

Putnam County School District

Putnam Edge High School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Putnam Edge High School

200 S 7TH ST, Palatka, FL 32177

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

Demographics

Principal: Emmanuel Swift

Start Date for this Principal: 2/1/2019

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Putnam County School Board.

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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Putnam Edge High School

200 S 7TH ST, Palatka, FL 32177

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>High School 9-12</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>57%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		F	F	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Putnam County School Board.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Swift, Emmanuel	Principal	<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.</p> <p>Implements a technology infrastructure that supports the curriculum and school. Advances educational reform by contributing to the Putnam EDGE High School activities. Supervises and evaluates the performance of all personnel in accordance with a researched based evaluation and assessment system, recommends appropriate action in cases of substandard performances, and identifies and encourages individual teachers with leadership potential.</p> <p>Develops school plans and organizational procedures for the health, safety, discipline and conduct of students as established in District procedures. Identifies, provides, assigns, and coordinates professional growth opportunities for teaching personnel within the school. Carries out a program of community relations as a means of disseminating and garnering community, parent, and other community organizations support. Coordinates and supervises transportation services. Manages and supervises the school's financial resources. Performs other duties as assigned by the Edge board.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 2/1/2019, 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.*

4

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

5

Total number of students enrolled at the school

52

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	18	20	61
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	3	3	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	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	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	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/15/2021

2020-21 - 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	0	12	17	21	24	74
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	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	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	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	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	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

2020-21 - 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	0	12	17	21	24	74
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	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	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	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				11%	31%	56%	21%	35%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				19%	34%	51%	37%	46%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					27%	42%		41%	44%
Math Achievement					25%	51%	21%	38%	51%
Math Learning Gains					43%	48%	60%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					42%	45%		44%	45%
Science Achievement				13%	39%	68%		50%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				35%	49%	73%	34%	55%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	0%	41%	-41%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	9%	41%	-32%	53%	-44%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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
2021					
2019	8%	54%	-46%	67%	-59%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	32%	51%	-19%	70%	-38%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	8%	49%	-41%	61%	-53%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	43%	-43%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Star Assessments are computer-adaptive tests, meaning each student's testing experience is unique. For new students, Star starts at grade level—or at the level set by their teacher. For returning students, Star picks up at the level they left off.

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11%	20%	26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	1%	1%	1%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students	33%	37%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	1%	1%	1%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22%	26%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	4%	4%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25%	23%	26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	4%	4%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%	25%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	5%	5%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50%	25%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	5%	5%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18%	25%	22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	29%	29%	29%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15%	18%	22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	29%	29%	29%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD				30							
BLK				33						42	
WHT				10				10		58	
FRL	19	31		21	18			13		44	

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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	22
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	173
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	78%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

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%	
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%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	20
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	24
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

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.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The ELA component both proficiency and growth demonstrated the greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Change in school based leadership contributed to the factors of this need for improvement. No new actions need to be taken however, the school will continue to implement the mandatory intervention block as well as before and after the bell.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

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

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

With the use of Study Island students were able to receive more support on Tuesday and Thursday during our mandatory intervention block.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We continue to utilize Study Island and Renaissance learning to track monitor student progress to provide on time support.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will receive summer PD focused on implementing TLAC strategies to increase proficiency of all students across content areas.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Mandatory academic Intervention on Tuesday and Thursday, along with before the bell and after tutoring support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:**#1. Other specifically relating to Graduation****Area of****Focus****Description**
and**Rationale:**

Paraprofessional/ Graduation Coach 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).

Monitoring:

Hiring a paraprofessional/graduation coach will ensure the successful transition of all students from high school to post-secondary education or the workforce. Provide comprehensive prevention/intervention programs for students at risk of grade retention and/ or dropping out of school. Identify students in need of additional support and work with them to achieve academic and social success.

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of****Focus**

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.

Description and**Rationale:****Measurable****Outcome:**

The overall English learning gain will increase by 50%.

Monitoring:

Renaissance learning with track student proficiency rate three times within the academic year (Fall, Winter, Spring).

Person**responsible****for****monitoring****outcome:**

[no one identified]

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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 50%

Renaissance learning with track student proficiency rate three times within the academic year (Fall, Winter, Spring).

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)

Monitoring:**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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

N/A

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.

Putnam Edge will implement small mental health group session with our mental health consultant. As well as implement Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) a skill-development process through which students learn how to manage emotions, problem solve, and create positive relationships with others.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

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.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Graduation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$42,275.00

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22	
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0071 - Putnam Edge High School		1.0	\$42,275.00	
			<i>Notes: State Certified ELA teachers in to implement intervention models for the lowest performing students; Retirement @ 10.88% 3,846.72 Social Security (FICA) @ 7.65% 2,704.72 Workers Compensation @ 0.46% 162.64 State Unemployment Tax @0.58% 205.06 First \$7,000 of Salary TOTAL PERSONNEL 42,275.00</i>				
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math					\$0.00
					Total:	\$42,275.00	