Putnam County School District

C. H. Price Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

C. H. Price Middle School

140 N COUNTY ROAD 315, Interlachen, FL 32148

www.putnamschools.org/o/chpms

Demographics

Principal: Mechelle Higginbotham

Start Date for this Principal: 9/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 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 (48%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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

C. H. Price Middle School

140 N COUNTY ROAD 315, Interlachen, FL 32148

www.putnamschools.org/o/chpms

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)
Middle School 6-8	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	33%

School Grades History

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

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.

The mission statement at C.H. Price Middle School is: As a Razorback community, we will inspire and challenge every student to think, to learn, to achieve, to care, and to become a successful and responsible
citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at C.H. Price Middle School is to provide a safe, caring, and stimulating learning environment for all students that is nurtured by a clearly communicated professional culture that is based on high expectations for our personal and professional behaviors.

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
Higginbotham, Mechele	Principal	-Oversee the safety and supervision of all students and staff members throughout the day. -Oversee the day to day duties of running a school. -Ensure that a standards based curriculum is being taught in all classes and that students are being provided with opportunities that will help them be successful. -Supervise and evaluate teachers and classified employees. -Make sure that budgets are balanced and that expenditures are within guidelines and benefit the student. -Ensure that confidentiality of student information and assessment security are enforced.
Williams, Tammie	Other	-Oversee the Dean's office and student discipline. -Work with teachers on classroom intervention strategies to improve student behavior. -PBIS Lead
Burnett, Joni	Assistant Principal	-Assist the Principal in overseeing the safety and supervision of students. -Assist the Principal in observing and evaluating teachers and staff. -Assist the Principal in the day to day running of the school. -Oversee the implementation of the requirements for School Safety. -Oversee the work order needs of the school.
Stout, Kristen	School Counselor	-Provide school academic and general counseling to students. -Refer students to social emotional counseling when needed. -Work with teachers to address interventions for academic and behavioral success in classes. -Provide input for Lead team decisions. -Evaluate new student's transcripts to ensure they are on track for coursework. -Attend and provide support in Attendance/Truancy meetings. -Assist MTSS/Testing Coordinator as needed.
Hodges, Karri	School Counselor	-Coordinate the MTSS process. -Testing Coordinators -School academic and general counseling to students in the JFG and AVID programs. -Refer students to social emotional counseling when needed. -Work with teachers to address interventions for academic and behavioral success in classes. -Provide input for Lead team decisions. -Evaluate new student's transcripts to ensure they are on track for coursework.
Hess, Katie	Teacher, ESE	-ESE Facilitation for all SWD -Provide academic counseling and behavior interventions to ESE students.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		-Provide support to classroom teachers with ESE student interventions. -Write and Monitor the IEP's for all SWD to ensure accommodations are being met in the classrooms. -ESE Department chair and leads PLC meetings
Wilburn, Tisha	Instructional Coach	-Provide input and help make decisions for school improvement -Provide support to teachers as District Reading Coach -Help monitor data for school administration and teachers. -Leads PLC meetings for ELA and Reading
Gallagher, Chris	Teacher, K-12	-Provide input and disseminate information to 7th grade team. -Department chair for Science and leads PLC meetings for Science -Teaches 7th & 8th grade Science -Coaches Archery
Ownbey, Judith	Teacher, K-12	Provide input and help make school based decisions -Chair and disseminate information to 6th grade team. -Teaches Physical Education
Holley, Mary Arlene	Dean	-Provide Input and help with school based decisions. -Process student discipline referrals and parent contact -Meets with ELA and helps Instructional coach with PLC meetings.
DeMore, Dallas	Teacher, K-12	Ms. DeMore is the ELA Department Chair and teacher lead. She provides additional support to ELA teachers and disseminates Reading and ELA information as she leads the PLC's for that ELA department.
Carpenter, Stephen	Teacher, K-12	Provide input to the Admin team -Disseminates information to SS team. -Department chair for Science and leads PLC meetings for Science -Teaches 7th grade Social Studies (Civics)
Thompson, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	-Provide input to the Admin team -Disseminates information to 8th grade team and Math Department . -Department chair for Math -Teaches Algebra, 7th grade Math, and 8th grade Pre-Algebra

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 9/1/2017, Mechelle Higginbotham

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.*

3

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 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 (48%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	203	213	158	0	0	0	0	574
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	79	64	0	0	0	0	231
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	66	58	0	0	0	0	200
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	32	27	0	0	0	0	84
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	62	41	0	0	0	0	147
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	56	77	0	0	0	0	214
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	62	59	0	0	0	0	212

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	103	98	78	0	0	0	0	279

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	18	18	3	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	5	0	0	0	0	29

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	273	192	186	0	0	0	0	651
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	71	60	0	0	0	0	226
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	56	40	0	0	0	0	151
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	68	58	0	0	0	0	184
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	72	56	0	0	0	0	252

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	42	34	42	0	0	0	0	118

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	30	26	0	0	0	0	0	56
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	14	3	0	0	0	0	32

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	273	192	186	0	0	0	0	651
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	71	60	0	0	0	0	226
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	56	40	0	0	0	0	151
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	68	58	0	0	0	0	184
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	72	56	0	0	0	0	252

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	42	34	42	0	0	0	0	118

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	30	26	0	0	0	0	0	56
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	14	3	0	0	0	0	32

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	38%	39%	54%	29%	29%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	48%	54%	39%	44%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	45%	47%	33%	36%	44%
Math Achievement	39%	43%	58%	31%	32%	56%
Math Learning Gains	43%	45%	57%	38%	34%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	42%	51%	33%	31%	50%
Science Achievement	32%	25%	51%	39%	26%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	60%	72%	63%	54%	70%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey			
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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**
06	2019	38%	42%	-4%	54%	-16%
	2018	39%	42%	-3%	52%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	36%	38%	-2%	52%	-16%
	2018	30%	38%	-8%	51%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison	6%					
Cohort Comparison	-3%					
08	2019	34%	41%	-7%	56%	-22%
	2018	39%	47%	-8%	58%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison	-5%					
Cohort Comparison	4%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	39%	45%	-6%	55%	-16%
	2018	42%	47%	-5%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison	-3%					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	42%	33%	9%	54%	-12%
	2018	23%	25%	-2%	54%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison	19%					
Cohort Comparison	0%					
08	2019	7%	16%	-9%	46%	-39%
	2018	13%	16%	-3%	45%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison	-6%					
Cohort Comparison	-16%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	23%	14%	9%	48%	-25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	31%	20%	11%	50%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	54%	27%	67%	14%
2018	95%	58%	37%	65%	30%
Compare		-14%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	63%	60%	3%	71%	-8%
2018	62%	60%	2%	71%	-9%
Compare		1%			

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	72%	49%	23%	61%	11%
2018	72%	43%	29%	62%	10%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	43%	34%	57%	20%
2018	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
Compare		77%			

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	21	47	43	28	44	38	12	37			

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
ELL	22	56	60	17	17						
BLK	29	45	57	25	30	33	6	75			
HSP	31	46	52	28	34	35	29	67	83		
MUL	47	59		33	32			70			
WHT	40	56	44	44	48	43	36	63	69		
FRL	34	52	50	35	42	35	26	62	63		

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	19	35	31	22	38	33	26	33			
ELL	15	43		15	36						
BLK	26	41	29	29	39	43	22	63			
HSP	38	44	36	29	34	29	20	62	75		
MUL	38	67	67	24	33	36	38				
WHT	40	45	34	40	42	39	47	65	78		
FRL	35	43	34	34	38	37	33	62	65		

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	10	29	27	15	34	27	10	42			
ELL	8	33		8	33						
BLK	24	45	36	18	33	32	33	72			
HSP	26	42	36	27	36	30	20	42			
MUL	31	33		29	43			57			
WHT	31	38	34	35	39	35	43	66	47		
FRL	28	38	33	28	34	29	36	61	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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
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	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	38
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	45
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	48
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	
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	49
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	44
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.

Science Achievement was the lowest performing component and traditionally we have always under-performed in this component. 8th grade Science was 23% and Biology was 81%. We dropped 7 percentage points from the previous year, however we were above the district average. The district Science coach that serves all schools in the district was pulled mid year to work 2 days a week at another school so he was not as available to provide the Science content coaching and progress monitoring feedback to the teachers he was supporting. The percentage we were using to gauge readiness for progress monitoring did not provide us with an accurate measure so remediation was not in place. The critical thinking skills of our students was not challenged in core instruction or classroom assessments. Our ESSA subgroups of SWD and Black students dropped significantly from the previous year, 14% and 16% respectively.

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

Based on cohort data, our greatest decline overall was our 8th grade Math. 8th grade Math consists of prior year FSA level 1 and 2 students. FSA level 3 and higher students are placed in Algebra. These students began the year lacking the foundational skills needed to perform at level 3 and although intervention classes and progress monitoring was in place, these students still under-performed. The lack of transportation for students to stay for after school tutoring and lack of teacher allocations to create a block for all students to have intervention and core class instruction impeded the efforts to bring these students' foundational skills up in order for them to show grade level achievement.

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.

Science Achievement has consistently been under the state average. Our students receive instruction on specific standards in 6th and 7th grade that are tested in the 8th grade. Our 8th grade pacing focused on teaching 8th grade standards and did not adequately provide for cycling back through these standards at an depth which the students needed.

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

Learning gains of lowest performing 25% in Reading showed the most improvement which increased 13 percentage points. This is attributed to all 6th grade classes being blocked for ELA with either Read180 for level 1 students and Achieve 3000 for the level 2 students. 7th grade students received intervention in Read180 for level 1 or Mindplay for our SWD. 8th grade level 1 and 2 students received intervention through Teengagement by a state recognized high impact teacher. We used Achieve 3000 school wide for all students in ELA, Science, and Social Studies to support them with comprehension of informational text.

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

1.Based on current year enrollment, the number of students with 2 EWS indicators is at 47%.
2.Attendance below 90% and and Suspensions are indicative of a problem with accessibility to instruction and curriculum, resulting in low student achievement. This has been made more accessible with the implementation of all teachers utilizing Canvas so all students can still receive their lessons and instruction when absent.

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

1. Students with Disabilities subgroup support and intervention in all core subjects.
2. Science instruction and progress monitoring at the level of rigor needed for achievement with a pacing calendar that allows for cycling back to address the 6th and 7th grade standards that are assessed on the 8th grade Science assessment.
3. Math instruction and intervention that is individualized for all grade levels based on progress monitoring.
4. Reading intervention and remediation practices to replicate the learning gains and push for overall achievement.
5. Identify our students with 2 or more EWS indicators and use our SEL Research period for mentoring and advisement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improvement of our Students with Disabilities subgroup in all core content subjects. Student performance in this subgroup did show improvement in the previous year as evidenced by by their FSA scores. We intend to continue with the support these students received and add a more focused plan to support instruction in all core classes through support facilitation and progress monitoring. monitored.
Measurable Outcome:	We intend for the students in this subgroup to show learning gains on their FSA ELA, Math, and Science assessments. For Science achievement component, our goal is for our SWD subgroup to improve to 30%. In Reading and Math, our goal is to show a 10 percentage point increase which is 31% and 38% respectively.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mechele Higginbotham (mhigginbotham@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Support Facilitation utilizes a push-in, pull-out model to support instruction in the regular classroom setting. It also provides students with disabilities the opportunity to receive the same instruction as their non disabled peers but with supports in place to help them overcome their disability and achieve success. Support in learning to advocate for themselves and use of their allowable accommodations as written on their IEP to help them achieve success within the mainstreamed classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Due to the immediate implementation of all students to digital learning last Spring, students were not afforded the full year of site based instruction and support and will be experiencing gaps in the foundational skills needed for the grade level achievement and this will be especially evident with our SWD subgroup. In order to help them overcome these gaps in learning, a focused and individualized remediation and intervention plan will need to be developed and put in place in the mainstreamed classroom for these students. Use of the support facilitator to push in and see the challenges the students is facing will be followed up with pulling the student to the resource room for additional support.

Action Steps to Implement

1. ESE Support Facilitator will meet with core PLC's at the beginning of the year to explain the process for the push in and pull out support facilitation model including the process for completing the consultation logs for the mainstreamed SWD.

Person Responsible	Joni Burnett (jburnett@my.putnamschools.org)

2. ESE Support Facilitator will have consultation meetings monthly with both students and teachers to determine the supports needed as well as how the SWD is progressing. As part of the monitoring, a consultation log will be kept.

Person Responsible	Joni Burnett (jburnett@my.putnamschools.org)

3. SWD that are coded as Tier 3 or 2 for Reading will have intervention plans entered into Bright Bytes LMS by their ELA or Intervention teacher for progress monitoring. This information will be shared with the Support Facilitator to ensure adjustments to classroom supports are made as needed.

Person Responsible	Katie Hess (khess@my.putnamschools.org)

4. Support Facilitator will provide the accommodations listed on the IEP's to provide support for the SWD for both classroom and state assessments. Students will utilize the resource room for these

accommodations which may include: Oral presentation of material, small group, one on one, and extended time.

Person Responsible Mechele Higginbotham (mhigginbotham@my.putnamschools.org)

5. A daily push in and pull out log will be maintained by the ESE Support Facilitator and submitted monthly to administration. The log will be organized by date, student serviced, setting, services provided, and classroom teacher and subject they are working on.

Person Responsible Joni Burnett (jburnett@my.putnamschools.org)

6. Additional support will be provided as needed by a paraprofessional that works closely with the ESE Support Facilitator to help with the push in pull out model so that students are not having to wait longer than necessary to receive the support needed.

Person Responsible Katie Hess (khess@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 part of our schoolwide improvement initative, we will continue using the LSI instructional support for our teachers as they further their implementation of Academic Teaming structures in their classrooms to aid their students in owning their learning. Admin and Lead team members will monitor the rigorous instruction and learning conditions in the classrooms via Trend Tracker. Teachers will receive training, planning, coaching, and feedback from an LSI Instructional Coach on standards based alignment of the learning target and activity to the taxonomy level of the standard so that students will be able to self monitor ltheir learning and mastery of standard using a success criteria. In addition, teachers will receive professional development on Academic Teaming 201 and receive coaching and feedback of implementation so that students are moving from a teacher centered approach to a more student centered model. As a result, students will take ownership of their learning and move to self monitoring and ultimately self-actualization. In efforts to address our students with 2 or more EWS indicators, the Lead Team will develop and monitor an EWS Indicator Hotlist that is used through our 4th period SEL Research class. Teachers will work with these pre-identified students to track, mentor, and advise them on the indicators in which they are associated. Additionally, this time will also serve for some of these students as a Tier 2 Reading or Math Intervention, as many of these students have as an indicator as well.

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.

C.H. Price will use the School Messenger call out system to keep parents and guardians informed about school information. Different student groups will record the daily announcements to be posted in Canvas so students will have access to the information at a time that is convenient for them and so our digital students can also be privy to the information.

During the 4th period Research class period that all students are enrolled in, they will participate in various activities that are incorporated in the Caring Schools Communities curriculum. This curriculum allows students to discuss and participate in activities that engage them in scenarios based around bullying, peer pressure, societal problems, school issues, etc. Teachers have been trained on how to engage students in discussion and how to ensure students are gleaning information that they can apply to appropriate situations.

The AVID classes (7th and 8th grade) will also sponsor various community building activities within the school year. The AVID elective teacher will arrange for the AVID students to determine two days a month in which the AVID students will be able to show support for a cause (Breast Cancer Awareness, March of Dimes, etc) as well as support for contests between classrooms while collecting donations for local organizations (Food Drive for Thanksgiving, Supplies for Teachers, etc.).

Culture Club Fridays will be starting in November for students to build social interaction skills and a sense of belonging. Each student will have a choice in the club they choose to join. 1-2 Fridays per month during our 4th period Research class, students will meet will meet with their club sponsor and participate in various club activities.

Our School Advisory Council will resume meetings in October through a google meet format. Hopefully, by Novermber, the CDC guidelines will be lifted so that we can meet face to face. By using input from our stakeholders and giving them a voice, we will be able to make decisions that will impact and improve our school for the students, faculty, and community.

Our school based PBIS team will schedule activities and rewards for our students throughout the year.

A school based Principal Student Advisory Council (PSAC) will be organized this year so that a diverse group of students will have voice and choice in some of the shared decisions made that will impact the school culture for our students.

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