Browning Pearce Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Browning Pearce Elementary School

100 BEAR BLVD, San Mateo, FL 32187

www.putnamschools.org/o/bpes

Demographics

Principal: Yolanda Brady

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
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)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: D (40%)
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

Browning Pearce Elementary School

100 BEAR BLVD, San Mateo, FL 32187

www.putnamschools.org/o/bpes

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-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	40%

School Grades History

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

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.

The Bear Mission Statement
Browning Pearce Elementary School will:

-Empower teachers to create a challenging learning environment where students are expected to excel in all academic standards, encouraged to think critically and persevere, and are inspired to be creative problem solvers as they engage in collaborative tasks with their peers.

-Foster positive relationships between staff, students, families, and the community we serve by providing a variety of academic and social emotional supports.

-Maintain a safe and healthy learning environment where our students and their cultures are respected, their unique abilities are valued, and students have a voice in their educational pursuits so that they are ready for 21st Century demands.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Bear Vision Statement
At Browning Pearce, we are a unified family of learners who nurture & challenge each student to excel in the classroom & community.

The Bear Motto
EVERY CHILD. EVERY DAY.

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
Drew, Diana	Principal	Conducts Business Between School and District Office School Improvement Plan Creates and Monitors Budgets Non-Instructional Evaluation Plans For Professional Development Attends Superintendent Advisory Council Meetings Hires and Manages Employees Leads Administration Team Leads Data Analysis/Prepares District Data Presentations Threat Assessment Team Member Teacher Observations and Evaluations via Effective Educators Student drop off/pick up
Bellamy, Cindy	Assistant Principal	Parent and Family Engagement Plan PBIS Coordinator Threat Assessment Team Member EOP and Safety Public Relations/Website/Social Media Title 1 Audit Box Scheduling Teacher Observations and Evaluations via Effective Educators Student Discipline Support Student drop off/pick up
Jackson, Molly	Reading Coach	K-6 i-Ready Diagnostics and Monitoring Coordinates T2 and T3 Reading Interventions and Enrichment K-6 Monitors and Collects Data for K-6 ELA PLC meetings Supports implementation of Benchmark Advanced and Open Court curricula Supports Implementation of 3-6 ELA Unit Builds Keep Lowest Quartile Lists Current- K-6 ELA 3rd Grade Portfolio Contact Bus Discipline School Advisory Council Chairperson
Watson, Lashonda	Math Coach	K-6 i-Ready Math Diagnostics and Monitoring Monitor and plan for K-6 grade level Math PLC meetings Math Instructional Support Keep Lowest Quartile Lists Current- Math K-6 Discipline
Ramirez, Donna	Other	Caring Classroom Coordinator ESOL and WIDA Coordinator 504 Plans ESE Contact MTSS Coordinator K-6 Mental Health Contact Behavior Threat Assessment Member

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Cumulative Folders and Student Records DCF Contact
Bacon, Kan Dee	Instructional Media	Media Contact Technology Contact Science Contact Testing Coordinator for State Assessments Yearbook STEM Contact

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Yolanda Brady

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

652

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

4

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

17

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	98	117	100	95	64	93	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	652
Attendance below 90 percent	18	58	45	43	33	49	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	280
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	3	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	3	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	12	33	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	16	34	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	20	39	43	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
	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	2	2	5	14	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	7	0	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/15/2021

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	117	94	86	81	88	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	559
Attendance below 90 percent	29	35	24	22	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	1	8	2	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	25	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	24	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	1	3	1	2	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	117	94	86	81	88	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	559
Attendance below 90 percent	29	35	24	22	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	1	8	2	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	25	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	24	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	1	3	1	2	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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				41%	46%	57%	39%	43%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	55%	58%	44%	45%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67%	54%	53%	34%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				52%	51%	63%	47%	52%	62%
Math Learning Gains				58%	56%	62%	48%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	43%	51%	38%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				43%	41%	53%	31%	46%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	44%	41%	3%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	36%	43%	-7%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	36%	42%	-6%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	55%	46%	9%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	53%	-8%	64%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	44%	8%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	37%	38%	-1%	53%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						

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	26	42	50	22	38	29	23				
ELL	30	40		46							
BLK	21	33		24	20		27				
HSP	44	41		46	44		21				
MUL	38			38							
WHT	45	41	42	45	40		40				
FRL	36	44	41	35	30	25	27				
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	57	68	32	49	48	38				
ELL	35	65		40	59		50				
BLK	23	46	47	37	54	47	13				
HSP	39	70	82	42	45		60				
MUL	64			64							
WHT	46	60	71	59	63	55	51				
FRL	38	57	67	49	58	49	44				
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	30	36	28	30	48	52	23				
ELL	19	29		35	52		17				
BLK	22	31	22	35	42	35	11				
HSP	32	39		41	51	30	17				
MUL	53			47							
WHT	47	49	45	54	50	44	45				
FRL	37	41	33	44	47	38	28				

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)	

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
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	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	325
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	25
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	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	42
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
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 data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA reading proficiency. The percentage grew from 39% to 41% but is significantly below the state average of 57%. Every grade level has an intervention block and every child is placed in a group according to the state approved Decision Tree from our K-12 Reading Plan.

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

The data component with the greatest gap is ELA proficiency.

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

The main contributing factor to this need for improvement in ELA proficiency is addressing achievement gaps of incoming 3rd-6th grade students. This year, K-3rd grade teachers are

implementing Open Court for Foundational skills and K-2nd grade teachers are implementing the Benchmark Advanced curriculum for ELA instruction. Although we won't see results from this implementation immediately, we should see results over time that affect growth and proficiency. We also have two additional Reading Interventionists funded by the district to meet the needs of our T3 students.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the lowest quartile in ELA. It grew from 34% to 67%.

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

There were interventions such as SIPPS, ACT, and LLI put into place with T2 and T3 students.

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

The district is funding two Reading Interventionists for BPES. We will closely track progress within the T2 and T3 intervention groups using running records to determine growth and placement within LLI and SIPPS. We will also continue prioritizing ELA by having 90-minute blocks for each grade level and focusing on standards-based planning.

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.

Each week, our teachers have PLCs, with someone from the lead team, targeted to improve student achievement. We also have a district ELA coach available on campus 2-3 times per week to accommodate teacher needs either in teams or through one on one coaching support. On October 21st, the Department of Teaching and Learning will offer PD to teachers for our In-Service day. Members of the Lead Team have registered to attend an iReady training called Acceleration vs. Remediation. In addition, our teachers have been invited to attend after hours iReady Educator Learning Opportunities on October 25th, which includes Using the Personalized Instruction by Lesson Reports to Plan Differentiated Support and B.E.S.T Alignment.

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

In order to build shared ownership among school leadership and teachers, we will work to involve teachers in the school improvement process. We have started by sharing our goals and targets for this year's school grade with teachers and asked for input from them on our targets. We will utilize our weekly PLCs to foster a culture where collaborative work routines are in place that prioritize student learning. Peer observations will be conducted to give teachers the opportunity to learn from one another. Together, we will use data to guide decisions about instruction and to identify practices that are improving instruction. Overall, we will work to build a culture of high expectations for students and staff.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This school has been identified under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence Act (RAISE) as needing to focus on improving student reading outcomes. Data from Spring 2021 showed 37% of students in third grade, 31% in fourth grade, and 43% in fifth grade scored a level 3 or above on the ELA FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase students scoring Mid or Above Grade Level on the 2022 Spring i-Ready Reading Diagnostic. Targets for Grades K-2 include: 60 Percent in Grade K 65 Percent in Grade 1 56 Percent in Grade 2 Increase students scoring Level 3 or above on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Targets for Grades 3-6 include: 52 Percent in Grade 3 57 Percent in Grade 4 51 Percent in Grade 5 53 Percent in Grade 6
Monitoring:	We will utilize iReady testing and running records from LLI and SIPPS in order to monitor ELA progress toward the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Diana Drew (d2drew@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based team planning and collaboration is an expectation at BPES. Our K-3 teachers are implementing Open Court this year for foundational skills. In addition, our K-2 teachers are implementing Benchmark Advance this year. We are utilizing LLI and SIPPS to address T2 and T3 needs. Tier 3 students are attending Reading Intervention with a certified or endorsed teacher, per state rule.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The identified evidence-based strategies meet Florida's definition of evidence-based and align to the Putnam County School District's K-12 Reading Plan. The programs address the identified need to improve student reading outcomes. Resources and criteria are based on the approved K-12 Decision Trees.
Action Steps to Implement	

Hire two certified Reading Interventionists.

Person Responsible	Diana Drew (d2drew@my.putnamschools.org)

Create a master schedule with 90-minute ELA blocks and an additional 45 minute block for Reading Intervention.

Person Responsible	Cindy Bellamy (cbellamy@my.putnamschools.org)

The two Reading Interventionists will attend a series of district Learning Communities this year. They have attended two, to date.

Person Responsible	Molly Jackson (mjackson@my.putnamschools.org)

K-2 Teachers will attend district B.E.S.T. Standards training offered at various times this year, to follow up on a three day summer institute.

Person Responsible Diana Drew (d2drew@my.putnamschools.org)

Administration will attend Best Practices to Accelerate Learning for Florida's Children on Oct 28, 2021 at 11:00 AM (virtual PD).

Person Responsible Diana Drew (d2drew@my.putnamschools.org)

Teachers will participate in weekly PLCs facilitated by our instructional coaches or our district ELA Coach and the leadership team to engage in systematic data review sessions and planning.

Person Responsible Molly Jackson (mjackson@my.putnamschools.org)

Teachers will be invited to participate in PD offered by IReady on Monday, October 25th outside of their contracted hours. Teachers will be offered incentives to attend. iReady staff will send a report of attendees to administration following the event. The following sessions are offered:
B.E.S.T. Alignment
Family Supports in iReady
Acceleration Using the Prerequisites Report
Using the Personalized Instruction by Lesson Report to Plan Differentiated Support

Person Responsible Diana Drew (d2drew@my.putnamschools.org)

Administration will attend a virtual PD session by iReady titled Acceleration vs. Remediation online on October 7th, 2021.

Person Responsible Diana Drew (d2drew@my.putnamschools.org)

Utilize an Instructional Assistant placed at BPES twice a week for Migrant Students for ELA tutoring and support. In addition, we will utilize our ELL Instructional Assistant to support ELL students who need T2 Reading Interventions.

Person Responsible Diana Drew (d2drew@my.putnamschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This school has been identified as having one subgroup scoring below the threshold of the required Federal Percent of Points Index. The students in our Black/African American subgroup were at 38% reading proficiency. The previous year this subgroup was at 23%, so proficiency for this subgroup is trending upward. We have the following numbers of African Americans in each grade level: KG- 16 1st- 14 2nd- 13 3rd- 18 4th- 10 5th- 18 6th- 9 Total: 98
Measurable Outcome:	
Monitoring:	We will utilize iReady testing and running records from LLI and SIPPS in order to monitor ELA progress toward the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement	
We will track progress focused on improving the reading proficiency of our Black/African American subgroup using EWS data and i-Ready.	
Person Responsible	Molly Jackson (mjackson@my.putnamschools.org)
Placeholder for Core Instruction and Interventions already in place for AF1	
Person Responsible	Diana Drew (d2drew@my.putnamschools.org)
Placeholder for Staff Mentors	
Person Responsible	Cindy Bellamy (cbellamy@my.putnamschools.org)
Placeholder for Zeta Phi Beta Mentors	
Person Responsible	Diana Drew (d2drew@my.putnamschools.org)
Acceleration vs Remediation Training Possibility? Data from study- see iReady training	
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

After reviewing school behavioral data, our primary area of concern that we plan to monitor during the upcoming year are events of misconduct or defiance. At this point in the year, we have 23 referrals, which is substantially less than other schools in the state. The Caring School Curriculum is expected to be implemented to address SEL needs. Relationship building and adult responses to misconduct or defiance will be a focus this year. We will monitor who writes the referrals and support them with classroom management and/or appropriate intervention or deescalation strategies. In addition, we have teachers who will receive Youth Mental Health First Aid training on October 21st. One more thing that will assist us this year is the ASPEN training that a small team of teachers/paras will receive in October and November. They will come back and share strategies with our grade level teams in PLCs.

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.

We utilize a school theme each year to build in excitement about the coming year. This year, our theme is Wild About Learning! Yearly, the lead team shares 5E data with staff members and stakeholders. This data, along with Title 1 Parent Survey data is considered when creating the Parent Engagement Plan and School Improvement Plan for the current year. Each quarter, we host family events that not only build positive relationships between families and the school, but also address something academic. We have a solid PBIS Committee that has developed a school-wide PBIS system with planned and tracked various and frequent rewards led by the lead team and committee members. Student and teacher buy-in to this program is extremely high. BPES also participates in programs such as Literacy Week and Red Ribbon Week, which builds student excitement around learning. To support teacher's well being and morale we have a Sunshine Committee that plans for staff socials and uplifting programs such as Secret Pal. Ongoing staff development is a part of our school culture as it directly relates to the implementation of effective teaching strategies that our students need to be successful academically. To support this, we have weekly PLCs each Wednesday led by a member of the lead team. We also have ongoing district training, instructional support provided by our district ELA and Math coaches and new teachers supported by their Novice Teacher Mentor.

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

Vulcan- school staff shirts, lanyards and koozies for pre-planning, teacher appreciation gifts and student incentives
San Mateo Presbyterian Church- monthly staff treats
San Mateo Church of God- snack bags, clothing for students and eye glasses
WHIF 91.3 HOPE FM- backpacks and supplies
Zeta Phi Beta Sorority- monthly supplies, mentoring
Kona Ice- Top Student Recognition
Kiwanis Club- student recognition/Terrific Kid
Parents- quarterly SAC meetings to share goals, share ideas and celebrations

All of these organizations make it possible to provide staff and students with things that are needed and things that boost morale and motivation. They provide us resources for success, as well as the resources of gifts, skills and strengths. We want to move forward from merely communicating with our stakeholders to creating lasting connections. Their generous donations of funding and time are essential to building a positive culture in our school.