

Polk County Public Schools

James E. Stephens Academy 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	28

James E. Stephens Academy

1350 MAPLE AVE N, Bartow, FL 33830

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/stephens>

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.

As students explore new ways to create and develop a more peaceful world, our vision is to partner with our school community to ensure that scholars grow in self-confidence and compassion, develop the desire to learn and build a strong academic foundation through a challenging curriculum. Our parents, teachers, and staff will develop lifelong learners by providing every student with the supports needed to meet their academic potential and become responsible members of the local and school community. All stakeholders will promote self-discipline through character building and ensure high quality instruction that encourages risk-taking and international mindedness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

James Stephens Academy will take a collaborative approach with all stakeholders to ensure every child performs to their full potential. As we create inquiring, knowledgeable and caring scholars.

SOAR

Safe

Organized

Accountable

Respectful

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
Lewis, Nadia	Principal	To monitor and ensure that district and school policies, procedures, and initiatives are being done with fidelity.
Towles, Alatheia	Assistant Principal	To support and oversee the implementation of district and school initiatives. To perform observations, check for fidelity with new initiatives and assist with discipline as needed.
Breiter, Lee	Instructional Coach	Providing expert level math strategies to teachers, coaching cycles, and reviewing schoolwide data to plan for interventions.
Cortes Vega, Shaime	Instructional Coach	Providing expert level reading strategies to teachers, coaching cycles, and reviewing schoolwide data to plan for interventions.
Bates, Catherine	Behavior Specialist	Assist admin by dealing with discipline issues, making parent contact, and working collaboratively with teachers and administrators to lower discipline incidents on campus.
Martini, Samantha	School Counselor	Provide support to teachers and students. Keep documentation for MTSS and hold appropriate meetings with parents to make them aware of their child's achievement levels.
Windsor, Cindy	Other	Provide interventions for K-3 students to improve schoolwide achievement levels in reading.

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 school leadership team reviews state assessments to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses. As a leadership team we devise a plan for improvement and then present this plan to our School Advisory Council (SAC) as well as our Community Advisory Team (CAT). The SAC members give parent and student perspective and we adjust the SIP as needed. During CAT meetings members offer ideas to improve the outcomes of our initiatives and also provide financial support or other resources for these initiatives.

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))

During monthly MTSS data meetings the leadership team and teachers will review the progress of all students toward mastery of the standards. As needed, we will make adjustments based on data from ISIP, STAR Reading and Math, and FAST ELA and Math.

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	83%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: D 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 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	51	39	41	23	19	25	0	0	0	198	
One or more suspensions	19	9	9	17	3	21	0	0	0	78	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	10	13	4	11	2	1	0	0	0	41	
Course failure in Math	6	4	8	4	5	2	0	0	0	29	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	29	15	13	0	0	0	57	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	16	18	0	0	0	60	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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	0	1	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	2	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	37	23	22	20	21	27	0	0	0	150	
One or more suspensions	9	8	12	7	10	15	0	0	0	61	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	29	33	46	26	18	13	0	0	0	165	

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	19	12	21	13	30	36	0	0	0	131

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	37	23	22	20	21	27	0	0	0	150	
One or more suspensions	9	8	12	7	10	15	0	0	0	61	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	29	33	46	26	18	13	0	0	0	165	

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	19	12	21	13	30	36	0	0	0	131

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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*	27	45	53	24	47	56	22		
ELA Learning Gains				48			37		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			50		
Math Achievement*	39	49	59	25	42	50	26		
Math Learning Gains				41			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				22			9		
Science Achievement*	38	41	54	35	49	59	46		
Social Studies Achievement*					56	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					39	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	59	54	59	52			31		

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	184
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	286
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	18	Yes	4	3
ELL	33	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	13	Yes	4	3
HSP	34	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	37	Yes	3	

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	22	Yes	3	2
ELL	39	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	21	Yes	3	2
HSP	45			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	45			
FRL	33	Yes	2	

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	27			39			38					59
SWD	19			26			8				4	
ELL	14			27							3	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	11			20			11				4	
HSP	24			38							4	59
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	58			69			85				3	
FRL	27			38			34				5	60

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	24	48	39	25	41	22	35					52
SWD	12	35	31	3	23	19	28					
ELL	28	53		26	39		36					52
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	10	41	46	10	16	12	10					
HSP	28	58		32	48		53					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	37	50		33	61		43					
FRL	19	47	41	20	35	20	30					52

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	22	37	50	26	40	9	46					31
SWD	5	8		11	25							
ELL	19			19								31
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	13	30		11	25		36					
HSP	22	42		26	42		36					31
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	37	45		50	64		70					
FRL	18	32		22	30	0	40					31

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	33%	43%	-10%	54%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	27%	53%	-26%	58%	-31%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	14%	42%	-28%	50%	-36%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	33%	51%	-18%	59%	-26%
04	2023 - Spring	36%	56%	-20%	61%	-25%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	44%	-4%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	33%	39%	-6%	51%	-18%

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.

Reading scores were the lowest this year because there was inconsistency with a 3rd grade small group that prevented several students from achieving the proficiency scores they should have attained. Also, the core instruction for 3rd grade students was not fully aligned to the B.E.S.T standards. A lack of strong core instruction and consistent intervention has been a trend for several years, which has caused the low scores for this subject area. In the past six years, James E. Stephens has not scored over 35% proficient in ELA. This is a clear indication that core there has not been strong core instruction. It is also a clear indication that the Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports have not been implemented for several year.

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

No data point showed a decline from the previous year. However, the Science scores were not as strong as predicted. The current 5th grade teacher has been able to produce Science scores that are 10% above 5th grade ELA proficiency scores. Therefore, we predicted the scores should have been at least 43%. The low scores may have been caused by teacher and student attendance and a shorter time frame to teach Science content.

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 greatest gap when compared to state averages are in ELA proficiency. Students in 3rd scored 36 percentage points below the state and 4th grade students scored 31 percentage points below the state. This can be explained by several factors. For the past several years research-based reading instruction has not taken place in grades K-2 at James E. Stephens, making it difficult for students to read and comprehend questions and text on an assessment. Furthermore, teachers did not have a structured ELA curriculum that allowed them to practice phonics, review previous taught standards, and allow for standards-based core instruction. Last year, these systems were put in place, and we will continue these systems with the addition of a focus on equivalent experiences.

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

The Math proficiency data showed the most improvement with 13 percentage points. In the area of Mathematics we provided teachers with a spiral review of all benchmarks for the beginning of the Math block, a scripted lesson that fully aligned to the B.E.S.T standards, and a structured intervention time.

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

The biggest concern with the EWS data is the number of students absent. The school's daily attendance rate for 2022-2023 was only 88 percent daily attendance. We will address this with a focused plan to contact parents early to make them aware of the impact attendance can have on achievement. Records will be kept of parent phone calls, conferences, and if necessary, truancy officer referrals.

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

1. Hiring a highly effective staff to improve core instruction
2. Improving student attendance
3. Consistency with core instruction and interventions
4. Building teacher/support staff capacity

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 Other**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.

In 2021-2022 student discipline data shows 434 referrals. Since this goal has been in place referrals have dropped to 195. However, there is still improvement that can be made in this area.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The referrals will decrease by 5% and attendance will improve to 93% daily attendance rate. Teacher and staff attendance will remain at 90% daily attendance or higher.

Monitoring:

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

During weekly leadership meetings we will review discipline referrals and attendance rates by grade level. Then, we will drill down to the classroom level to identify possible classroom culture issues. Last, we will drill down to individual students that may require intensive interventions and support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nadia Lewis (nadia.lewis@polk-fl.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 CHAMPS expectations that have proven results for classroom and schoolwide management. Tackling the attendance issues, we have created a system that establishes a main contact person to work with parents.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

CHAMPS has been a district wide discipline program that was introduced in 2015. It's basic principles are showing dignity and respect to all students. Teacher must learn that how you Structure your classroom, Teach expectations, Observe and provide positive feedback or correction, and Interact positively all are the basics for providing the best possible learning environment. Then CHAMPS is just the clear expectations for each activity. With students from different backgrounds it is important to be clear what respect or active listening looks like as it may be different in varying cultures.

Evidence supports having one main contact person to support parents with students that have truancy issues. Truancy interventions can be setup to help support parents and students.

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.

Review CHAMPS with all teachers and give more in-depth training for new teachers.

Person Responsible: Nadia Lewis (nadia.lewis@polk-fl.net)

By When: This action should be completed by July 31st for new teachers and August 3rd for returning teachers.

Make the learning environment the focus for observations and feedback the first two weeks with students.

Person Responsible: Nadia Lewis (nadia.lewis@polk-fl.net)

By When: The focus will be communicated to teachers by August 7th.

The schoolwide attendance policy and expectations will be reviewed with teachers and they will be given a hard copy of this policy to keep for the school year.

Person Responsible: Nadia Lewis (nadia.lewis@polk-fl.net)

By When: This task will be completed by August 5th.

The registrar secretary will create an excel sheet to keep a running document of all parent contact, conference dates, and referrals to truancy officer.

Person Responsible: Nadia Lewis (nadia.lewis@polk-fl.net)

By When: The excel sheet was create June 2023.

The registrar secretary and principal will meet weekly to review the excel sheet, schedule parent conferences, and decide if students should be referred to the truancy officer.

Person Responsible: Nadia Lewis (nadia.lewis@polk-fl.net)

By When: This task will begin August 16th and continue every Wednesday for the remainder of the school year.

To monitor CHAMPS implementation, administrators will complete journey evaluations that focus on domain three. This will allow administrators to provide feedback on the implementation of CHAMPS.

Person Responsible: Team Administrative (stephenselementary@polk-fl.net)

By When: These focused walk throughs will be conducted the second and third week of school, before Thanksgiving, Winter and Spring break, and after Thanksgiving, Winter, and Spring break.

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

Teachers will actively engage all students through rigorous data-driven instruction to the depth and complexity of the standard. With this focus, teachers must provide Multi-Tiered Systems of Support for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in sub groups below 41% proficient in both ELA and Math Fast will double in proficiency rate from PM1 to PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly MTSS meetings will be held to review interventions and student progress toward mastery of the grade level standards. We will use iStation Reading, Corrective Reading logs, PM1/PM2 data, and STAR data to monitor progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Team Leadership (stephensleadership@polk-fl.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.)

Students will be provided with interventions through Corrective Reading to build reading fluency and comprehension. Number Worlds interventions for gaps in Mathematics will be provided to students showing a need for interventions in Mathematics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Both programs have been provided as a district resource that is evidence based. Both programs for Reading and Math provide interventions that will help to fill foundational gaps in instruction and allow students to reach mastery of grade level standards.

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.

All teachers will receive the MTSS procedures and documents to keep running logs on interventions and the progress students are making.

Person Responsible: Samantha Martini (samantha.martini@polk-fl.net)

By When: This task should be complete by August 10th.

Students in the bottom 25% and students below proficiency in ELA will be identified for tier 2 and 3 support. Students that are identified will be scheduled to receive interventions with a Corrective Reading group.

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

By When: This task should be complete by August 10th.

A calendar for MTSS leadership meetings will be created and distributed to all teachers and instructional support staff.

Person Responsible: Nadia Lewis (nadia.lewis@polk-fl.net)

By When: This action will be complete by August 3rd.

To ensure that students are receiving Tier 1, 2, and 3 supports, administrators will perform weekly walk-throughs to monitor that benchmarks are being taught during core instruction, teachers are meeting with tier 2 and 3 groups daily, and corrective reading is being conducted daily during Power Hour and What I Nee (WIN) time.

Person Responsible: Nadia Lewis (nadia.lewis@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monitoring that teachers are exposing students to grade level benchmarks will begin the week of August 14th and will continue until the end of April 2024.

Administration will monitor the progress of all students by reviewing iStation data, Star ELA data, and ELA FAST data to determine if interventions are working.

Person Responsible: Nadia Lewis (nadia.lewis@polk-fl.net)

By When: The data reviews will begin the first week of September 2023. They will continue at the beginning of each month.

Track the number of students between August and October that moved from A to B1, B1 to B2, B2 to C

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

By When: The tracking will begin October 13, 2023 and will continue at the end of each 9 weeks.

The Math and Reading interventionist will identify students that needs tier 2 and tier 3 interventions and set a schedule to begin intervention groups with identified students.

Person Responsible: Cindy Windsor (cindy.windsor@polk-fl.net)

By When: This task will be completed every 6 weeks starting September 4th.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

Teacher instruction will fully align to ELA and Math Benchmarks and allow students exposure to equivalent experiences. This focus will ensure students are exposed to all grade level benchmarks and give them opportunities to see the benchmarks as they will see them on the state assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in ELA will score 42 percent proficient or higher for the 2023-2024 school year on FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will participate in planning sessions on Tuesdays during specials and during after school planning sessions on Mondays and Tuesdays. During planning sessions, teachers and instructional support staff will breakdown the benchmarks, create objectives, and choose tasks that align with benchmarks/objectives. Administrators will observe lessons using the district provided walk through tool and give immediate feedback on benchmarks and task alignment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nadia Lewis (nadia.lewis@polk-fl.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.)

The use of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) is an evidenced based practice that will help teachers provide the best possible instruction, interventions, and acceleration to their students. We will also utilize the planning tools from the district to and the unit planning tools from the IB PYP.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The district planning tool will help teachers have a consistent way to breakdown the benchmark and align tasks. The IB PYP unit planner provide a consistent way to document evaluation of lessons and revisions to make them more effective.

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.

Teacher will review the district planning tool and unit planners for IB PYP.

Person Responsible: Nadia Lewis (nadia.lewis@polk-fl.net)

By When: This task will be complete by August 5th.

A calendar of planning sessions and PD will be developed for the school year.

Person Responsible: Nadia Lewis (nadia.lewis@polk-fl.net)

By When: This task will be completed by August 3rd.

Administration will walk classes using the district provided "Walk Through Tool" and give feedback weekly to teachers regarding benchmarks and task alignment.

Person Responsible: Nadia Lewis (nadia.lewis@polk-fl.net)

By When: This task will start on August 21st and continue for the school year.

To monitor the impact of planning sessions, administration will review the equivalent experiences with teachers on Monday and Tuesday after school planning sessions. Administrators will also review classroom data from performance matters assessments.

Person Responsible: Nadia Lewis (nadia.lewis@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monitoring for impact of planning sessions will begin September 18, 2023, and continue till the end of the year.

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 process to review school improvement funding allocations starts with analyzing the data to determine where the funding resources should be utilized. This year funds from Title I and UNSIG are utilized to pay for an academic coach for ELA and Mathematics and an interventionist for ELA and Mathematics. The scores in both ELA and Math show a strong need for core instruction support from coaches and intensive interventions that can be provided by the interventionists in both ELA and Math.

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

Our students show a critical need for explicit instruction in foundational skills aligned to our state benchmarks and enrichment for students that are on level.

Kindergarten- Kindergarten students now in 1st grade showed 73% of students making adequate progress to pass at a level 3 or above on a standardized ELA assessment.

First- First grade students now in 2nd grade showed 68% of students that tested out of Star Early Lit. and in to STAR Reading.

Second- Second grade students now in 3rd grade only had 10% of students on track to score a level 3 or above on a standardized ELA assessment.

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

Teachers will focus instructional practice on explicit instruction in language comprehension that focuses on vocabulary development and building knowledge through informational text.

This decision is based on the ELA FAST scores for 2022-2023:

3rd 13% proficient

4th 29% proficient

5th 36% proficient

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

Teachers will have 80% of kindergarten students scoring at a level 3 or above on the STAR Early Lit. by May 2024.

Teachers will have 60% of 1st grade students scoring at a level 3 or above on the STAR Reading assessment by May 2024.

Teachers will have 50% of the 2nd grade students scoring at a level 3 or above on the STAR Reading assessment by May 2024.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Teachers will have 50% of the 3rd grade students scoring at a level 3 or above on FAST Reading PM3.

Teachers will have 50% or more of the 4th grade students scoring at or above a level 3 on FAST Reading PM3.

Teachers will have 50% or more of the 5th grade students scoring at or above a level 3 on FAST Reading PM3.

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.

Every 4 to 6 weeks the leadership team will monitor the progress of MTSS for academics, attendance, and behavior. Excel documents for each area have been created to track students in each grade level and will help to lead discussions with classroom teachers, students, and parents about student performance, attendance or behavior.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lewis, Nadia, nadia.lewis@polk-fl.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?

Students in grades K-2 will use the Reading Mastery curriculum to close gaps in foundational Reading skills. Students will go through a diagnostic test that will place them in the appropriate level. This will allow every student to receive instruction on specific reading deficiencies during the Power Hour. Students in grade 3-5 will use the Corrective Reading curriculum to close gaps in foundational Reading skills. Students will go through a diagnostic test placing them in the appropriate level of instruction to close their specific learning gaps.

Students in grades 3-5 will also receive instructional materials from WriteScore and assessments with specific feedback for improvement.

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?

Students in K-2 and 3-5 need explicit instruction in foundational skills, both Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading will provide daily explicit instruction. Both programs show that students will have at least a year and a half growth if used with fidelity and with good pacing.

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
To address the school's Areas of Focus all teachers and coaches will be properly trained to deliver instruction using Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading.	Cortes Vega, Shaime, shaime.cortesvega@polk-fl.net
To address the school's Areas of Focus students will be assessed and monitored regularly to ensure they are making adequate progress academically.	Lewis, Nadia, nadia.lewis@polk-fl.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.

The SIP is reviewed with staff during the first work week, when teachers and staff return from winter break to review progress toward the goals and make changes if necessary, and at the end of the school year to determine if the school met the focus goals. The three focus areas are listed on the weekly staff email. For parents, students, and stakeholders the SIP is reviewed in SAC meetings and CAT meetings three to four times a year to get parent, community, and student input. The SIP is available to parents in the title one PEN Notebook. Lastly, the SIP is posted on the school website, <https://stephens.polkschoolsfl.com/>

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))

For the Family Engagement Plan visit <https://stephens.polkschoolsfl.com/>

Students will be provided with a school agenda that lists all of the school policies and will be the main form of communication with parents and families. The school will utilize monthly newsletters as well as school messenger to provide parents with reminders of upcoming events. We will have an Open House night in September, a conference night in October to review student progress with parents, and two more academic nights to inform parents of grade level academic expectations and how they can help support their child at home. Furthermore, teachers and the leadership team will review student data and notify parents if their child needs interventions/tutoring.

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))

To strengthen the academic program at James E. Stephens Academy we have created a master schedule that allows more instructional staff to be available during the Power Hour intervention times. Furthermore, the schedule allows 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade teachers to specialize in two core subject areas instead of four so they can plan highly effective lessons. The school is also taking steps to become an IB PYP school, which means all of our teachers and support staff will be trained to implement high impact lessons with enrichment and acceleration built into every unit. One of the main goals of the school improvement plan is to provide teachers with planning sessions and professional learning communities where they will break down BEST Standards for both ELA and Math and create objectives and tasks that fully align to the benchmarks. Teachers will also utilize highly effective teaching strategies to improve student engagement, such as Kagan structures, project-based learning, and unit themes for IB PYP.

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))

All plans to use funds are aligned with the school improvement plan goals. The plan utilizes federal funds to pay for food pantry items for families in need. We pay teachers to tutor students after school, with a focus on our tier 2 and 3 students.

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))

A. School Based Mental health services are requested by the teacher or the parent through the school-based counselor. The team then meets to determine the best support for the student.

B. Specialized supports follow the same process with the team determining the best course of action for the student.

C. Other strategies, such as behavior strategies, go through the behavior interventionist to the PBIS team.

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))

All students participate in Great American Teach in where different fields are invited to the school to share what they do for career and what kind of training they needed to do it.

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).

At Stephens Academy all staff and families look for ways to encourage students to always follow the learner profiles. This is accomplished in several ways. Schoolwide classrooms are given compliment cards and when classes are seen modeling one of the traits in the Learner Profile or following schoolwide CHAMPS expectations, they will receive compliments that will earn class rewards.

Staff use specific verbal praise when providing a compliment to the students by detailing which Learner Profile attribute was displayed and how. Students are encouraged verbally on morning announcements and by their teachers to live the Learner Profile and to earn Eagle points. Around campus there are visual encouragement for students to live the Learner Profile as well as on our school's website and unit overview for each unit of study taught to every grade level.

As an IB school, we strive to help students develop attributes of the Learner Profile. A way students can show these attributes is by taking action. Any time a student is caught taking action, whether big or small, a teacher or family member can recognize them with an action ticket.

Stephens school-wide reward systems for positive behavior increases the likelihood that desired behaviors will be repeated and focuses staff and student attention on desired behaviors while fostering a proactive positive school climate.

Consequences/Tracking Method

When students do not meet the behavior expectation, for example, they are being disrespectful or choosing not to obey, all staff members will provide that child with a max of two verbal or nonverbal warnings to correct the behavior. After the warnings are given, if the undesired behavior continues the students receive a written infraction in their agenda along with a code that signals the undesired behavior. The agenda is required to be signed nightly by a parent or guardian. Each level of infraction requires a greater form of parent communication and consequence. Additionally, each grade level uses this procedure for infractions, however, consequences are specific to that student's grade.

CHAMPS is a PCSB initiative as of 2016 that provides structure for classroom management and the conditions for learning.

Tier 2 Behavior Intervention

A school-based team collaborated to identify criteria and procedures for identifying students for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions and supports. Stephens' school based PBIS Leadership Team include administration, IB Coordinator, Instructional Coaches, ESE teacher and a teacher from each grade level.

When a student has earned 10 infractions for behavior that student is referred to the team for Tier 2 intervention and support during Multi-Tiered System of Support meetings. As a team, a plan is designed to support tier 2 and 3 students.

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))

Stephens takes part in the Teacher Engagement Ambassador program to ensure new teachers are comfortable and have all they need. These teachers are also tiered for support by the leadership team. Where Academic Coaches and Interventionists as well as Administrators support them.

During MOU after school planning and staff development days, teachers and paraprofessionals are given professional development that directly targets areas of concern. For example, ELL and black students have shown a need for support with vocabulary. All teachers will receive highly effective strategies for ELL vocabulary instruction.

To recruit effective and highly effective teachers, all advertisements included information regarding the bonus pay for effective and highly effective VAM scores. We were able to recruit, one more highly effective ELA teacher for 3rd grade and two effective teachers for 4th and 5th grade ELA.

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))

James E. Stephens offers a Headstart program and ESE Pre-K. The parents are encouraged to participate in all after school activities with their students.

To introduce new kindergarten parents to the academic and behavior expectations, we offer "Kindergarten Discovery Day" in April. At this event, parents and students meet the kindergarten team, counselor, and administrators. We discuss expectations and what they can do to ensure their child is kindergarten ready.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$151,063.13
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	130	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG	2.0	\$104,049.59
			Notes: Other Certified Instructional Personnel - School based Math and Reading Interventionists who work with small groups of students in need of remediation			
	5100	210	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$14,119.53
			Notes: Retirement - 13.57% - Reading & Math Interventionists			
	5100	220	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$7,959.79
			Notes: Social Security y -7.65% -Reading & Math Interventionists			

	5100	231	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$22,056.00
			Notes: Health and Hospitalization - Reading & Math Interventionists			
	5100	232	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$43.20
			Notes: Life Insurance - Reading & Math Interventionists			
	5100	240	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$582.68
			Notes: Workers Compensation - .56% - Reading & Math Interventionists			
	6400	160	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG	0.03	\$1,462.14
			Notes: Cost sharing- Senior Coordinator of Instruction - individual will support multiple schools focusing on student learning by providing support and assistance to teachers and school-based administration. Provides extensive support and coaching services related to content-area instruction.			
	6400	210	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$285.80
			Notes: Retirement - 13.57%			
	6400	220	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$161.12
			Notes: Social Security - 7.65%			
	6400	231	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$330.84
			Notes: Health and Hospitalization			
	6400	232	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$0.65
			Notes: Life Insurance			
	6400	240	1751 - James E. Stephens Academy	UniSIG		\$11.79
			Notes: Workers Compensation .56%			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				\$0.00
Total:						\$151,063.13

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes