Putnam County School District

Kelley Smith Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Kelley Smith Elementary School

141 KELLEY SMITH SCHOOL RD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/kses

Demographics

Principal: Mike Tucker   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (43%)
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 11/3/2020.

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

Kelley Smith Elementary School

141 KELLEY SMITH SCHOOL RD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/kses

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-6	Yes	87%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	D	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

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 Kelley Smith Elementary School is to provide a culture of inclusivity coupled with positive relationships that fosters social, emotional, and academic learning while focusing on developing each child into a future leader of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will inspire every student to think, to learn, to achieve, to care, and to become a successful and responsible citizen of the community.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tucker, Mike	Principal	Observing, coaching, and monitoring the goals and practices put into place for the faculty, staff, and students at KSES.
David, Cynthia	School Counselor	Provide valuable input into the decision making process from their experience with teachers and students. Our counselor provides an array of support to our students and families in the form of mental and emotional health.
Oyster, Cathy	Assistant Principal	Responsible for observing, coaching, and mentoring the goals and practices put into place for the faculty, staff, and students of KSES.
Raburn, Shelly	Other	Provide coaching to instructional staff in areas of ELA.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Mike Tucker

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
29

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (43%)
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.	

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	67	79	58	90	84	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	465
Attendance below 90 percent	29	15	17	23	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	11	4	7	8	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	7	1	2	5	16	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	3	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/18/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	79	69	88	91	87	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	500
Attendance below 90 percent	20	22	20	22	20	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	1	6	2	6	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	22	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	1	4	2	3	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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**	
Number of students enrolled	79	69	88	91	87	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	500
Attendance below 90 percent	20	22	20	22	20	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	1	6	2	6	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	22	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	1	4	2	3	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	39%	46%	57%	42%	43%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	55%	58%	49%	50%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	54%	53%	46%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	49%	51%	63%	45%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	56%	62%	48%	56%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	43%	51%	30%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	33%	41%	53%	31%	37%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(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	2019	35%	41%	-6%	58%	-23%
	2018	40%	40%	0%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	43%	-8%	58%	-23%
	2018	44%	38%	6%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	39%	42%	-3%	56%	-17%
	2018	34%	39%	-5%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	43%	46%	-3%	62%	-19%
	2018	54%	48%	6%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	53%	-4%	64%	-15%
	2018	49%	50%	-1%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	48%	44%	4%	60%	-12%
	2018	30%	48%	-18%	61%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	30%	38%	-8%	53%	-23%
	2018	28%	42%	-14%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	28	49	48	38	61	57	20				
BLK	25	45	46	37	57	50	16				
WHT	53	57	75	59	61	55	50				
FRL	35	49	55	44	56	48	30				
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	29	33	33	26	38	44	12				
BLK	28	37	32	31	32	39	12				
HSP	60			70							
WHT	52	42	38	60	50	31	41				
FRL	41	40	35	47	42	39	28				
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	18	47	47	17	24	7	11				
BLK	29	45	45	32	37	26	20				
WHT	51	51	45	55	56	39	38				
FRL	38	49	45	42	44	28	25				

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	336
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Overall ELA Achievement 39% (2019 School Grade)
ELA Learning Gains for 4th grade projected 44% (Mid Year Projections 4th Grade)
5th Grade Math Learning Gains (36%) and Math Bottom Quartile (39%) (Mid Year Projections 4th Graders)

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

Using a combination of data, Mid Year Data Projections, and 2019 School Grade, there was a notable drop in learning gains and bottom quartile across Math. This most likely is due to the change in population at our school. The school changed to a Cambridge site. We also had a large teacher turnover, with many new hires entering a new grade level.

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.

Our science achievement accounts for our largest gap between the state. A 20 percent spread is recorded. Two years ago, science was not focused upon in the classroom and all teachers taught

science, yet no one was an expert. Last school year we implemented a school wide STEM focus. We also designated two expert teachers to teach science to ensure quality instruction.

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

Based on mid-year projections, the achievement data for ELA and Math showed the most improvements. This would be due to the increase in enrollment of high achievers.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our area of concern is the number of 5th graders with Level 1's on the 2019 statewide ELA and Math assessments.

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

1) ELA Achievement
2) 5th Grade Math Learning Gains
3) 5th Grade ELA Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If the school focuses heavily on improving core instruction through the use of collaborative planning, it will improve our African American/Black ESSA subgroup and overall 3-5 ELA proficiency, 5th grade learning gains, and 5th grade math learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA Achievement will improve from 39% to 51%. (2019 School Grade) ELA Learning Gains ELA from 44% to 55% (Mid Year Projections 4th Grade) 5th Grade Math Learning Gains will increase from 36% to 50%. (Mid Year Projections 4th Graders)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cathy Oyster (coyster@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategically focused Professional Learning Communities. Collaborative full day planning sessions with teaching cohorts. Intentionally structured instructional core.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through highly focused planning sessions, geared towards grade level aligned tasks, appropriate grade level texts, rigorous tasks, and condition and rigor walks, we will increase overall proficiency and growth in ELA and Math.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Grade Level PLC's once a week as a school team.
2. Grade level planning sessions every six weeks supported by SBLT and District Support (as needed).
3. Condition Walks completed by each grade level with SBLT.
4. Rigor walks completed by SBLT and teachers whose conditions are optimal for next stage of implementation.
5. PD in PLC structures and expectations.
6. Revisit condition walks and set expectations.
7. Set schedule for monitoring implementation of work completed in PLCs.

Person Responsible	Cathy Oyster (coyster@my.putnamschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

This school year we will have a focus on SEL and positive relationship building to help bridge the gap between home and school. These relationships will help to promote the importance of education while also building a trusting relationship with families. A sequential and systematic SEL curriculum will be implemented school wide. We will also be increasing our focus on school and family communication and collaboration.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Kelley Smith Elementary School has made monumental strides in improving the collaboration between the school, home, and community. Our school is working to establish a PTO and continue to build relationships in the community with business partners and outside agencies. We also work to model service and sacrifice and frequently do outreach projects to build a positive outreach into the community. In the beginning of the year we conduct an Open House during the 1st nine weeks of school to promote education of Title I status and promote home/school communications and ways to support student learning. Parents will be given a needs survey at that time. We will continue to hold School-wide Data Chats to keep parents informed and updated on their child(ren)'s goals and how they are meeting/not meeting them according to the Pupil Progression Plan. In September we will host Bring your Dad to School, Dads or a representative will enjoy donuts in the cafeteria with their child. In October we hold a family fall night to promote positive relationships. In November, we plan to bring our Bingo For Books Night back to the school to support our other community areas that are closer to the school. In December, host a Christmas literacy night. In February, we plan to have an Invention Convention night for parents and students to show parents the inventions the classes have been working on as they learn the scientific process during the 2nd semester. In March, we will hold a Spring Parent Night that will focus on upcoming testing in grades 3-5 as well the last IReady diagnostic. Families will be able to ask questions and receive important information related to preparing for testing. From September through March we host a food truck Wednesday lunch. We bring in a local food truck to encourage families to come eat with their child while also promoting a local business. Each month we focus on supporting local charities, facilities, or families to encourage service of others. Finally, in conjunction with the Kiwanis Club of Palatka we hold quarterly Terrific Kids ceremonies to highlight students from each class that have demonstrated good character. We are dedicated to supporting our students' growth/achievement in all academic areas of Kelley Smith Elementary School.

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