Putnam County School District

Melrose Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Melrose Elementary School

401 STATE ROAD 26, Melrose, FL 32666

www.putnamschools.org/o/mes

Demographics

Principal: Leah Lundy

Start Date for this Principal: 8/30/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	79%
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: B (59%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (64%)
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

Melrose Elementary School

401 STATE ROAD 26, Melrose, FL 32666

www.putnamschools.org/o/mes

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 PK-6	Yes	80%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

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

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.

Melrose Elementary School's mission is for every student to achieve academic growth based on his or her personal abilities.

Note: Melrose Elementary School is a Title I school that serves students from Pre-K through sixth grade. Melrose Elementary School has maintained a School grade of an A from 2013 - 2017, but dropped to a C in the 2017-2018 school year. Melrose did increase to a B in the 2018-2019 academic school year. Due to Covid, we did not have scores during the 2019-2020 school year.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision is for every student to achieve a year's worth of growth as defined by the state/district. Both the mission and the vision of the school is shared with all stakeholders via newsletters, SAC meetings, and parent nights.

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
Lundy, Leah	Principal	Establish and promote high standards for expectations for all students and staff for academic performance and for behavior (this includes making sure everyone knows the expectations and monitoring the expectations). Lead the school management team, manage operations of the school. Collect and analyze data regarding the needs of the school and achievement of students. Lead school level planning (including PLCs, all school level professional development). Supervise the instructional programs, evaluate lesson plans, observe classes on a regular basis, encourage the use of researched base instructional strategies. Build a rapport with all stakeholders, ensure the safety and well being of all students, faculty, and staff. Communicate/participate with district staff on district goals. Overall: be responsible for all aspects of the school which includes: safety, maintenance, progress monitoring, academic achievement, etc..
Wylie, Sarah	School Counselor	Designs and implement a data-driven, comprehensive school counseling program for all students to address barriers to student learning and to close the achievement/opportunity gap. Provides counseling curriculum while doing classroom lessons, small group counseling, and preventative and responsive services. Sits in on IEP meetings, leads the PBIS/MTSS programs at Melrose. Uses school data to identify and assist individual students who do not perform at grade level and do not have opportunities and resources to be successful in school. Fosters family and community partnerships to support the social/emotional and academic development of all students. Supports the continuum of mental health services, including prevention and tiered intervention strategies, and collaborates with both school-based and community mental health providers to enhance student success.
Channell, Terri	Assistant Principal	Establish and promote high standards for expectations for all students and staff for academic performance and for behavior (this includes making sure everyone knows the expectations and monitoring the expectations). Lead the school management team, manage operations of the school. Collect and analyze data regarding the needs of the school and achievement of students. Lead school level planning (including PLCs, all school level professional development). Supervise the instructional programs, evaluate lesson plans, observe classes on a regular basis, encourage the use of researched base instructional strategies. Build a rapport with all stakeholders, ensure the safety and well being of all students, faculty, and staff. Communicate/participate with district staff on district goals. Overall: be responsible for all aspects of the school which includes: safety, maintenance, progress monitoring, academic achievement, etc..

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 8/30/2017, Leah Lundy

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

23

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	79%
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: B (59%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (64%)
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	45	44	58	52	57	49	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	327
Attendance below 90 percent	16	13	6	13	8	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	56	63	57	66	47	50	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	363
Attendance below 90 percent	8	15	15	17	10	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	3	3	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	6	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	56	63	57	66	47	50	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	363
Attendance below 90 percent	8	15	15	17	10	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	3	3	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	6	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	61%	46%	57%	58%	43%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	55%	58%	57%	50%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	54%	53%	50%	50%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	67%	51%	63%	72%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	56%	62%	83%	56%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	43%	51%	71%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	41%	53%	62%	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	54%	41%	13%	58%	-4%
	2018	59%	40%	19%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison	-5%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	43%	15%	58%	0%
	2018	42%	38%	4%	56%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison	16%					
Cohort Comparison	-1%					
05	2019	49%	42%	7%	56%	-7%
	2018	45%	39%	6%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison	4%					
Cohort Comparison	7%					
06	2019	100%	42%	58%	54%	46%
	2018	100%	42%	58%	52%	48%
Same Grade Comparison	0%					
Cohort Comparison	55%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	46%	12%	62%	-4%
	2018	61%	48%	13%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison	-3%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	53%	25%	64%	14%
	2018	62%	50%	12%	62%	0%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
Same Grade Comparison		16%					
Cohort Comparison		17%					
05	2019	50%	44%	6%	60%	-10%	
	2018	68%	48%	20%	61%	7%	
Same Grade Comparison		-18%					
Cohort Comparison		-12%					
06	2019	100%	45%	55%	55%	45%	
	2018	100%	47%	53%	52%	48%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison		32%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	48%	38%	10%	53%	-5%	
	2018	56%	42%	14%	55%	1%	
Same Grade Comparison		-8%					
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	55	53	34	43	28	25				
BLK	19	29	30	33	35	20	8				
HSP	53	75		67	83						
MUL	82	92		76	85						
WHT	67	63	67	72	69	39	62				
FRL	50	56	62	58	59	44	45				
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	34	37	29	40	45	42	60				
BLK	24	25	17	28	40	40					
HSP	57	46		62	62						
MUL	71			86	60						
WHT	56	46	44	73	63	52	59				
FRL	46	36	29	61	61	52	55				

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	16	24	33	32	52	38					
BLK	28	40		52	67						
HSP	39			71							
MUL	59	50		71	92						
WHT	64	60	52	75	85	68	70				
FRL	45	45	36	63	80	73	51				

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	25
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	70
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	84
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	63
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	53
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.

This data showed that our 5th grade Math learning gains for all students and LPQ were our lowest areas. That particular group of 5th graders was one of our largest cohorts on campus and one of our least motivated groups. Those students are no longer at Melrose Elementary. We have moved a new teacher into 3rd grade and our 4th and 5th grade teachers have been working with our district Math coach to work on strategies to increase Math scores.

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

For this data, our greatest decline came in the area of Science. This particular year we dropped 7 percentage points. We made a change in teachers in the area of Science and the new teacher works with the District Science Coach to ensure we are teaching the standards and that we are monitoring growth as needed.

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 math LPQ had the greatest gap, the state was at 51% and we were at 41%. Although we had great growth in our 4th grade, our 5th grade LPQ did not grow as anticipated. Although we are lacking FSA data for our students for last year, we are already looking at diagnostic data to determine the best instructional approaches to ensure that the students in all areas (especially LPQ) are working on those deficiencies.

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

Our ELA LPQ showed the most improvement with 34 percentage points. We strategically focused on writing in 4th-6th grades and we focused on our LPQ in all grades. We were able to provide support to those students by pushing a paraprofessional into the classes to work in small groups. We have already started looking at areas of strengths and weaknesses after being out of school for 6 months due to Covid. We are still using paraprofessionals to offer support to students that need additional help, we have moved a couple of teachers to new grade levels, and we are setting goals for students to reach their goals.

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

This year we will work to decrease the number of students who are a level 1 in the area Math. We will work on ELA also but Math will be an area we really try to decrease the number by 20% this year.

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

1. African American Math learning gains (overall and LPQ).
2. African American ELA learning gains (overall and LPQ).
3. SWD Math learning gains (overall and LPQ).
4. Continuation of academic growth for LPQ school-wide.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:	

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This year we will be focusing on our African American students as well as our SWD students. The area we will work on is learning gains for both subgroups.
Measurable Outcome:	Using FSA and iReady data, our African American students as well as our Students with disabilities will be above the 41% federal index score.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Leah Lundy (llundy@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will begin using LLI with our students who are not meeting the expectations and we will have paraprofessionals working with these students in the area of Math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We are implementing LLI because we know that it is an effective tool for student growth and we have found that additional help from a paraprofessional can be the additional help students need.

Action Steps to Implement	
Train teachers how to use LLI and set up a plan for usage.	
Person Responsible	Sarah Wylie (swylie@my.putnamschools.org)
Create a schedule for paraprofessionals to work with these subgroups in the area of Math.	
Person Responsible	Leah Lundy (llundy@my.putnamschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities	

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

As a whole, our leadership team, will work on helping teachers with more rigorous curriculum and we will use the Conditions walks data to help determine changes that are needed in classrooms across the school. We will also work to decrease the number of students who receive Level 1 on the FSA.

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.

Our school has implemented the Caring Schools Community curriculum and PBIS. School culture is addressed daily through classroom meetings and daily announcements. The reward system works individually and as whole class rewards. We are still working to include our stakeholders by hosting virtual meetings where we discuss school concerns, Title 1, Testing requirements, and basic information. Parents are encouraged to share concerns with administration to be addressed during parent virtual meetings.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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