

The School District of Lee County

J. Colin English 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	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

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: 9/20/2021

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: C (53%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (53%)
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	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

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)	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	57%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Williams III, Joe	Principal	
Stevens, Monica	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, 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.*

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

368

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

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

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	61	64	60	68	49	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	368
Attendance below 90 percent	20	22	17	22	14	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	3	9	7	5	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in Math	3	3	5	2	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
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	4	9	5	4	12	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	4	5	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

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	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

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	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

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				52%	57%	57%	44%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	56%	58%	49%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	50%	53%	55%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				60%	62%	63%	55%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				55%	65%	62%	55%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	54%	51%	46%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				47%	52%	53%	45%	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	49%	58%	-9%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	71%	61%	10%	62%	9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	62%	-14%	64%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	58%	-13%	60%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	43%	50%	-7%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady, and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	4/7.4	18/31	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	1/14.3	2/28.6	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3/5.9	11/19	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	6/10.7	18/30	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/14.3	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	3/23.1	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4/7.1	19/15	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9/20.5	18/38.3	24/51.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/11.1	1/11.1
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2/4.5	13/27.7	18/38.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/11.1	1/11.1
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17/28.3	22/33.3	23/33.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	1/1.8	12/18.2	15/21.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/10

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/19.5	19/43.3	21/44.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/12.5	2/25
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/12.5	10/22.2	14/29.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/40	16/37.2	22/46.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/12.5	2/25

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	6			21							
ELL	28	58		38	64		40				
BLK	67			33							
HSP	38	64		47	52		40				
WHT	44			63							
FRL	38	64		50	47		45				
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				

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	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				

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	52
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
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	48
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 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	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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	54
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

2019 FSA Data trends show a gap in learning gains for SWD. The school average for learning gains in ELA was 63%, while SWD had 24% with learning gains. In Math, the school average was 55% learning gains, while SWD had 47% learning gains.

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

Science achievement level for 2019 was 47%, which is a 2% increase from 2018 school year.

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

In the previous 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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

Small group instruction for intervention
Progress monitoring and planning during PLCs
Development and use of tasks focused on higher order thinking skills.

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.

PLCs will focus on building teacher capacity in small group intervention strategies as well as progress monitoring.

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

PLC protocols

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 FY22 ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored through standards based assessments, exemplars, and diagnostic test results.
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).
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)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2019 FSA Data show a gap in learning gains for SWD. The school average for learning gains in ELA was 63%, while SWD had 24% with learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	JCE will increase the percentage of SWD making learning gains in ELA from 24% to 34% as measured by the FY22 ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored through standards based assessments, exemplars, and diagnostic test results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joe Williams III (joewil@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	JCE teachers will engage students in intervention activities to address the gaps in learning (iReady, HD Word, and Reflex Math).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will implement a variety of evidence-based strategies to address the needs of all learners..

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will meet in PLCs to review and discuss findings in student data.
2. Track standards mastery for individual student intervention plans.
3. Teachers will use intervention strategies to improve student learning.
4. Teachers will continue to monitor student progress and adjust as needed.
5. Provide professional development and coaching opportunities for teachers as needed.
6. 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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2019 FSA Data show a gap in learning gains for HSP. The school average for learning gains in ELA was 63%, while SWD had 40% with learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	JCE will increase the percentage of HSP making learning gains in ELA from 40% to 45% as measured by the FY22 ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored through standards based assessments, exemplars, and diagnostic test results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joe Williams III (joewil@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	JCE teachers will engage students in intervention activities to address the gaps in learning (iReady, HD Word, and Reflex Math).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will implement a variety of evidence-based strategies to address the needs of all learners..

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will meet in PLCs to review and discuss findings in student data.
2. Track standards mastery for individual student intervention plans.
3. Teachers will use intervention strategies to improve student learning.
4. Teachers will continue to monitor student progress and adjust as needed.
5. Provide professional development and coaching opportunities for teachers as needed.
6. 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)

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.

School culture and environment are monitored through PBIS expectations.

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 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.

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

Stakeholders will be invited to 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.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00