

Putnam County School District

Putnam Edge High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Putnam Edge High School

200 S 7TH ST, Palatka, FL 32177

<http://www.putnamedge.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Emmanuel Swift

Start Date for this Principal: 2/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2022-07-26
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: F (23%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: D (33%) 2015-16: F (26%) 2014-15: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 9/17/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Putnam Edge High School

200 S 7TH ST, Palatka, FL 32177

<http://www.putnamedge.org/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	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	Yes	60%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	F	C	D	F

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 9/17/2019.

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.

Mission:
 Our Putnam EDGE students will.
 Explore the unfamiliar through critical thinking.
 Develop individual accountability.
 Grow together utilizing cooperative learning.
 Engage with community partners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:
 Putnam EDGE High school endeavors to launch scholars into Putnam County and beyond as pioneers and architects of the future.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Swift, Emmanuel	Principal	Job Duties: Provides leadership to the staff in determining objectives and identifying school needs as the basis for developing long and short-range plans for Putnam EDGE High School. Implements school-wide student-centered, project and problem-based learning tied to State and Common Core State Standards. Provides instructional leadership to all staff and assures integration between curricular areas. Commits to developing a culture of trust and responsibility among students, teachers, staff, and the Putnam EDGE HS community. Participates with significant higher education and business partnerships to support college courses, internships and community service experiences for students. Implements a technology infrastructure that supports the curriculum and school.
Smith, Claudette	Assistant Principal	Supervises and evaluates the performance of all personnel in accordance with a researched based evaluation and assessment system, recommends appropriate action in cases of substandard performances, and identifies and encourages individual teachers with leadership potential. Develops school plans and organizational procedures for the health, safety, discipline and conduct of students as established in District procedures.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	18	25	18	73
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	14	9	43

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/5/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	3	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	13	36

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	6	0	15

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	11%	31%	56%	23%	28%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	19%	34%	51%	35%	40%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	27%	42%	0%	41%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	25%	51%	14%	27%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	43%	48%	17%	27%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	45%	0%	28%	39%
Science Achievement	13%	39%	68%	50%	53%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	35%	49%	73%	58%	57%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	12 (0)	18 (0)	25 (0)	18 (0)	73 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	1 ()	1 ()	2 ()	4 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	8 (0)	12 (0)	14 (0)	9 (0)	43 (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.

NOTE: 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
09	2019	0%	41%	-41%	55%	-55%
	2018	21%	38%	-17%	53%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	9%	41%	-32%	53%	-44%
	2018	16%	38%	-22%	53%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	8%	54%	-46%	67%	-59%
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	32%	51%	-19%	70%	-38%
2018	34%	53%	-19%	68%	-34%
Compare		-2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	8%	49%	-41%	61%	-53%
2018	23%	43%	-20%	62%	-39%
Compare		-15%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	43%	-43%	57%	-57%
2018	14%	50%	-36%	56%	-42%
Compare		-14%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	25										
BLK	4	8									
WHT	19	33						70		73	31
FRL	13	22					6	29		57	31
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	20										
BLK	13	36									
WHT	33	47		27				44		65	76
FRL	17	39		29				43		61	64
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
WHT	35	48		18	23			60			
FRL	21	44		5	17		45				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	23
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	163
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	2
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	23
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The Math component was the lowest performance matrix. Contributing factors began with the late start to the 2018-2019 school year, which impeded our ability to implement several interventions and supports that tied back to our previous action steps and strategies for improvement from the prior year. A increase in student enrollment at the beginning of second semester.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline was Math. Prior year's data showed 60% of growth in Math compared to this year data showed no academic growth. The contributing factor to this decline was due to barriers of implementing a new curriculum along with change in staffing patterns.

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 Math component had the greatest gap due to Instructional practices as a means of providing academic supports, lesson delivery protocol for direct instruction and staff retention. There were no trends.

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

History EOC component showed the most improvement primarily due to the hiring of new instructional personnel and the implementation of a new online curriculum.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators that did not experience any response to intervention.

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

1. English learning Gains
2. Math Learning Grains
3. Math Proficiency
4. Instructional Delivery Practice and protocol
5. Parental Engagement and Support

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	The purpose of this area of focus is to improve the overall student performance in Math proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The overall Math achievement will increase by 20%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Emmanuel Swift (ejswift@putnamedge.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>The gradual release of responsibility instructional framework purposefully shifts the cognitive load from teacher-as-model, to joint responsibility of teacher and student, to independent practice and application by the student. It stipulates that the teacher moves from assuming all the responsibility for performing a task to a situation in which the students assume all of the responsibility. This gradual release may occur over a day, a week, a month, or a year. Effective instruction often follows a progression in which teachers gradually do less of the work and students gradually assume increased responsibility for their learning. It is through this process of gradually assuming more and more responsibility for their learning that students become competent, independent students.</p> <p>Explicit Instruction is a very practical yet effective model of instruction. Explicit Instruction may often resemble the Cycle of Effective Instruction, the Gradual Release Model (Fisher & Frey) or the I Do, We Do, You Do model of teaching. This models require active participation, student engagement and collaboration and result in high levels of student achievement. Explicit instruction is based on research proven best practice and is appropriate to be used at all grade levels and across content areas. This will also inform our blended instructional model which enable the instructor the ability to provide one on one and small group support.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gradual Release of Responsibility 2. Classroom Workshop (One on One) 3. Individualized instructional support 4. Collaborative Activities 5. Formative-Reflective Assessment 6. Differentiation 8. Accountable Talk 9. Strategic Thinking (Depth of Knowledge)
Person Responsible	Claudette Smith (csmith@putnamedge.org)

#2	
Title	English Learning Gains
Rationale	Student performance in the ELA component was lower then the prior year. In order to improve other areas of focus we must first address the literacy deficit that has a direct impact on students ability to comprehend across content.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The overall English learning gain will increase by 20%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Emmanuel Swift (ejswift@putnamedge.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>The gradual release of responsibility instructional framework purposefully shifts the cognitive load from teacher-as-model, to joint responsibility of teacher and student, to independent practice and application by the student. It stipulates that the teacher moves from assuming all the responsibility for performing a task to a situation in which the students assume all of the responsibility. This gradual release may occur over a day, a week, a month, or a year. Effective instruction often follows a progression in which teachers gradually do less of the work and students gradually assume increased responsibility for their learning. It is through this process of gradually assuming more and more responsibility for their learning that students become competent, independent students.</p> <p>Explicit Instruction is a very practical yet effective model of instruction. Explicit Instruction may often resemble the Cycle of Effective Instruction, the Gradual Release Model (Fisher & Frey) or the I Do, We Do, You Do model of teaching. This models require active participation, student engagement and collaboration and result in high levels of student achievement. Explicit instruction is based on research proven best practice and is appropriate to be used at all grade levels and across content areas. This will also inform our blended instructional model which enable the instructor the ability to provide one on one and small group support.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gradual Release of Responsibility Training 2. Classroom Workshop 3. Strategic Thinking (Depth of Knowledge) 4. Collaborative Activities 5. Formative-Reflective Assessment 6. Inquiry 7. Representing to Learn 8. Differentiation 9. Accountable Talk 10. Student Interventions
Person Responsible	Claudette Smith (csmith@putnamedge.org)

#3	
Title	Math Learning Gains
Rationale	The purpose of this area of focus is to improve the overall student performance in Math learning gains.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The overall Math learning gain will increase by 20%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Emmanuel Swift (ejswift@putnamedge.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>The gradual release of responsibility instructional framework purposefully shifts the cognitive load from teacher-as-model, to joint responsibility of teacher and student, to independent practice and application by the student. It stipulates that the teacher moves from assuming all the responsibility for performing a task to a situation in which the students assume all of the responsibility. This gradual release may occur over a day, a week, a month, or a year. Effective instruction often follows a progression in which teachers gradually do less of the work and students gradually assume increased responsibility for their learning. It is through this process of gradually assuming more and more responsibility for their learning that students become competent, independent students.</p> <p>Explicit Instruction is a very practical yet effective model of instruction. Explicit Instruction may often resemble the Cycle of Effective Instruction, the Gradual Release Model (Fisher & Frey) or the I Do, We Do, You Do model of teaching. This models require active participation, student engagement and collaboration and result in high levels of student achievement. Explicit instruction is based on research proven best practice and is appropriate to be used at all grade levels and across content areas. This will also inform our blended instructional model which enable the instructor the ability to provide one on one and small group support.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gradual Release of Responsibility 2. Classroom Workshop (One on One) 3. Individualized instructional support 4. Collaborative Activities 5. Formative-Reflective Assessment 6. Differentiation 7. Accountable Talk 8. Strategic Thinking (Depth of Knowledge)
Person Responsible	Claudette Smith (csmith@putnamedge.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Utilizing the MTSS framework will not only improve student achievement but more importantly have a direct impact on school culture/school safety as well as process and procedures for teacher professional development and retention. The MTSS process is a collaborative approach that will encompass all school level, district and community stakeholders.

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 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.

Putnam Edge will continue to make contact with local and small business owners when seeking community support for sponsorship of events and the yearbook. During scheduled outings, students are expected to share the mission of Putnam EDGE High School. NHS (National Honor Society) student members are required to obtain a set number of community service hours per year. These are completed through local groups like Kiwanis, Rotary, Hospice, Putnam Community Medical Center, Crestwood Nursing Center, and The Heart of Putnam Food Service. Putnam EDGE is currently working on revamping our relationship with the Putnam County Sheriff's Office E911Telecommunications program. Students who complete this program and pass the state exam will be eligible for employment as a dispatcher. All students are encouraged to use Monday's to engage with the community through job shadowing, internship and or on the job training.

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.

Putnam Edge teachers will communicate with students at on a personal level to raise the level of trust that students should feel with adults, to resolve issues they may encounter. Students may communicate any concerns or issues either in person through face-to-face contact with a staff member or through media, such as emailing or texting. Students and parents are able to access teacher's emails from the PutnamEdge.org website or may text or phone the director to ensure issues are dealt with promptly, courteously and in a mutually respectful manner. Outside agency referrals to the mobile response team will be made for students needing additional support.

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

In order to ensure a smooth transition entering high school, Putnam Edge host several new student tours and informational session to discuss the many challenges they may face as incoming freshmen while they adjust to the rigors of high school. Following the informational session there is a question and answer session where students receive assistance selecting their schedule for next year. To assist outgoing seniors, each senior receives his/her personal portfolio with all pertinent information he/she will need for the entire year. Throughout the school year, administration meets with each senior individually to help keep track of their progress and to help with any issues the student may have. At-risk seniors are identified through frequent graduation checks and letters are sent home encouraging students and parents to meet and go over opportunities to get back on track to graduate. Seniors also are given the

opportunity to meet with military personnel for those who interesting in going to the military verses college.

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.

Putnam Edge Director/Principal is responsible for creating a data-driven culture that target and monitor the students identified as "HOT." Title II provides professional development training as needed. Title I provides supplemental resources that helps with increasing student achievement. Nutrition Programs- Putnam Edge cafeteria provides breakfast and lunch for 100% of all students. The Director is responsible for attending all district wide leadership meetings and Title I workshops.

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

Putnam Edge hosts grade level meetings where parents and students can plan course selection each year. Putnam Edge works with parents and students in directing the students focus on their future endeavors. CTE course are offered to students whereby students can acquire industrial certifications. Students experience college rigor through advanced placement and dual enrollment courses.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency				\$25,500.00
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	0071 - Putnam Edge High School	UniSIG		\$10,500.00	
		<i>Notes: Computes to maintain 1 to 1 device ratio. One-to-one technology is transforming the way teachers instruct and how students learn. Although results vary from district-to-district, mobile technology is increasingly beneficial to student test scores and achievement. While standardized testing is only one measure of student achievement, one-to-one technology is showing a positive impact on the way students learn in the 21st-century classroom. Cost of 20 computers x 525= 10,500</i>				
6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0071 - Putnam Edge High School	UniSIG		\$15,000.00	
		<i>Notes: Onsite and online professional development, training and support to meet the item (b) requirement to contract with an outside entity with demonstrated effectiveness in improving/operating a school. Dr. Ohlson will work with school staff and administration to create customized plan that leads to increased leading and/or lagging indicators, renewed focus on Putnam Edge branding and a consistent focus on engagement, collaboration and deeper knowledge. 20 days x 750= 15,000</i>				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: English Learning Gains				\$24,061.70
Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20	
5100	510-Supplies	0071 - Putnam Edge High School	UniSIG		\$1,215.33	

			<i>Notes: Classroom materials. These materials will be used to give students multiple means of representation of concepts, multiple means of engaging in learning the concepts, and multiple means of expression for students to demonstrate what they have learned.</i>			
5100	690-Computer Software	0071 - Putnam Edge High School	UniSIG			\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: USATestprep, LLC is recognized as a leader in curriculum resources and test prep for high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools. We have been helping students with high-stakes tests since 1998, and we offer a multitude of review products for subject area end-of-grade, end-of-course, graduation level, career readiness, and college entrance assessments. Our programs are tailored to both individual state and/or Common Core standards. Achieve3000® provides the only patented, cloud-based solutions that deliver daily differentiated instruction for nonfiction reading and writing that are precisely tailored to each student's Lexile® reading level. Read 180 As the leading blended learning solution, READ 180® helps students who are two or more years behind become active, accomplished readers. By bringing teachers, families, and adaptive technology together, it meets students on their unique paths to provide a truly personalized experience.</i>			
5100	150-Aides	0071 - Putnam Edge High School	UniSIG			\$12,846.37
			<i>Notes: Salary & Benefits: Paraprofessional for academic intervention for one on one tutoring support All students will receive high-quality, instruction. This instruction is research-based and includes differentiation (tier one). Then, students who are not progressing adequately in the regular, high quality classroom are provided with some type of intervention an additional, smaller math or reading class, for example (tier two). If a student is still struggling, then he/she will receives one-on-one targeted intervention that speaks to his specific skill deficits (tier three): Total of \$15,000 for position. -5100-150 Salary \$12,846.37; -5100-210 Retirement @8.47% = \$1,088.09 -5100-220 Social Security @6.2% = \$796.48; -5100-221 Medicare @1.45% = \$186.27 -5100-240 Worker's Comp @0.59% = \$75.79 -5100-250 Unemployment Comp @0.10% on first \$7,000 of Wages = \$7.00</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains				\$10,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	0071 - Putnam Edge High School				\$10,500.00
			<i>Notes: Computers to maintain 1 to 1 device ratio. One-to-one technology is transforming the way teachers instruct and how students learn. Although results vary from district-to-district, mobile technology is increasingly beneficial to student test scores and achievement. While standardized testing is only one measure of student achievement, one-to-one technology is showing a positive impact on the way students learn in the 21st-century classroom. Cost of 20 computers x \$525 = \$10,500</i>			
					Total:	\$63,073.88