

Putnam County School District

C. L. Overturf Jr 6th Grade Center



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

C. L. Overturf Jr 6th Grade Center

1100 S 18TH ST, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/clo

Demographics

Principal: Mary Wood

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
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: C (43%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: D (33%) 2015-16: C (43%) 2014-15: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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 11/5/2019.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

C. L. Overturf Jr 6th Grade Center

1100 S 18TH ST, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/clo

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)
Middle School 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	52%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/5/2019.

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.

Our mission at C. L. Overturf Sixth Grade Center is to build a learning community that fosters the development of our students and teachers that leads to their continued success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As a school family, we commit to create and maintain a culture of character, leadership, and ownership, with shared responsibility for helping all students learn at high levels, while focusing on intentional engagement with rigorous curriculum and effort.

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
Wood, Mary	Principal	<p>The CLO Leadership Team works together in an ongoing mission to build a community that fosters the development of our 6th graders and leads to their continued success. The core Leadership team is comprised of Mary Wood, Principal, Tiffany Scranton, Assistant Principal, Jarimy Passmore, Dean, and Melissa Hibbs, Guidance Counselor. The team meets weekly and follows a consensus-building model.</p> <p>Mary Wood, Principal and Tiffany Scranton, Assistant Principal share the following responsibility for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development and required training. Needs for PD are driven by data, implemented with best practices and follow up planned to ensure implementation for improved student achievement. 2. PLC Monitoring. PLCs have multiple functions: PD (Strategy study, Lesson study, book/article study), Data Review and Collaboration. 3. MTSS Process, and IEP, EP, & LEP Plan Creation, Implementation and Monitoring (Coordinated by Guidance Counselor Melissa Hibbs) 4. Scheduling. Disaggregate testing data to create a responsive master schedule that places students in appropriate academic classes. 5. Ensure instructional program implementation. Conduct lesson plan evaluation and classroom observations (iobserve and LSI Walks) in order to ensure standards instruction with best pedagogical practices, and to provide coaching, support and evaluation. Collaborate with team leaders, content area coaches, guidance counselors and the dean to make decisions that are in the best interest of our students and teachers. 6. Additional Needs: mental health counseling, alternate instruction needs (Solutions Center - Odysseyware, Ripple Effects), as well as basic needs (Catholic Charities Weekend Hunger Program), clothing, etc. 7. Testing - District and State Testing as well as Gifted screening (CogAT) - All coordinated by Guidance Counselor Melissa Hibbs. 8. Safety. Ensure school meets safety protocols: Drills for bus evacuation, fire, armed intruder/lockdown, and various other emergency drills. This includes responsibility for school hardening facility endeavors and safety training requirements. 9. PBIS Plan & Discipline. Collaboratively implement PBIS with suite of interventions and token economy to reward positive behavior. Discipline is coordinated by Dean Passmore, and supervised by Tiffany Scranton. 10. Positive Culture and School Climate. Both on campus, at the staff level and with the greater community. Social Media posts, recognition programs (Terrific Kids, Award Ceremonies), newspaper coverage work together to shape a positive image for CLO.
Hibbs, Melissa	School Counselor	<p>Mrs. Hibbs is responsible oversight of all ESE and 504 related activities. She delivers counseling - individual and small group. She is responsible for FSA testing and oversees our student safety plans. Mrs. Hibbs serves as liason, coordinating parent-student conferences.</p>
Scranton, Tiffany	Assistant Principal	<p>The CLO Leadership Team works together in an ongoing mission to build a community that fosters the development of our 6th graders and leads to their continued success. The core Leadership team is comprised of Mary Wood, Principal, Tiffany Scranton, Assistant Principal, Jarimy Passmore, Dean, and</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	-------	---------------------------------

Melissa Hibbs, Guidance Counselor. The team meets weekly and follows a consensus-building model.

Mary Wood, Principal and Tiffany Scranton, Assistant Principal share the following responsibility for:

1. Professional Development and required training. Needs for PD are driven by data, implemented with best practices and follow up planned to ensure implementation for improved student achievement.
2. PLC Monitoring. PLCs have multiple functions: PD (Strategy study, Lesson study, book/article study), Data Review and Collaboration.
3. MTSS Process, and IEP, EP, & LEP Plan Creation, Implementation and Monitoring (Coordinated by Guidance Counselor Melissa Hibbs)
4. Scheduling. Disaggregate testing data to create a responsive master schedule that places students in appropriate academic classes.
5. Ensure instructional program implementation. Conduct lesson plan evaluation and classroom observations (iobserve and LSI Walks) in order to ensure standards instruction with best pedagogical practices, and to provide coaching, support and evaluation. Collaborate with team leaders, content area coaches, guidance counselors and the dean to make decisions that are in the best interest of our students and teachers.
6. Additional Needs: mental health counseling, alternate instruction needs (Solutions Center - Odysseyware, Ripple Effects), as well as basic needs (Catholic Charities Weekend Hunger Program), clothing, etc.
7. Testing - District and State Testing as well as Gifted screening (CogAT) - All coordinated by Guidance Counselor Melissa Hibbs.
8. Safety. Ensure school meets safety protocols: Drills for bus evacuation, fire, armed intruder/lockdown, and various other emergency drills. This includes responsibility for school hardening facility endeavors and safety training requirements.
9. PBIS Plan & Discipline. Collaboratively implement PBIS with suite of interventions and token economy to reward positive behavior. Discipline is coordinated by Dean Passmore, and supervised by Tiffany Scranton.
10. Positive Culture and School Climate. Both on campus, at the staff level and with the greater community. Social Media posts, recognition programs (Terrific Kids, Award Ceremonies), newspaper coverage work together to shape a positive image for CLO.

Passmore, Jarimy Dean	Jarimy Passmore is responsible for implementing our PBIS Plan & for implementing our Discipline Plan. Mr. Passmore oversees implementation of PBIS with suite of interventions and token economy to reward positive behavior. Mr. Passmore reports to Ms. Scranton.
--------------------------	---

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	339	0	0	0	0	0	0	339
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	135

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	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

18

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/19/2019

Prior Year - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	0	0	0	0	0	0	171

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	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	0	0	0	0	0	0	171

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	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	40%	39%	54%	37%	29%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	48%	54%	43%	44%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	45%	47%	32%	36%	44%
Math Achievement	39%	43%	58%	37%	32%	56%
Math Learning Gains	38%	45%	57%	26%	34%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	42%	51%	21%	31%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	25%	51%	0%	26%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	60%	72%	0%	54%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)	Total
	6	
Number of students enrolled	339 (0)	339 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	96 (119)	96 (119)
One or more suspensions	50 (68)	50 (68)
Course failure in ELA or Math	53 (58)	53 (58)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	135 (171)	135 (171)

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
06	2019	37%	42%	-5%	54%	-17%
	2018	44%	42%	2%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	36%	45%	-9%	55%	-19%
	2018	42%	47%	-5%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort 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					
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					
2018					

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

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

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	19	49	50	18	32	31					
ELL	7	64		29	43						
BLK	25	47	51	26	31	26					
HSP	18	63	69	28	28						
WHT	56	60	52	52	46	34					
FRL	32	50	54	32	32	27					
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	39	65	63	41	66	63					
BLK	37	61	55	36	61	72					
HSP	40	79		52	92						
MUL	55	64		45	64						
WHT	59	65	52	57	64	54					
FRL	45	62	57	44	64	67					
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	8	29	27	11	12	4					
BLK	20	33	27	24	24	22					
HSP	48	55		33	30						
MUL	29	15		50	31						
WHT	48	49	45	45	26	20					
FRL	29	38	30	28	21	18					

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	303
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	34
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	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
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	40
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.

Math LPQ was the lowest performance at 31. The math LPQ performance the past couple years at CLO has been far better. In fact, over twice the prior year with 68. To drop from 68 to 31 there were multiple contributing factors. Overall the 6th grade group last year had academic and behavioral struggles. Behavior issues impeded learning and was exacerbated by staff changes in one of the key math positions.

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

Math LG & LPQ. This data outcome was situational and a result of an unfortunate set of circumstances.

One of the five math teachers quit during the first month of school. The replacement teacher then left the position. This led to a series of substitutes. Math instruction for these already low-performing students was weak and inconsistent. Contributing also was a low staff morale due to discipline issues.

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.

Math LPQ at 31 is also the category with the largest gap compared to the state average and even district average.

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

There were no components showing growth or improvement.

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

The area of greatest concern is the high number of level 1 students. Past failure in Math or ELA is also of concern.

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

1. Math Achievement
2. Math LPQ
3. Math Gains
4. ELA Gains
5. ELA LPQ

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Reading Proficiency
Rationale	<p>Students scoring a Level 1 and/or 2 on FSA ELA need differentiated interventions. In an effort to close the achievement gap, we are focusing on strong, standards-based Tier 1 instruction, as well as intentional, differentiated interventions and enrichment for all students. We have aligned our master schedule to reflect a "double blocked" approach that allows teachers to re-sort students to meet their specific needs daily.</p> <p>For SY20, CLO has a significant number of SWD's 92 or 341 = 27%. This ESSA group will be given priority by providing a specialized intervention program called Mindplay.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we focus on commonly planned, standards-based instruction and intentional, differentiated interventions, then teachers will build and deliver rigorous standards-based instruction that will increase reading proficiency for all students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mary Wood (mwood@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	If we focus on Standards-Focused Tier 1 instruction and evidence-proven programs for interventions, then students will receive rigorous instruction for whole group and differentiated intervention for small group and independent practice.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we focus on Standards-Focused Tier 1 instruction and evidence-proven programs for interventions, then students will receive rigorous instruction for whole group and differentiated intervention for small group and independent practice.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train all teachers on how to effectively use a Standards-Focus board. Use Standards-Focus boards in all classrooms. 2. Train teachers on AVID strategies, including WICOR, during bi-monthly PLCs. 3. Develop and deliver rigorous instruction that is aligned to the standards by applying the AVID strategy-WICOR as a requirement for lesson plans daily. 4. Implement the use of the Standards-Focus Board and WICOR tracker on the lesson plan checklist monthly. 5. CEL, Center for Educational Leadership, training for Writing in ELA classes. 6. LSI, Learning Sciences International, District created Unit Builds for ELA curriculum. 7. Implement Mindplay intervention for all Level 1 and 2 ESE students. 8. Implement Read180 intervention for 80 Level 1 and Level 2 nonESE students. 9. Implement iReady Reading Instruction for all students that are not enrolled in Mindplay or Read180 interventions. 10. Collaborate with District Specialist to provide support for implementation as needed. 11. Collaborate with District New Teacher Mentor to provide support for two first year ELA teachers as needed. 12. Continue use of iReady Diagnostic, Teacher Toolbox, Progress Monitoring daily as needed. 13. PLC structures established and documentation for data sharing, standards unpacking, and common assessments weekly. 14. Collaborate with Social Studies and Science teachers to implement standards-based

strategy use in multiple content areas that will be trained by ELA teachers and monitored by administration.

15. K12 Lift Data Analysis pilot program to analyze data and action plan.

Person Responsible Mary Wood (mwood@my.putnamschools.org)

#2

Title Math Proficiency

Rationale

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve If we focus on standards-based instruction and the use of quality resources, then teachers will build and deliver rigorous standards-based instruction that increases math proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Mary Wood (mwood@my.putnamschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy Having well planned heterogeneous-grouped core instruction, and differentiated computer intervention will give students a good chance to remediate their deficits or if already on grade level, enrich and advance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Having well planned heterogeneous-grouped core instruction, and differentiated computer intervention will give students a good chance to remediate their deficits or if already on grade level, enrich and advance.

Action Step

1. Train all teachers on how to effective use a Standards-Focus board. Use Standards-Focus boards in all classrooms.
2. Train teachers on AVID strategies, including WICOR, during bi-monthly PLCs.
3. Develop and deliver rigorous instruction that is aligned to the standards by applying the AVID strategy-WICOR as a requirement for lesson plans daily.
4. Implement the use of the Standards-Focus Board and WICOR tracker on the lesson plan checklist monthly.
5. Collaborate with District Specialist to provide support for implementation as needed.
6. Collaborate with District New Teacher Mentor to provide support for two first year Math teachers as needed.
7. Continue use of EngageNY as main curriculum resource.
8. Continue use of iReady Teacher Toolbox, Interim Assessments daily as needed.
9. PLC structures established and documentation for data sharing, standards unpacking, and common assessments weekly.
10. K12 Lift Data Analysis pilot program to analyze data and action plan.

Description

Person Responsible Tiffany Scranton (tscranton@my.putnamschools.org)

#3	
Title	School Culture
Rationale	Coming into the school with two new administrators, we need to work to create a positive school culture where students and staff feel safe, supported, and given every opportunity to maximize their academic and professional growth.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we, as a team, create a school-wide culture of Character, Leadership, Ownership that identify, support, and monitor growth, then all stakeholders will be able to self monitor academic, behavioral, and social-emotional outcomes, producing increased instructional time, student achievement, while decreasing student discipline referrals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mary Wood (mwood@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create Master Schedule "double-blocks" content areas to allow for intervention/enrichment time. 2. Create Cohorts of students that travel together to minimize transitions and create a community of learners. 3. Implement Cohort Chats with the Guidance Counselor, Melissa Hibbs, during lunch on a monthly rotation to cover social emotional lessons. 4. Implement the use of social media, Facebook, to communicate with students and families as needed. 5. Collaborate with district support for STEM implementation and family nights sponsored by Stem2Hub. 6. Collaborate with community members for student mentoring and extra-curricular activities, including Men of Moseley, North Point Youth, and Basketball. 7. Initiation of the 21st Century After-School Program for academic and social emotional enrichment. 8. Initiation of a token economy of Tiger Tickets as part of our PBIS plan that rewards students on a daily basis, school-wide reward every 3 weeks, and initiation of a Tiger Team Ticket token economy for the staff to reward the promotion of Character, Leadership, and Ownership on campus. 9. Initiation of Quarterly Award Ceremonies that include academic and behavior recognition, as well as Terrific Kid presentation sponsored by the Palatka Kiwanis Club of the Azalea City.
Person Responsible	Tiffany Scranton (tscranton@my.putnamschools.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).

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.

Hold quarterly parent events to increase the partnership between the school and home to at least 30% of our parents.

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.

Bi-weekly advisement lessons focus on ASCA standards: Understanding Self, Understanding Others, Service, Giving, Study Skills, Planning, Careers, & Transitions

Peer Mediation

Small group counseling is available based on needs (grief, anger management, etc.)

One on one counseling as needed with school counselor

Character Counts

Second Step

Monthly Threat Assessment Meeting

District Mental Wellness Counseling for select students

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

5th Grade Orientation/Tours

5th Grade Parent Night

Camp Rise

Advisement/Team building activities

7th Grade Orientation/Tours

7th Grade Parent Night

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.

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.

The District's Chief Financial Officer assures 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 report is audited by the State yearly to assure the District meets this mandate.

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, five, six, seven, and eight are allocated 1 teacher per 21 students.

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.

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.

NA