they show a deficit in a standard they will move to a remediation group. In our primary grades we have instituted the RISE framework which is designed to close reading gaps within an 8 week period of time. We cycle students through these groupings every 8 weeks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	At our leadership meeting, current data of student referrals and out of school suspension reports will be presented to the team. We will discuss types of referrals being written and look at time of day/time of month that these referrals are being issued to modify our action plan. If students need additional support, our intervention support specialist will start observations on students struggling behaviorally so that we can initiate appropriate interventions for students that need additional support. As we collect data based on these interventions, we will communicate their goals and progress at each leadership meeting.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Reinforce PBIS expectations
2. Work with teachers on their behavior interventions
3. Work with behavior specialist and student services team to identify tier 3 students that need additional supports.

Person Responsible Bridget McGill (bridgetam@leeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students lack of higher order thinking skills and the ability to connect to text create gaps in their comprehension. Students also lack vocabulary and the background knowledge to make the appropriate connections to text. During the 20-21 SY, only 9% of students in grades 3-5 are scoring above proficient levels on the ELA FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the amount of students scoring above proficient from 9% to 11% as measured by the FY22 ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	At every PLC, teams work to analyze student formative and summative data which is entered into a standards tracker by domain. Additionally we are completing an item analysis for each formative and summative assessment to look for trends and student performance on specific question stems and item types. We use that data to change the instructional plan for our intervention periods. We also move students within those intervention groups to better meet their needs. These groupings are based on the standards being taught---if students need enrichment in specific standards they are in one group but if next assessment they show a deficit in a standard they will move to a remediation group.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Stedman (kellyast@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase the number of above proficient learners, we will use extra instructional time built into the schedule to differentiate instructional pathways using the guided reading framework. Teachers will prioritize opportunities for higher order thinking activities, which should be evidenced in the planning process. Teachers will continue to increase the level of text as students increase their reading level. Differentiated tasks will engage students at a higher level and require higher order think. There will be a strong emphasis on student feedback and/or data chats.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	At our PLC, student formative and summative data will be discussed along with instructional practices that have been utilized in the teaching of standards. Student data will drive instructional changes to meet the needs of these below proficient learners. We will use the PDSA model to continue monitoring student outcomes and make instructional decisions based on that data. Data chats with students will be documented through the use of data folders/walls.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Work through deconstruction of standards with teachers to provide a more prescriptive intervention.
2. Identify areas of strength and weakness through summative and formative data.
3. Focus on DBQs for students that need additional enrichment.

Person Responsible Kelly Stedman (kellyast@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Primary area of concern will be to decrease the amount of fighting on the school campus. Secondary area of concern will be decrease the amount of physical attack on the school campus. At every PLC, teams work to analyze student formative and summative data which is entered into a standards tracker by domain. Additionally we are completing an item analysis for each formative and summative assessment to look for trends and student performance on specific question stems and item types. We use that data to change the instructional plan for our intervention periods. We also move students within those intervention groups to better meet their needs. These groupings are based on the standards being taught---if students need enrichment in specific standards they are in one group but if next assessment they show a deficit in a standard they will move to a remediation group. In our primary grades we have instituted the RISE framework which is designed to close reading gaps within an 8 week period of time. We cycle students through these groupings every 8 weeks.

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.

At the beginning of the school year, families and students will be invited to an open house and the Annual Title I meeting where staff will share the vision, mission, and culture of the school. Parents, teachers, students, community members and business partners will participate in the comprehensive needs' assessment by working with the School Advisory Council meetings for analyzing data and decision-making activities pertinent to the school, developing the annual School Improvement Program at School Advisory Council meetings through a collaborative decision making process and an annual Comprehensive Needs Assessment from which the results are used to drive decision making whenever appropriate. Stakeholders will participate as the result of invitations through the school newsletter, School Messenger, Peach Jar, and personal phone calls. These communications will be flexible in format (such as online, in person or on paper) allowing for all parents to give input. Formats will be in different languages and simple terms that parents can easily understand. Information gathered from this data will be used to identify school needs and create a plan. Strategies to increase family engagement are included in the PFEP. Currently, we are unable to hold events at our school campus but we attempt to communicate with parents virtually. These regulations are subject to change and we will continue to welcome parents on our campus for various events when that occurs.

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

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA					\$248,698.74
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22	
	5100	750-Other Personal Services	0592 - James Stephens Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$215,247.93	
			Notes: Peer Collaborative Teacher and Instructional Teachers				
	5100	750-Other Personal Services	0592 - James Stephens Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$33,450.81	
			Notes: Instructional Paraprofessional				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance					\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA					\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports					\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA					\$0.00
Total:							\$248,698.74