

Putnam County School District

C. L. Overturf Jr 6th Grade Center



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	22
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: 7/1/2019

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
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 (43%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: D (33%) 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 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	59%

School Grades History

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

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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
		<p>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.
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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Mary Wood

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

19

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
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 (43%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: D (33%) 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	349	0	0	0	0	0	0	349
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	125

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	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	108

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	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

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	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

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	
	(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	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
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%	0
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%	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	34
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	42
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	
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	50
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Math LPQ was the lowest performance at 31 in school year 2019. Due to COVID, we didn't take FSA Math for school year 2020. The math LPQ performance prior to 2019 had been far better. In fact, in 2018, it was 68 - double 2019's score. The drop from 68 to 31 resulted from a number of contributing factors. Behavior issues in 2019 impeded learning and was exacerbated by staff changes in one of the key math positions. While many of the school culture and discipline issues have been resolved due to a strong PBIS program, we still have some new staff members on the math team - thus focus on math achievement of our LPQ continues to be of concern.

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

Math LG & LPQ. As aforementioned, in 2018, CLO was challenged with a class of students with high discipline issues. 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. In 2019, new administration brought in a strong PBIS program with structures to address discipline issues and promote positive behaviors. Due to COVID, we didn't have data to show improvement over 2018, but we felt, based on ALEKS mastery data, we were making great improvements.

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 in 2018 was the category with the largest gap compared to the state average and even district average. The reasons were mentioned in a & b above.

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

Unfortunately our last FSA data of 2018, showed no area of growth or improvement. However, our ALEKS data from 2019 looked very promising. Based on the ALEKS data, we believe had FSA Math been taken in 2019 there would have been a large improvement.

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

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Students scoring a Level 1 and/or Level 2 on FSA ELA for 4th grade need differentiated interventions. In an effort to close the achievement gap, we are focusing on strong, standards-based Tier 1 instruction utilizing rigorous district created "Units" that incorporate on grade level, challenging text. Additionally, to close the achievement gap, we are providing intentional, differentiated interventions and enrichment via an "ELA extension class" for all students. In essence, students have a 2 period block of ELA. We have aligned our master schedule to reflect a "double blocked" approach prior to lunch - to maximize student learning before fatigue later in the day sets in.

For SY21, CLO has a significant number of SWD's and a significant portion of those students are working from home due to COVID-19. This ESSA group will be given priority by providing a specialized intervention program called Read180.

Measurable Outcome:

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:

Our main strategy is to deliver Standards-Focused, rigorous Tier 1 instruction via whole group and intervention/enrichment via small differentiated groups.

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. This will lead to increase ELA/Reading proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Train all teachers on how to effectively use a Standards-Focus board. Use Standards-Focus boards in all classrooms.

Person Responsible

Mary Wood (mwood@my.putnamschools.org)

Develop and deliver rigorous instruction that is aligned to the standards by applying the AVID strategy-WICOR as a requirement for lesson plans daily.

Person Responsible

Mary Wood (mwood@my.putnamschools.org)

Implement the use of the Standards-Focus Board on the lesson plan checklist monthly.

Person Responsible

Mary Wood (mwood@my.putnamschools.org)

LSI, Learning Sciences International, District created Unit Builds for ELA curriculum.

Person Responsible

Mary Wood (mwood@my.putnamschools.org)

Implement Read180/Systems 44 intervention (Reading class) for Tier 1 & Tier 2 Reading students.

Person Responsible

Mary Wood (mwood@my.putnamschools.org)

Collaborate with District Specialist to provide support for implementation as needed.

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

Collaborate with District New Teacher Mentor to provide support for novice ELA teachers as needed.

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

Continue use of iReady Diagnostic, Teacher Toolbox, Progress Monitoring daily as needed.

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

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. This will include implementation of academic teaming, roles, agree-disagree cards, etc.

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

PLC structures established and documentation for data sharing, standards unpacking, and common assessments weekly.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students scoring a Level 1 and/or Level 2 on FSA Math for 4th grade 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 all students to receive Math Core and Math Extension (Intervention/Enrichment) prior to lunch - thus maximizing optimal learning time. For SY21, CLO has a significant number of SWD's and a significant portion of those students student working from home due to COVID-19. This ESSA group will be given priority by providing a specialized intervention program called ALEKS.

Measurable Outcome: 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: Well planned heterogeneous-grouped core instruction, and differentiated computer intervention will give students a good chance to remediate their deficits while still working on grade level math skills. This approach allows for enrichment and advancement of our high achieving students as well.

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 Steps to Implement

Train all teachers on how to effective use a Standards-Focus board. Use Standards-Focus boards in all classrooms.

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

Develop and deliver rigorous instruction that is aligned to the standards by applying the AVID strategy-WICOR as a requirement for lesson plans daily.

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

Continue use of iReady Teacher Toolbox, Interim Assessments daily as needed.

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

PLC structures established and documentation for data sharing, standards unpacking, and common assessments weekly.

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

Continue use of EngageNY as main curriculum resource.

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

Collaborate with District New Teacher Mentor to provide support for novice Math teachers as needed.

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

Implement the use of the Standards-Focus Board on the lesson plan checklist monthly.

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

Collaborate with District Specialist to provide support for implementation as needed.

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

Utilize both iready Math diagnostic assessments to monitor growth toward FSA achievement. Utilize ALEKS Math program for on grade level practice as well as remediation of deficits to close learning gaps.

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: As a school family, 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.

Measurable Outcome: 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: Caring Schools Community will be used to support teachers and students with curriculum based on creating a positive culture both in and out of the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we focus on Tier 1 standards focused instruction along with social-emotional 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. When students develop Character, Leadership, and Ownership traits and coping strategies, then students will be able to spend more time on instruction and less time with behavior distractions.

Action Steps to Implement

Create Master Schedule "double-blocks" content areas to allow for intervention/enrichment time.

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

Create Cohorts of students that travel together to minimize transitions and create a community of learners.

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

Implement the use of global announcements, social media, Facebook, to communicate with students and families as needed.

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

Implement Cohort Chats with the Guidance Counselor, Melissa Hibbs, as well as daily CSC lesson during Homeroom class time.

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

Collaborate with district support for STEM implementation and family nights sponsored by Stem2Hub.

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

Continuation/adaption of a token economy of Tiger Tickets as part of our PBIS plan that rewards students on a daily basis, school-wide reward every 2 weeks, and continuation of a Tiger Team Ticket token economy for the staff to reward the promotion of Character, Leadership, and Ownership on campus.

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

Continuation 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

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

The aforementioned plan addresses our areas of focus.

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.

For now, during COVID restrictive times, we plan to hold quarterly, virtual parent events to increase the partnership between the school and home to at least 30% of our parents. As restrictions lift, incorporate face to face events that highlight students. We will have virtual award ceremonies to encourage positive behaviors - academically and behaviorally.

CLO plans to further develop business partner relationships. Currently CLO has several very supportive organizations: PAL, North Point Youth, St. James United Methodist Church, Azalea City Kiwanis Club, and Catholic Charities of St. Augustine. We seek to expand our partnerships.

Finally, we plan to continue to develop our staff morale PBIS. We instituted "Tiger Team Tickets" for all staff. Staff is awarded tickets by admin for being FIERCE and going above and beyond. The tickets can be spent in our staff store which is funded by donations or fundraising. Staff can also use tickets for non-tangible things like: no duty for the week, etc. The program is working very well. We compliment the PBIS staff token economy with a strong positive reinforcement push via social media. We take photos of teachers teaching and celebrate their strategy use, adaptive innovations, achievement, and creativity.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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