James A. Long Elementary School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

James A. Long Elementary School

1400 OLD JACKSONVILLE RD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/jal

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-6	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	C	C	C*

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/6/2018.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At James A. Long Elementary School, students will be inspired to think, to learn, to care and to become successful, responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

I am somebody. I was somebody when I got here. I'll be a better somebody when I leave. I am powerful and I am strong. I deserve the education I can get here. I have important things to do, people to impress, and places to go! I will make it a great day . . . or not, the choice is mine.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title
Hedstrom, Mary Beth	Principal
Adams, Paula	Assistant Principal
Clifton, Sarajo	Instructional Coach
Wright-Purifoy, Jennifer	School Counselor

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The James A. Long Elementary School leadership team works together to ensure seamless integration of teaching and learning at the school. The team meets regularly, both formally and informally, to address the needs of teachers and students. The Guidance Counselor/MTSS coordinator, Jennifer Wright-Purifoy, plans, schedules and coordinates MTSS (Multi-tiered System of Support) meetings to ensure the provision of academic, psychological and behavior supports needed for every student. The Instructional Coach, Sarajo Clifton, oversees the professional learning community meetings with teachers to identify and track data for appropriate differentiated instruction. Administrators implement the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model that provides a continuous feedback loop to increase the opportunities for students to learn.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	23	25	29	18	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	2	6	4	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	23	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	2	5	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	3	4	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected

Monday 8/27/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	11	24	20	21	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	32	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	1	0	2	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	11	24	20	21	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	32	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	1	0	2	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Learning Gains of the Lowest Performing 25% in ELA and Math

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest Performing 25%

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Learning Gains of the Lowest Performing 25% in ELA and Math

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Science Achievement - Yes

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Utilization of the District Science Coach

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	56%	43%	56%	53%	42%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	45%	55%	51%	49%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	22%	40%	48%	37%	42%	46%
Math Achievement	61%	52%	62%	53%	51%	58%
Math Learning Gains	55%	55%	59%	65%	56%	58%

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	23%	44%	47%	48%	44%	46%
Science Achievement	67%	46%	55%	54%	40%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Attendance below 90 percent	23 (11)	25 (24)	29 (20)	18 (21)	17 (16)	21 (22)	0 (0)	133 (114)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	2 (4)	6 (3)	4 (3)	3 (4)	6 (7)	0 (0)	21 (21)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (2)	0 (0)	2 (2)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (1)	23 (32)	38 (28)	0 (0)	68 (61)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2018	52%	40%	12%	57%	-5%	
	2017	53%	42%	11%	58%	-5%	
Same Grade Comparison		-1%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2018	50%	38%	12%	56%	-6%	
	2017	58%	42%	16%	56%	2%	
Same Grade Comparison		-8%					
Cohort Comparison		-3%					
05	2018	61%	39%	22%	55%	6%	
	2017	50%	38%	12%	53%	-3%	
Same Grade Comparison		11%					
Cohort Comparison		3%					
06	2018						
	2017						
Cohort Comparison		-50%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2018	62%	48%	14%	62%	0%	
	2017	52%	48%	4%	62%	-10%	
Same Grade Comparison		10%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2018	55%	50%	5%	62%	-7%	

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2017	65%	53%	12%	64%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2018	63%	48%	15%	61%	2%
	2017	59%	45%	14%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	64%	42%	22%	55%	9%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	31	26	10	34	39	15	47				
BLK	30	45	28	34	35	16	45				
HSP	62	58		69	75						
WHT	65	50	14	71	62	29	72				
FRL	47	43	18	52	48	17	63				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	28	24		39	38						
BLK	23	40	32	38	61	33	19				
HSP	54			62							
WHT	68	61	52	69	80	43	78				
FRL	45	49	36	48	63	36	40				

Part III: Planning for Improvement
Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title	Attendance
Rationale	Twenty-three percent of students at JAL have attendance less than 90%.
Intended Outcome	Reduction of the percentage of students at JAL that have less than 90% attendance by 8 percentage points.
Point Person	Paula Adams (p2adams@my.putnamschools.org)

Action Step

Description	Implement attendance program that includes incentives for attending.
Person Responsible	Virginia Solomon (vsolomon@my.putnamschools.org)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	Attendance reports provided to parents at the beginning of the year, mid-year and end of year.
Person Responsible	Paula Adams (p2adams@my.putnamschools.org)

Activity #2

Title	Quality Core Instruction
Rationale	If there is ongoing focus, understanding and implementation of quality instruction that supports individual student needs, then there will be an increase in student achievement. School Grade points dropped from 373/C in 2017 to 333/C in 2018.
Intended Outcome	Earn at least 378 points for School Grade of B.
Point Person	Mary Beth Hedstrom (mhedstrom@my.putnamschools.org)

Action Step

Description	Continue to implement the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model with fidelity to provide the needed feedback and coaching to increase the quality of instruction.
Person Responsible	Mary Beth Hedstrom (mhedstrom@my.putnamschools.org)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	Continued ongoing professional development on Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model during professional learning community setting using the data in iObservation, i-Ready, LLI, progress monitoring for Science and all other data generated.
Person Responsible	Mary Beth Hedstrom (mhedstrom@my.putnamschools.org)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

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

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

The parent involvement target for our school is to have 50% of our school attend open house. Our target for ongoing parent nights is 40% attendance. We will have a flexible meeting schedule for PTO and SAC meetings. We will also send out a monthly newsletter to inform parents of the opportunities to be involved at James A. Long.

PFEP Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

In order to meet the social-emotional needs of all students, needs are assessed on a case-by-case basis. The school guidance counselor or lead team member will conference with students that are exhibiting social-emotional issues. If a student requires guidance or support interventions beyond the school's capabilities, an outside agency is contacted such as DCF or a resource officer. There are also agencies such as Helping Hands and mental wellness counseling services that come into the school and provide counseling services for students in need. Class council sessions are held in many classrooms where students can safely discuss feelings and needs. The Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) is used to identify students with additional needs and document the support provided and the effectiveness of that support.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

The Keys to Kindergarten Success Workshop is provided each year for pre-kindergarten parents. The school sends home the kindergarten first nine week expectations at this time, with all parents, so that they may start instruction at home over the summer. This helps parents understand the intensity of the kindergarten curriculum. We use the end of the year VPK assessment to create balanced classrooms in kindergarten.
We hold open enrollment for kindergarten throughout the summer. We collaborate with the 6th Grade Center to facilitate the transition students from 5th grade to 6th grade. 5th grade students visit the 6th Grade Center at the end of the year to learn expectations and to become familiar with the school. This helps to decrease the anxiety of the transition from elementary school.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The James A. Long SBLT consists of the Guidance Counselor, CRT, Principal or AP. The meetings include the school based team with a teacher leader. All teachers have been trained in the MTSS and the processes are reviewed periodically. Appropriate forms and data are collected at the classroom level and brought to the attention of the MTSS team when support is needed.

The U.S. Department of Education released proposed regulations to implement therequirements related to Federal spending in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as recently revised by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA} which states, Federal funds must supplement and may not supplant state and local funds. Regulations ensure that Federal funds are additive and do not take the place of state and local funds in low-income schools in keeping with the longstanding commitment under Title I that the nation's highest need students receive the additional financial resources necessary to help them succeed.

In accordance with ESSA Section 118 (b} (2}, the methodology used to allocate State and local funds to each school receiving assistance under this part (Title I, Part A) ensures that the school receives all the State and local funds it would otherwise receive if it were not receiving Federal funds. The District has a methodology for support not supplant when allocating State and local funds to each school.

Each school year, the District's Chief Financial Officer assures State and local funds are distributed at an equal level by preparing a report showing comparability across all schools for the allocation of instructional staff. Staff allocations are based on a formula applied consistently so that all schools that are comparable receive allocations in a comparable manner.

The funding formula is based on Florida Public Schools Full-time Equivalent (FTE) data. For the past several years, grades Kindergarten, first, second, and third grades have been allocated 1 teacher per 17 students. Grades four and five are allocated 1 teacher per 21 students. Though the specific ratio may change year to year, this formula provides teachers for these grade levels at slightly below the ratio required to meet Florida's class size regulations.

Expenditures of titled funds at the school level are then monitored to ensure expenditures supplement the general curriculum and fulfill the intent of grant funding. All expenditures are reviewed by the Federal Programs Office to ensure compliance with applicable Federal and State guidelines.

Additionally, the school leadership team conducts a district unified Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) towards the end of each school year. The CNA reports on how resources including personnel, instruction, and curriculum are aligned to identified needs. Student programming outcomes are monitored both in the CNA and district school data report-outs conducted quarterly.

Federal funding projects are monitored for auditing purposes by the Office of Federal Programs. Audit boxes for each program are maintained and aligned to pertinent work papers and Federal and State guidance.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

James A. Long Elementary School has cultivated a partnership with Beck Automotive Group to advance college and career awareness. We also work closely with the District Graduation Coaches to ensure our students are on track for graduation.