

The School District of Lee County

James Stephens Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	27
VI. Title I Requirements	30
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

James Stephens Elementary School

1333 MARSH AVE, Fort Myers, FL 33905

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fantasia, Jacki	Principal	Administrator over Pre-K through 5th grade elementary school. Works with parents, teachers, and students to achieve school goals.
Adderley, Kim	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of curriculum over grades K-2.
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.
McGill, Bridget	Dean	Student discipline and safety
Rathbun, Karie	Other	Intervention Support Specialist that services all Tier 3 students with academic goals.
Deleon, Loyda	Attendance/ Social Work	Works with parents, students, and staff on school attendance and provides resources to parents that are in need.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The SIP is reviewed at our SAC meetings to include input from a variety of stakeholders including instructional staff, support staff, parents, students and community business partners. A state of the school is provided and analyzed to determine areas of need as well as celebrate strengths from the previous school year.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Student achievement data is analyzed and discussed at weekly PLC meetings. Students in low performing ESSA subgroups including the lowest 25 percent have their data reviewed closely monitoring access to fluid interventions to remediate skills including skills from prerequisite courses. These groupings are changed regularly to best meet the needs of the students based upon results from recent summative and formative assessments as well as classroom observations. Additionally, progress monitoring data is reviewed to ensure students are making appropriate growth in core subject areas.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	93%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C

	2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	21	36	21	33	20	22	0	0	0	153	
One or more suspensions	7	1	3	5	7	10	0	0	0	33	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	12	8	6	31	14	21	0	0	0	92	
Course failure in Math	9	8	4	16	8	24	0	0	0	69	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	19	18	37	16	29	0	0	0	119	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	3	16	20	11	23	0	0	0	73	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	18	14	21	41	18	33	0	0	0	145	
	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	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	7	2	4	30	22	39	0	0	0	104

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	13	17	13	12	7	15	0	0	0	77	
One or more suspensions	3	10	6	7	6	15	0	0	0	47	
Course failure in ELA	10	9	0	42	13	24	0	0	0	98	
Course failure in Math	7	7	0	15	6	16	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	42	28	38	0	0	0	108	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	18	34	0	0	0	75	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	36	41	42	28	38	0	0	0	200	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	6	28	13	23	0	0	0	76

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	31	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	13	17	13	12	7	15	0	0	0	77	
One or more suspensions	3	10	6	7	6	15	0	0	0	47	
Course failure in ELA	10	9	0	42	13	24	0	0	0	98	
Course failure in Math	7	7	0	15	6	16	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	42	28	38	0	0	0	108	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	18	34	0	0	0	75	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	36	41	42	28	38	0	0	0	200	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	6	28	13	23	0	0	0	76

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	31	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	26	48	53	31	52	56	30		
ELA Learning Gains				60			35		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				66			60		
Math Achievement*	56	57	59	48	45	50	33		
Math Learning Gains				58			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66			93		
Science Achievement*	45	53	54	43	59	59	18		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					47	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	53	51	59	61			40		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	204
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	19	Yes	2	1
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	1	
HSP	40	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	61			
FRL	41			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	1	
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	58			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	26			56			45					53
SWD	14			31			17				4	
ELL	15			59			37				5	53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			50			38				4	
HSP	22			60			45				5	52

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50			71							2	
FRL	27			57			47				5	49

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	31	60	66	48	58	66	43					61
SWD	12	43	50	22	50	55	19					
ELL	19	61	78	47	64	80	32					61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	48		44	48	56	38					
HSP	29	63	72	50	64	77	44					61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	32	55	67	48	55	60	45					67

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	30	35	60	33	39	93	18					40
SWD	21			32								
ELL	16	38	50	30	57	100	16					40
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	33		27	25		0					
HSP	27	35	50	34	54	100	30					38
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
FRL	31	34		37	35		13					56

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	21%	48%	-27%	54%	-33%
04	2023 - Spring	32%	56%	-24%	58%	-26%
03	2023 - Spring	25%	42%	-17%	50%	-25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	61%	55%	6%	59%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	61%	-12%	61%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	52%	-6%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	50%	-9%	51%	-10%

III. Planning for Improvement**Data Analysis/Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Achievement levels for students with disabilities continue to decline in both ELA and Math. Many of the ESE students are substantially below grade level in one or both subject areas. While these students make steady growth, it is often not enough to tip the scale toward proficiency. These students are provided consistent supports with grade level content but require prerequisite skills to master the standards. Many students are not proficient readers which ultimately impacts their performance in math and science as well. The foundational skills the students are lacking often come from high mobility rates in the primary grades when the focus on foundational reading skills and phonics is more prevalent. This results in low reading fluency rates which significantly impacts reading comprehension. The same idea applies for numeracy in math. Without a strong grasp on basic computation students struggle when the benchmarks become more complex and require analyzing operations to complete an equation as well as multi step problems. Another contributing factor is lack of retention of previously taught skills. Without regular practice and even over holiday and summer breaks the students fail to retain the skills needed to build upon to more complex topics. This results in needing to reteach prior standards before moving back into grade level content which impacts the learning cycle. Interventions are critical for these students as is small group instruction for both prerequisite and current content.

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

Math learning gains for the lowest 25% declined from 93% to 66%. In the 2020-2021 school year the students in the lowest 25% had a statistically high number of students performing in the lowest quartile at level 1a. Statistically these students are more likely to make gains. The following school year the students in the L25% were proportionally higher level 1b and 1c students. This was a contributing factor for the decline. The students in the lowest 25% receive targeted interventions in math in order to build basic computation and to receive scaffolds to find success in mastering the state standards. Many of these students also fall into the ELL subgroup and are learning language acquisition simultaneously with content. This presents a significant challenge for students who are both learning new skills and also the English Language. The processing time of translation to home language sometimes impedes the rate of progress in their learning.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The disparity between our ELA achievement levels and the state average is concerning. The school has a disproportionate amount of level one learners in enrollment and while the students make growth, it is not enough growth to ensure proficiency. Many of the students have high mobility rates and have been to several schools resulting in gaps in their instruction especially in critical foundational skills like phonics and phonemic awareness. These gaps lead to low reading fluency which impacts comprehension. Additionally, many students are new to the country and are learning language as well as content which puts them at a disadvantage compared to their peers who already have command of the English Language. Significant challenges in student home lives and past traumas also impact their capacity for learning with concerns for their basic needs at the forefront.

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

Our math achievement increased twelve percentage points from 48% proficient in 21-22 to 60% proficient in 22-23. The increase in achievement was directly linked to having high quality teachers in grades 3-5 math with a strong command of the benchmarks coupled with their longevity at the school and in their subject areas. The instruction students received was targeted with close monitoring by both the teachers, coaches, and administration for both new content and previously taught basic skills that were lacking. Enacting spiral review was instrumental in combating learning losses and increasing retention of critical skills.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The historic low ELA proficiency continues to be a concern. The student mobility and lack of reading foundational skills impacts not only reading but all subject areas and greatly reduces their likelihood for academic success. Additionally, the attendance data is a concern. Students who have chronic absenteeism are less likely to perform well in their academics and are missing skills that build as they progress in their academic careers. Students at the elementary level have little control over their attendance records and parents who are in crisis often fail to put precedence on regular and on time school attendance. Incentivizing families to partner with the school and to make a commitment to regular attendance is a priority.

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

1. Improve ELA reading proficiency as measured by the 3-5 FAST PM 3 data.
2. Improve Science proficiency as measured by the 5th grade NGSSS data.
3. Increase learning gains in ELA for students in grades 3-5 as measured by the 4-5 FAST PM 3 data.
4. Increase learning gains for third grade retainees as measured by the 3-5 FAST PM 3 data.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

EWS data indicates student attendance persists as an issue for JSE. Focusing on positive culture and environment as a way to promote and incentivize student attendance can benefit the students and staff. Students who regularly attend school have greater academic success which lightens the load for teachers. When students are chronically absent it creates more work for the teacher to ensure that the content is taught for small groups of students after the rest of the class has moved on. This also creates issues for pacing as well as creates retention issues for the students suffering frequent absenteeism.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

James Stephens will decrease the percentage of students who are chronically absent according to the EWS from 33% to 25% for FY24.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students will track their daily attendance as part of their data binder process. Students will reflect on how the absences affect their academic performance as a part of their data chats. Students will be incentivized to decrease their absences and will be rewarded for meeting set targets as a part of the PBIS quarterly celebrations. The Mustang Attendance Committee will review students who are at risk for chronic absenteeism and develop targeted plans that are individualized based on family need. Leadership team will meet weekly to review PLC document which includes a space for attendance concerns to ensure all members of leadership (SSW, counselor, dean) are aware of concerns and can appropriately plan to mitigate the reasons for absences collaboratively.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Loyda Deleon (loydad@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will use a combined approach of Early Warning System data tracking along with utilizing the Showing Up Matters for R.E.A.L toolkit from Attendance Works we will focus on building routines that support regular attendance, engage the families in the reason why attendance is critical, and ensure we partner to provide access to resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Active monitoring of the EWS partnered with a toolkit for attendance campaign will provide actionable steps for the school to follow to systematically increase attendance rates. Simply emphasizing the impact of days missed on learning does not adequately recognize the overwhelming stresses many students and families are faced with during the pandemic. This toolkit offers a new framework for communicating about attendance that is embedded in a whole child perspective. This resource provides free, ready-to-use messaging resources to incorporate into regular school operations.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students with historical patterns of absenteeism will be identified for support.

Person Responsible: Loyda Deleon (loydad@leeschools.net)

By When: Prior to the first day of school.

Students will track their daily attendance in their data binders.

Person Responsible: Kim Adderley (kimaa@leeschools.net)

By When: Each day of school, to be monitored by AP at weekly PLC data review.

Students with regular attendance will receive rewards at quarterly PBIS events.

Person Responsible: Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)

By When: Students to be identified each quarter who are eligible for rewards.

Families will be partnered to receive wrap around services that can strengthen relationship to the school and work to mitigate factors that prevent regular attendance.

Person Responsible: Loyda Deleon (loydad@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly for distribution of pantry goods on Thursdays and monitored through weekly Leadership team meetings to review families receiving services and track attendance data.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students with disabilities are not making adequate progress in ELA proficiency. The trend in this ESSA subgroup has been on a decline since FY19. These students are substantially below grade level and even when making progress toward their goals they remain significantly behind their peers.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students with disabilities will increase their ELA proficiency as measured by the FAST ELA assessment from 19% to 23% by May of 2024.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student progress will be monitored using both PM1 and PM2 FAST data and classroom exemplars to track student progress toward standard mastery. Data will be analyzed at PLC meetings and will include progress toward IEP goals and how that impacts overall proficiency in reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Megan Cook (meganac@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will be working during PLC to plan targeted interventions for students based upon their data. The teachers will be working with small groups of students to remediate weak skills, provide enrichment, or teach prerequisite skills that hinder student progress. This happens through our PLC process. We will take the assessments as a team and revise as needed in the plan portion of PLC. We will discuss action plans for core instruction and share resources during the next part of the PLC cycle. We will analyze student work samples to identify strategies that were effective for students or misconceptions that students had. The final part of the cycle we will analyze data to make changes to the groupings to best serve student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Targeted small group instruction is the best way to improve individual student achievement. By moving through the PLC cycle in a targeted manner we will be able to address all the key areas for student improvement: assessment tools, instructional planning, student work sample analysis, and data reflection. This work will drive the instruction that takes place during the intervention blocks that includes additional coaches and teachers to further reduce the class sizes for small group interventions. By keeping the groupings as fluid as possible we will ensure that each students' intervention plan relates specifically to their current understanding of the assessed benchmarks and is appropriate to continue to promote growth toward proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Train all teachers on the refined PLC process to guide our work. Isolate students who fit this subgroup category to be closely monitored.

Person Responsible: Megan Cook (meganac@leeschools.net)

By When: August 2, 2023.

When in the planning process of the PLC cycle: take all assessments prior to PLC time and come prepared to the PLC with suggestions and revisions. Share with the group to best improve upon the tools used. When in the instructional planning part of PLC: share out resources and instructional plans to be used for the set of benchmarks with the team.

Person Responsible: Kim Adderley (kimaa@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly on Wednesday

When in the part of the PLC cycle before the assessment is given come to PLC prepared with student work samples in order to review student best practices as well as misconceptions students had. When data is available, review the data to group students according to their performance in the assessed standards. Regroup students as necessary to best serve their needs.

Person Responsible: Kim Adderley (kimaa@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly at PLC meetings.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The overall 3-5 proficiency at James Stephens in historically low and consistently falling under the 41% expectation. In 22-23, 52/188 or 28% of students scored proficient on the state FAST. This is a three percent decline from the previous year. Students who are able to read proficiently will have better outcomes in other subject areas as well. It is imperative that more students are able to read on grade level in the intermediate grades.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By May of 2024 the overall 3-5 ELA proficiency rate will increase from 28% to 35% as measured by the FAST PM3 data.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Data from PM1 & 2 as well as summative ELA data will be tracked weekly during PLC. Students who are not making expected growth will be provided targeted interventions that match the need based upon recent performance data. Formative assessments will be given to monitor student mastery of individual standards and summatives will provide insight into student retention of previously taught skills as well as student achievement when benchmarks are assessed cumulatively. Student groups will remain fluid based on their data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will be working during PLC to plan targeted interventions for students based upon their data. The teachers will be working with small groups of students to remediate weak skills, provide enrichment, or teach prerequisite skills that hinder student progress. This happens through our PLC process. We will take the assessments as a team and revise as needed in the plan portion of PLC. We will discuss action plans for core instruction and share resources during the next part of the PLC cycle. We will analyze student work samples to identify strategies that were effective for students or misconceptions that students had. The final part of the cycle we will analyze data to make changes to the groupings to best serve student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Targeted small group instruction is the best way to improve individual student achievement. By moving through the PLC cycle in a targeted manner we will be able to address all the key areas for student improvement: assessment tools, instructional planning, student work sample analysis, and data reflection. This work will drive the instruction that takes place during the intervention blocks that includes additional coaches and teachers to further reduce the class sizes for small group interventions. By keeping the groupings as fluid as possible we will ensure that each students' intervention plan relates specifically to their current understanding of the assessed benchmarks and is appropriate to continue to promote growth toward proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students who are proficient readers or early intervention stage to be identified and closely monitored to push for proficiency.

Person Responsible: Kim Adderley (kimaa@leeschools.net)

By When: The close of the PM1 progress monitoring window.

The PLC process will begin with the refined pathways to guide our work in instructional planning for both core and intervention. The teachers will analyze assessment tools, discuss instructional plans, review student work samples, and analyze data to plan for intervention that are targeted and specific.

Person Responsible: Kim Adderley (kimaa@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly at PLC

Data from both programs as well as state PM testing and formative and summative assessments will be tracked and analyzed.

Person Responsible: Kim Adderley (kimaa@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly at PLC

Discussion of student trends will take place and students will be moved to intervention groups that best suit their needs based on the data.

Person Responsible: Kim Adderley (kimaa@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly at PLC

Discussion of student work and student samples will be reviewed as well as discussion on strategies implemented in class. Student samples will be reviewed to isolate misconceptions as well as strategies that impacted understanding positively.

Person Responsible: Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly at PLC

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The 3rd grade proficiency at James Stephens in historically low and consistently falling under the 41% expectation. In 22-23, 23/91 or 25% of students scored proficient on the state FAST. This is a three percent increase from the previous year but far from the state average or the expectation of 41% in each category. Students who are able to read proficiently will have better outcomes in other subject areas as well. It is imperative that more students are able to read on grade level in the intermediate grades.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By May of 2024, ELA proficiency will increase from 25% to 30% as measured by the FAST assessment given in the PM3 window.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Data from PM1 & 2 as well as summative ELA data will be tracked weekly during PLC. Students who are not making expected growth will be provided targeted interventions that match the need based upon recent performance data. Formative assessments will be given to monitor student mastery of individual standards and summatives will provide insight into student retention of previously taught skills as well as student achievement when benchmarks are assessed cumulatively. Student groups will remain fluid based on their data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jacki Fantasia (jaclynf@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our PLC process will guide our work with student achievement. We will take the assessments as a team and revise as needed in the plan portion of PLC. We will discuss action plans for core instruction and share resources during the next part of the PLC cycle. We will analyze student work samples to identify strategies that were effective for students or misconceptions that students had. The final part of the cycle we will analyze data to make changes to the groupings to best serve student needs. A part time coach has been hired in through Title 1 funds to oversee the PLC monitoring process for fidelity and improvement as well as to provide coaching, modeling, and support in ELA to the third grade ELA teachers. A PD on DBQ's was provided in July.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Targeted small group instruction is the best way to improve individual student achievement. By moving through the PLC cycle in a targeted manner we will be able to address all the key areas for student improvement: assessment tools, instructional planning, student work sample analysis, and data reflection. This work will drive the instruction that takes place during the intervention blocks that includes additional coaches and teachers to further reduce the class sizes for small group interventions. By keeping the groupings as fluid as possible we will ensure that each students' intervention plan relates specifically to their current understanding of the assessed benchmarks and is appropriate to continue to promote growth toward proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students will be identified and monitored for proficiency or early intervention during PLC.

Person Responsible: Kim Adderley (kimaa@leeschools.net)

By When: Following PM 1 progress monitoring window.

The PLC process will be used to improve assessment tools, discuss instructional plans, review student work samples and analyze student data from PM1 & 2 as well as formative and summative assessments for trends. Students will be grouped fluidly for interventions based upon this data.

Person Responsible: Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly at PLC

Student samples will be reviewed to provide examples of high, medium, and low student work. Teachers will discuss student misconceptions as well as strategies students utilized with positive results.

Person Responsible: Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly at PLC

Ongoing PD and Coaching will be provided to teachers on ELA 3rd grade team to improve their craft and build their capacity.

Person Responsible: Yvonne Caldwell (yvonnec@leeschools.net)

By When: Beginning 8/2/2023.

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The 2nd grade proficiency at James Stephens has risen over time. Due to the district's proximity plan, many of the new students are substantially below grade level with only 7/93 or 8% of the incoming students scoring proficient on their FY23 assessment making this a targeted area for FY24. In 22-23, 37/66 or 56% of students scored proficient on the state FAST. These students have been reassigned to other schools as a result of the district's proximity plan. Students who are able to read proficiently will have better outcomes in other subject areas as well. It is imperative that more students are able to read on grade level as they enter the intermediate grades.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By May of 2024, the percentage of 2nd grade students scoring proficient will increase from 7% to 15% as measured by the ELA FAST Assessment taken in PM3.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Data from PM1 & 2 as well as summative ELA data will be tracked weekly during PLC. Students who are not making expected growth will be provided targeted interventions that match the need based upon recent performance data. Formative assessments will be given to monitor student mastery of individual standards and summatives will provide insight into student retention of previously taught skills as well as student achievement when benchmarks are assessed cumulatively. Student groups will remain fluid based on their data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The teachers will be working with small groups of students to remediate weak skills, provide enrichment, or teach prerequisite skills that hinder student progress. This happens through our PLC process. We will take the assessments as a team and revise as needed in the plan portion of PLC. We will discuss action plans for core instruction and share resources during the next part of the PLC cycle. We will analyze student work samples to identify strategies that were effective for students or misconceptions that students had. The final part of the cycle we will analyze data to make changes to the groupings to best serve student needs. Eligible students will also be selected for our reading intervention program RISE, these students will work in small groups of four per instructor for sixty minutes a day in the areas of phonics, guided reading, comprehension, and writing.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Targeted small group instruction is the best way to improve individual student achievement. By moving through the PLC cycle in a targeted manner we will be able to address all the key areas for student improvement: assessment tools, instructional planning, student work sample analysis, and data reflection. This work will drive the instruction that takes place during the intervention blocks that includes additional coaches and teachers to further reduce the class sizes for small group interventions. By keeping the groupings as fluid as possible we will ensure that each students' intervention plan relates specifically to

their current understanding of the assessed benchmarks and is appropriate to continue to promote growth toward proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students will be identified as proficiency or early intervention to be closely monitored for progress.

Person Responsible: Kim Adderley (kimaa@leeschools.net)

By When: Following PM 1 progress monitoring window.

The PLC process will guide our work of improving assessment tools, discussing instructional strategies, reviewing student work samples, and analyzing data for intervention groupings.

Person Responsible: Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly at PLC

Student data from PM 1 and PM 2 as well as formative and summative assessments will be reviewed and analyzed for trends. Students will be grouped fluidly for interventions based upon this data.

Person Responsible: Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly at PLC

Student samples will be reviewed to provide examples of high, medium, and low student work. Teachers will discuss student misconceptions as well as strategies students utilized with positive results.

Person Responsible: Jacki Fantasia (jaclynef@leeschools.net)

By When: Weekly at PLC

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating funding to schools. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student needs. Initially the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, % of ESE students for academic support and for funding purposes. Content tiers are also established to provide instructional support resources based on individual student group needs. Within each school's Title

I, SAI, and UniSIG plans as appropriate there is a requirement to address ESSA student groups through high quality instruction and monitoring systems. School funding needs are addressed weekly throughout the school year in collaboration with principal supervisors and the budget department. Ongoing monitoring of student data and underperforming subgroups is provided through monthly visits and data chats by principal supervisors.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

56% of the in grades K-2 are below the proficiency benchmark. Kindergarten students performing below grade level accounted for 40% of the student population. First grade students performing below grade level accounted for 64% of the student population. Second grade students performing below grade level accounted for 59% of the student population. Students are provided interventions that are specific to their needs based on standards being taught and their performance on summative, formative, and classroom observation data. This includes remediation for prerequisite skills necessary for growth. Students who demonstrate they are significantly below grade level are provided intensive reading intervention. Students are provided an hour of instruction specializing in structured reading instruction, phonics, comprehension, and writing with support from teachers and paraprofessionals with a small group ratio of 4:1. Our PLC cycles ensure that instructional plans are reviewed with regard to the standards, student work samples are analyzed by the team, and after data review students are appropriately grouped for intervention instruction.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

72% of students in grade three through five scored level 1 or 2 on the FAST ELA assessment in 22-23. Third grade students performing below grade level accounted for 75% of the student population. Fourth grade students performing below grade level accounted for 67% of the student population. Fifth grade students performing below grade level accounted for 75% of the student population. These students are provided targeted ELA intervention built into their schedule. An hour per day is dedicated to standards based interventions that are specific to student need. In PLC cycles, student data is analyzed and students are grouped by need into smaller groups for interventions. As we progress through the standards, students are isolated based on need and moved into groups to better remediate their understanding of the standards already taught as well as prerequisite skills necessary to reach standards mastery. The review of instructional plans, assessments, and student data is critical to isolate student needs in real time and adjust student groups to match needs. ESE and ESOL teachers as well as academic coaches are utilized to ensure the student groups are as small as possible to ensure high quality teaching with low student to teacher ratios.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Based on prior year data, KG was 60% proficient at the end of the 22-23 school year as measured by the FAST PM3 results. Due to the proximity plan changes and high student mobility, and after reviewing PM1 results, the goal for 23-24 is to maintain 60% proficient in kindergarten as measured by the PM 3 FAST results in May of 2024.

Based on prior year data, 1st was 36% proficient at the end of the 22-23 school year as measured by the FAST PM3 results. Due to the proximity plan changes and high student mobility, and after reviewing PM1 results, the goal for 23-24 is to increase to 41% proficient in first grade as measured by the PM 3 FAST results in May of 2024.

Based on prior year data, 2nd grade was 41% proficient at the end of the 22-23 school year as measured by the FAST PM3 results. Due to the proximity plan changes and high student mobility, and after reviewing PM1 results, the goal for 23-24 is to maintain 41% proficient in second grade as measured by the PM 3 FAST results in May of 2024.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on prior year data, 3rd grade was 25% proficient at the end of the 22-23 school year as measured by the FAST PM3 results. Due to the proximity plan changes and high student mobility, and after reviewing PM1 results, the goal for 23-23 is to increase to 35% proficient in third grade as measured by the PM 3 FAST results in May of 2024.

Based on prior year data, 4th grade was 33% proficient at the end of the 22-23 school year as measured by the FAST PM3 results. Due to the proximity plan changes and high student mobility, and after reviewing PM1 results, the goal for 23-23 is to increase to 38% proficient in 4th grade as measured by the PM 3 FAST results in May of 2024.

Based on prior year data, 5th grade was 25% proficient at the end of the 22-23 school year as measured by the FAST PM3 results. Due to the proximity plan changes and high student mobility, and after reviewing PM1 results, the goal for 23-23 is to increase to 31% proficient in fifth grade as measured by the PM 3 FAST results in May of 2024.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Each PLC cycle will address the instructional plan of action for each set of standards in ELA. We will look at the exemplars as a group to discuss any misconceptions or pitfalls students may experience and ensure we are aware of the level of the standard and all components of addressing the benchmark fully. We will look at student work samples to discuss the students at varying levels of success and discuss positives in student work as well as misconceptions that occur. Student exemplar data, student work

samples, and discussions will lead to groupings of students for intervention cycles that will address the standards being taught. Pre-requisite skills will be taught as needed to ensure standards mastery can occur. ESE resource teachers, ESOL specialist, and academic coaches will be involved in both the PLC cycles and the interventions to ensure the groups have the smallest teacher to student ratio attainable. Through active monitoring we will ensure that students are grouped based upon need and are receiving the instruction necessary to close gaps in their understanding.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Fantasia, Jacki , jaclynef@leeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

PLC cycles with extensive deep dives into proficiency scales and review of work samples are evidence based and show strong effect sizes for students. Additionally, small group instruction is paramount to student learning. Analyzing student work as well as student performance data ensures that enough data points are collected to ensure that student performance is matching needs for targeted intervention. By including pre-requisite skills in the remediation we address gaps that could have been caused from high mobility rates or learning loss that occurred over time. iReady is also utilized daily which has is a program with a moderate level of evidence based results.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The evidence based practices are tried and true methods of improving student learning outcomes. iReady and PLC cycles focused around DeFour's 4 questions and review of Marzano Proficiency scales as it related to student work samples have been effective with similar student populations.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Schedule, plan and attend PLC meetings to address either instructional planning, student work review, data analysis and student groupings. Participate in said meetings with fidelity and provide high quality feedback to teachers, coaches, and staff.	Adderley, Kim, kimaa@leeschools.net
Regularly conduct classroom walkthroughs in both the ELA block and the intervention classes to ensure high quality instruction is occurring and student learning is engaging and relevant.	Fantasia, Jacki , jaclynef@leeschools.net
Review weekly minutes on iReady instructional learning paths and review the lessons passed for students regularly. Address any inconsistencies or issues accordingly.	Adderley, Kim, kimaa@leeschools.net

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

James Stephens Elementary, a Title I School, in compliance with Part A of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA); creates, develops and disseminates jointly with parents the SIP, UniSIG budget, and SWP plan. The implementation of the SIP will strengthen the connection and support of student achievement between the schools and the families. The SIP is a way to communicate with stakeholders the programs used to improve performance under Title 1 and to gain input from our families about their child's academic progress . In addition, the way in which we all work together to build and develop a partnership to ensure that all children achieve the State Standards on assessments. The SIP will be disseminated at our SAC/PTO meeting for review in September. Staff and stakeholders will have the opportunity to make all the necessary changes by the end of the month and everything will be approved by the October meeting.

The school will post a copy on our web site www.jsa@leeschools.net. Additionally, a copy of the SIP will be stored in the front office.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The purpose of the Parent and Family Engagement Plan is to foster the development of a school-family relationship by allowing parents to participate and have a voice in their child's academic success. It plans for flexible meetings, informative workshops for families and opportunities to understand their child's curriculum.

It is JSE's responsibility to provide a high-quality curriculum and instruction in a supportive and effective environment that enables children to meet the State's student performance standards. As part of that commitment, the school must address the importance of communication between parents/guardians and teachers on an ongoing basis through such efforts as parent teacher conferences, frequent reports to parents/guardians on their child's progress, reasonable access to staff, opportunities to volunteer and participate in their child's class, and observations of classroom activities, along with participating in the local school parent organization (SAC/PTO).

The Parent and Family Engagement Plan is provided to each family in their welcome packet and can be accessed on our website at www.jsa@leeschools.net.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

James Stephens will be focused on increasing ELA achievement in FY24. The master schedule has been created in order to maximize both ELA core content and ELA intervention blocks that will provided differentiated, targeted instruction based on student need. The schedule has a dedicated intervention team of teachers for each grade level to allow for small group instruction to take place. The students will be utilizing more technology based resources to better align with the state assessment that is computer based. Students will be taking their assessments within the Cambium platform to allow them to become more familiar with the tools and transferring strategies that can be effective from paper based practice to computer based practice. The ESE team will be closely monitoring our students with disabilities to ensure that not only growth is occurring, but that we are working with these students to close the gap and work toward mastery of the state standards. PLC structures will be enhanced to include a purpose for each meeting (analyzing the assessment tools, instructional planning, student work sample analysis, or data analysis and student groupings for intervention) this will guide our work. The goal is to improve the assessment tools utilized, deepen our conversations around the instruction taking place within the classrooms, look more closely at what students are producing independently, and planning for detailed targeted interventions that are fluid and meaningful. Additionally, a ELA coach has been budgeted through title one to provide specific support to the 3rd grades though PD, modeling, and assistance with data tracking and intervention planning. The coach is a highly effective former Peer Collaborative Teacher with a track record for improving ELA scores at James Stephens specifically.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

JSE partners with Head Start and has a Early Learning Center connected to it's campus. This allows us to serve a need in the community in the way of child care and provides us an advantage in welcoming kindergarten students who are prepared for the learning environment. We work closely with several community agencies to offer supports to the students and parents at James Stephens. In FY24 we will be offering the Boys and Girls Club after school program to students to receive homework help, additionally academic supports, in a safe environment at the school site until 6pm daily. This is offered at a significantly lower price than some fee based afterschool programs and allows parents to apply for scholarships based on financial need. We partner with the local food bank to provide wrap around services to families every Thursday to include meals, hygiene supplies, and clothing supports to our families in need. Finally, as a result of our MSAP grant we are able to partner with middle schools to bridge a pathway for our students who see themselves in a STEM career. This allows us to act as a feeder school to encourage our students to consider these types of programs.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The school has a full time school social worker as well as a full time counselor. The school counselor works with individual students as well as groups of students and will provide whole group lessons when they are needed. Our social worker has been working with several agencies to ensure we expand the wrap around services offered at JSE. At weekly PLC meetings teachers complete a form that has a section for student concerns in the areas of mental health, additional supports, attendance, or behavior. The leadership team disseminates these concerns with appropriate student service team members (dean, behavior specialist, counselor, social worker) in order to stay on top of student needs and communicate progress in assisting students and families back to the homeroom teacher. This allows the team and teachers to be aware of student situations in order to be of assistance. The school mental health team meetings monthly and the threat assessment team also meets monthly to go over open cases.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

JSE is an elementary school but through our MSAP STEM grant we partner with middle schools with STEM programs to encourage our students to pursue careers in these fields.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

JSE is a PBIS school. We offer mustang bucks to our students to encourage and reward following our Mustang Way: "Mustangs are kind, safe, and responsible so we can collaborate, communicate, critically think, and be creative." The Mustang Way incorporates the four C's that align with our STEM grant. Mustang bucks can be spent at the mustang store open weekly. Students who do not have any disciplinary referrals are invited to attend our quarterly PBIS parties that are run through the specials schedule as to not disrupt instructional minutes. Students needing more supports in tier 3 have behavior contracts or plans that are tailored to their needs and preferences based upon the targeted behavior and

rewards the student is working toward. MTSS for behavior is closely monitored for trends and discussed during leadership meetings.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

PD is offered to teachers in Picture Perfect Science, Engineering is Elementary, Document Based Questioning as well as mini PD opportunities based on teacher wants and needs throughout the year. All school based personnel are required to be trained in Youth Mental Health as mandated by state statute. In FY24, teachers will be trained on a refining process for PLC that will guide their work for the school year. Prior to the proximity plan, JSE had a 94% teacher retention rate. This year, we will be growing in capacity and have hired on new teachers to accommodate the increase in student enrollment. In order to retain our staff, the administration is focused on being present in classrooms as a support to teachers and students. We make it a priority to be involved in the work of the classroom and seek to support teacher autonomy when appropriate treating the teachers as the professionals they are. We offer modeling and coaching to teachers in need and work to develop their skill set as educators.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

JSE has an early childhood center connected to our campus. This allows us to transition students from head start to the school having the needed prerequisite skills to experience success in kindergarten. Families are in need of child care services and this partnership is a positive for the community. In FY24 we will strengthen our relationship with the Early Learning Center by having a more active role in the pre-k classrooms and will work more closely with the teachers and staff that are in the center. We anticipate this is an opportunity for us to continue to grow our early childhood program.