

Putnam County School District

Putnam Edge High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Putnam Edge High School

200 S 7TH ST, Palatka, FL 32177

<http://www.putnamedge.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Emmanuel Swift

Start Date for this Principal: 2/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2022-07-26
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	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: F (23%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: D (33%) 2015-16: F (26%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Putnam Edge High School

200 S 7TH ST, Palatka, FL 32177

<http://www.putnamedge.org/>

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)
High School 9-12	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	Yes	52%

School Grades History

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

Mission:

Our Putnam EDGE students will.
Explore the unfamiliar through critical thinking.
Develop individual accountability.
Grow together utilizing cooperative learning.
Engage with community partners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:

Putnam EDGE High school endeavors to launch scholars into Putnam County and beyond as pioneers and architects of the future.

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
Swift, Emmanuel	Principal	<p>Job Duties:</p> <p>Provides leadership to the staff in determining objectives and identifying school needs as the basis for developing long and short-range plans for Putnam EDGE High School. Implements school-wide student-centered, project and problem-based learning tied to State and Common Core State Standards. Provides instructional leadership to all staff and assures integration between curricular areas. Commits to developing a culture of trust and responsibility among students, teachers, staff, and the Putnam EDGE HS community. Participates with significant higher education and business partnerships to support college courses, internships and community service experiences for students. Implements a technology infrastructure that supports the curriculum and school.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 2/1/2018, Emmanuel Swift

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.*

1

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

9

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2022-07-26
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	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: F (23%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: D (33%) 2015-16: F (26%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	0	0	0	12	17	21	24	74	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	3	13	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	18	20	61	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	3	3	21	

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	0	0	0	12	17	21	24	74

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	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	18	25	18	73	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	14	9	43	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	18	25	18	73
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	14	9	43

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	18	24	17	71

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	11%	31%	56%	23%	28%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	19%	34%	51%	35%	40%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	27%	42%	0%	41%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	25%	51%	14%	27%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	43%	48%	17%	27%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	45%	0%	28%	39%
Science Achievement	13%	39%	68%	50%	53%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	35%	49%	73%	58%	57%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	0%	41%	-41%	55%	-55%
	2018	21%	38%	-17%	53%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	9%	41%	-32%	53%	-44%
	2018	16%	38%	-22%	53%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State 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	8%	54%	-46%	67%	-59%
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	32%	51%	-19%	70%	-38%
2018	34%	53%	-19%	68%	-34%
Compare		-2%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	8%	49%	-41%	61%	-53%
2018	23%	43%	-20%	62%	-39%
Compare		-15%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	43%	-43%	57%	-57%
2018	14%	50%	-36%	56%	-42%
Compare		-14%			

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	25										
BLK	4	8									
WHT	19	33						70		73	31
FRL	13	22					6	29		57	31
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	20										
BLK	13	36									
WHT	33	47		27				44		65	76
FRL	17	39		29				43		61	64
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
WHT	35	48		18	23			60			
FRL	21	44		5	17		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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	23
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
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	163
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	2
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	

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students 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	45
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	23
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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.

The Math component was the lowest performance matrix. Contributing factors began with the late start to the 2018-2019 school year, which impeded our ability to implement several interventions and supports that tied back to our previous action steps and strategies for improvement from the prior year. A increase in student enrollment at the beginning of second semester.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline was Math. Prior year's data showed 60% of growth in Math compared to this year data showed no academic growth. The contributing factor to this decline was due to barriers of implementing a new curriculum along with change in staffing patterns.

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.

The Math component had the greatest gap due to Instructional practices as a means of providing academic supports, lesson delivery protocol for direct instruction and staff retention. There were no trends.

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

History EOC component showed the most improvement primarily due to the hiring of new instructional personnel and the implementation of a new online curriculum.

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

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators that did not experience any response to intervention.

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

1. English learning Gains
2. Math Learning Grains
3. Math Proficiency
4. Instructional Delivery Practice and protocol
5. Parental Engagement and Support

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Paraprofessional for academic intervention for one on one tutoring support all students will receive high-quality, instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	This instruction is research-based and includes differentiation (tier one). Then, students who are not progressing adequately in the regular, high quality classroom are provided with some type of intervention an additional, smaller Math or Reading class, for example (tier two). If a student is still struggling, then he/she will receive one on one targeted intervention that speaks to his specific skill deficits (tier three).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Emmanuel Swift (ejswift@putnamedge.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The gradual release of responsibility instructional framework purposefully shifts the cognitive load from teacher-as-model, to joint responsibility of teacher and student, to independent practice and application by the student. It stipulates that the teacher moves from assuming all the responsibility for performing a task to a situation in which the students assume all of the responsibility. This gradual release may occur over a day, a week, a month, or a year. Effective instruction often follows a progression in which teachers gradually do less of the work and students gradually assume increased responsibility for their learning. It is through this process of gradually assuming more and more responsibility for their learning that students become competent, independent students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based instruction involves teaching and assessing students based on the standards adopted by the appropriate state department of education. Assessments are designed to measure student mastery of the state-adopted standards associated with the course. Lesson plans are designed to help students master each of these standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Gradual Release of Responsibility
2. Classroom Workshop (One on One)
3. Individualized instructional support
4. Collaborative Activities
5. Formative-Reflective Assessment
6. Differentiation
8. Accountable Talk
9. Strategic Thinking (Depth of Knowledge)

Person Responsible Emmanuel Swift (ejswift@putnamedge.org)

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

Student performance in the ELA component was lower then the prior year. In order to improve other areas of focus we must first address the literacy deficit that has a direct impact on students ability to comprehend across content.

Measurable Outcome:

The overall English learning gain will increase by 20%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emmanuel Swift (ejswift@putnamedge.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The gradual release of responsibility instructional framework purposefully shifts the cognitive load from teacher-as-model, to joint responsibility of teacher and student, to independent practice and application by the student. It stipulates that the teacher moves from assuming all the responsibility for performing a task to a situation in which the students assume all of the responsibility. This gradual release may occur over a day, a week, a month, or a year. Effective instruction often follows a progression in which teachers gradually do less of the work and students gradually assume increased responsibility for their learning. It is through this process of gradually assuming more and more responsibility for their learning that students become competent, independent students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explicit Instruction is a very practical yet effective model of instruction. Explicit Instruction may often resemble the Cycle of Effective Instruction, the Gradual Release Model (Fisher & Frey) or the I Do, We Do, You Do model of teaching. This models require active participation, student engagement and collaboration and result in high levels of student achievement. Explicit instruction is based on research proven best practice and is appropriate to be used at all grade levels and across content areas. This will also inform our blended instructional model which enable the instructor the ability to provide one on one and small group support.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Gradual Release of Responsibility
2. Classroom Workshop (One on One)
3. Individualized instructional support
4. Collaborative Activities
5. Formative-Reflective Assessment
6. Differentiation
8. Accountable Talk
9. Strategic Thinking (Depth of Knowledge)

Person Responsible

Emmanuel Swift (ejswift@putnamedge.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of****Focus****Description
and****Rationale:**

The purpose of this area of focus is to improve the overall student performance in Math proficiency.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

The overall Math achievement will increase by 20%

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Emmanuel Swift (ejswift@putnamedge.org)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

The gradual release of responsibility instructional framework purposefully shifts the cognitive load from teacher-as-model, to joint responsibility of teacher and student, to independent practice and application by the student. It stipulates that the teacher moves from assuming all the responsibility for performing a task to a situation in which the students assume all of the responsibility. This gradual release may occur over a day, a week, a month, or a year. Effective instruction often follows a progression in which teachers gradually do less of the work and students gradually assume increased responsibility for their learning. It is through this process of gradually assuming more and more responsibility for their learning that students become competent, independent students.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Explicit Instruction is a very practical yet effective model of instruction. Explicit Instruction may often resemble the Cycle of Effective Instruction, the Gradual Release Model (Fisher & Frey) or the I Do, We Do, You Do model of teaching. This models require active participation, student engagement and collaboration and result in high levels of student achievement. Explicit instruction is based on research proven best practice and is appropriate to be used at all grade levels and across content areas. This will also inform our blended instructional model which enable the instructor the ability to provide one on one and small group support.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Gradual Release of Responsibility
2. Classroom Workshop (One on One)
3. Individualized instructional support
4. Collaborative Activities
5. Formative-Reflective Assessment
6. Differentiation
8. Accountable Talk
9. Strategic Thinking (Depth of Knowledge)

Person**Responsible**

Emmanuel Swift (ejswift@putnamedge.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Utilizing the MTSS framework will not only improve student achievement but more importantly have a direct impact on school culture/school safety as well as process and procedures for teacher professional development and retention. The MTSS process is a collaborative approach that will encompass all school level, district and community stakeholders.

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.

Putnam Edge will continue to make contact with local and small business owners when seeking community support for sponsorship of events and the yearbook. During scheduled outings, students are expected to share the mission of Putnam EDGE High School. NHS (National Honor Society) student members are required to obtain a set number of community service hours per year. These are completed through local groups like Kiwanis, Rotary, Hospice, Putnam Community Medical Center, Crestwood Nursing Center, and The Heart of Putnam Food Service. Putnam EDGE is currently working on revamping our relationship with the Putnam County Sheriff's Office E911Telecommunications program. Students who complete this program and pass the state exam will be eligible for employment as a dispatcher. All students are encouraged to use Monday's to engage with the community through job shadowing, internship and or on the job training.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation				\$15,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	150-Aides	0071 - Putnam Edge High School	UniSIG	1.0	\$15,000.00
			Notes: Salary & Benefits: Paraprofessional for academic intervention for one on one tutoring support all students will receive high-quality, instruction. This instruction is research-based and includes differentiation (tier one). Then, students who are not progressing adequately in			

			<i>the regular, high quality classroom are provided with some type of intervention an additional, smaller Math or Reading class, for example (tier two). If a student is still struggling, then he/ she will receive one on one targeted intervention that speaks to his specific skill deficits (tier three): Total of \$ 15,000 for position. -5100-150 Salary \$12,846.37; -5100-210 Retirement @8.47%= \$1,088.09 -5100-220 Social Security @ 6.2%= 796.48; -5100-221 Medicare @ 1.45%= \$186.27; -5100-240 Worker's Comp @.059%= 75.79; -5100-250 Unemployment Comp @0.10% on first \$7,000 of wages= \$7.00</i>				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA					\$7,352.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0071 - Putnam Edge High School	UniSIG		\$7,352.00	
			<i>Notes: Edgenuity the leading blended learning solution. Edgenuity helps students who are two or more years behind become active, accomplished scholars, by bringing teachers, families, and adaptive technology together. Edgenuity meets students on their unique paths to provide a truly personalized experience. Due to projected enrollment, Total invoice is for 100 students = 8,500; Remaining 1175.00 will come from school operating funds.</i>				
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math					\$0.00
Total:						\$22,352.00	