

Putnam County School District

James A. Long Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

James A. Long Elementary School

1400 OLD JACKSONVILLE RD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/jal

Demographics

Principal: Beth Nelson

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (53%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

James A. Long Elementary School

1400 OLD JACKSONVILLE RD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/jal

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	41%

School Grades History

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

James A. Long Elementary is committed to engaging students in a rigorous academic and student centered learning environment while maintaining positive relationships with all students and families.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The teachers and staff at James A. Long will work together to prepare our students academically, socially, and emotionally to achieve success for their futures.

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
Nelson, Beth	Principal	School Improvement Plan Budget Creation and Monitoring Employee Evaluation Hiring Employees Coordinating Professional Development District Data Presentations
Adams, Paula	Assistant Principal	Safety and Security Contact Title 1 Audit Box and Parent Involvement Plan Lead Behavior Contact SBTAT Leader Website Employee Evaluation
Maynard, Spring	Instructional Coach	Literacy Contact i-Ready Monitoring Spelling Bee 3rd grade progression Parent Nights FLKRS Lead PLC Meetings
Walts, Mary	Math Coach	Math and Science Contact i-Ready Math Monitoring Assist with STEM and Robotics Lead PLC Meetings
Wright-Purifoy, Jennifer	School Counselor	Testing Coordinator Mental Health WIDA Truancy Student Records Cambridge Coordinator SEL Contact

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Beth Nelson

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

560

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

3

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

7

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	99	82	80	87	62	79	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	555
Attendance below 90 percent	19	38	24	31	22	40	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	8	6	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	6	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	13	29	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	22	34	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	23	27	28	34	15	26	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	161

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	9	21	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	9	20	5	11	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	68	87	75	65	69	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	435
Attendance below 90 percent	21	25	17	21	29	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	3	3	10	1	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	25	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	1	2	1	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	7	4	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	68	87	75	65	69	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	435
Attendance below 90 percent	21	25	17	21	29	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	3	3	10	1	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	25	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	1	2	1	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	7	4	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				56%	46%	57%	56%	43%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	55%	58%	49%	45%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	54%	53%	22%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				55%	51%	63%	61%	52%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	56%	62%	55%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	43%	51%	23%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				51%	41%	53%	67%	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	56%	41%	15%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	43%	7%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	42%	10%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	53%	46%	7%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	53%	9%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	44%	0%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	38%	11%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

N/A

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	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	28	36		35	36	10	14				
BLK	22	26	45	23	26		22				
HSP	17			33							
WHT	47	43		47	36		46				
FRL	30	42	47	28	31	8	33				
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	24	33	31	21	48	41	8				
BLK	31	41	33	35	49	38	18				
WHT	63	57	41	63	64	42	64				
FRL	46	46	39	45	55	39	47				
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	31	26	10	34	39	15	47				
BLK	30	45	28	34	35	16	45				
HSP	62	58		69	75						
WHT	65	50	14	71	62	29	72				
FRL	47	43	18	52	48	17	63				

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	34
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	240
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27

Students With Disabilities	
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	27
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	25
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	44
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	31
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?

Six school score grading categories dropped from 2019-2021 except the ELA learning gains of the lowest quartile.

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

The greatest area in need of improvement according to the 2021 results is the lowest 25% in math. The score was 12% making gains. Overall proficiency needs to improve in ELA, Math and Science. All three subjects were at 37% 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?

Tier 1 core curriculum in ELA, math and science needs to be taught to fidelity. Teams are planning for Tier 1 instruction with the assistance of school based and district coaches.

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

The one area that grew from 2019 to 2021 was the area of the lowest quartile in ELA.

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

There were ELA interventions in place for students in the lowest quartile. The school used LLI materials and hired extra Remedy tutors to provide help to low performing students.

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

Student centered instruction will be implemented.
Research based ELA interventions will be utilized.

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.

The school is participating in Academic Teaming 101. The school partners with consultants from Ready math for training opportunities at the school. The school has a reading and math coach on staff that facilitate professional development. District coaches provide training in the new ELA curriculum called Benchmark Advance. District coaches come on site to help with science and math support as well.

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

There will be a continued focus on student centered instruction. Interventions will be put into place based on individual student needs.

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, 32% in fourth grade, and 36% in fifth grade scored a level 3 or above on the ELA FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Increase students scoring Mid or Above Grade Level on the 2022 Spring i-Ready Reading Diagnostic. Targets for Grades K-2 include:</p> <p>___60___ Percent in Grade K ___50___ Percent in Grade 1 ___50___ Percent in Grade 2</p> <p>Increase students scoring Level 3 or above on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Targets for Grades 3-6 include:</p> <p>___50___ Percent in Grade 3 ___50___ Percent in Grade 4 ___50___ Percent in Grade 5 ___50___ Percent in Grade 6</p>
Monitoring:	There will be an extensive data review mid-year after the second diagnostic. Each teacher will be asked to study their class results and create a plan of action for helping the school reach 50% ELA proficiency. The Marzano element: Planning to close the achievement gap using data, will be used as a guide for teachers and administrators to use during data conversations surrounding ELA progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beth Nelson (bnelson@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy JAL will be using is student centered instruction using teaming tools. The goal is to get students working with other students to accomplish rigorous tasks involving writing and quality conversations.
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

Teachers will participate in Teaming 101 training on August 2, 2021.

Person Responsible Beth Nelson (bnelson@my.putnamschools.org)

Administrators will acknowledge in the Marzano iobservation tool when teachers are implementing student centered instruction during walkthrough, informal, and formal observations. The element: Organizing students to interact with content is the element that will be used to document teaming implementation.

Person Responsible Beth Nelson (bnelson@my.putnamschools.org)

ELA coach will conduct spotlight walks around campus and highlight instances where student centered instruction is happening. PLC planning activities will include using teaming tools and partner/team work as a regular practice.

Person Responsible Spring Maynard (smaynard@my.putnamschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with disabilities had poor performance scores on the 2019 FSA test. 29% of SWD were ELA proficient in 2019.

Measurable Outcome: SWD will improve their proficiency in ELA to 41%.

Monitoring: There will be an extensive data review mid-year after the second diagnostic. Each teacher will be asked to study their class results and create a plan of action for helping SWD reach 41% ELA proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Beth Nelson (bnelson@my.putnamschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: SWD will be included in all school based ELA interventions for students considered tier 2 and 3. The materials are evidence-based.

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

SWD will be placed in appropriate intervention groups based on data. The groups will change according to student progress after the second diagnostic and/or when regular data collection shows a need.

Person Responsible Beth Nelson (bnelson@my.putnamschools.org)

Special Education Teachers will participate in PLC meetings with the academic coaches to review data and plan for using rigorous curriculum which will include teaming activities.

Person Responsible Mary Walts (mwalts@my.putnamschools.org)

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.

When compared to all elementary schools statewide, James A. Long falls into a low concern area for discipline incidents overall. The school ranked #289 out of 1,395 schools for low incidents. Tobacco use is a primary area of concern that the school should monitor. There is an annual say no to drugs week and the school will provide information to discourage the use of tobacco products. The school monitors EWS data quarterly and shares the information with district, school, and advisory council 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.

The theme this year at James A. Long is "Be A Light." An emphasis is placed on being loving, intentional, gracious, hopeful, and thoughtful. Daily announcements remind students of the school theme, celebrate student success and encourage good citizenship. Students earn Lion Bucks for following school rules and achieving academic goals. The school teams with the Kiwanis Club quarterly to conduct the Terrific Kid Program. A student with good character is chosen to represent each class. Dress up days are planned to draw attention to special causes. Faculty and staff participates in special events together such as community walks.

The principal sends out a Monday Message to faculty and staff each week to keep them informed of relevant school business. School Messenger and a JAL Facebook page is used to communicate important information to families.

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

- The school holds advisory council meetings every other month and invites stakeholders proximal to the school.
- The manager at the Beck car dealership across the street from the school has offered to be a business partner in 2021-2022.
- Parents are invited to play a key role at James A. Long. They are invited to an annual Title 1 meeting, parent events, programs(digital or in person), academic meetings and are also encouraged to join the PTO. Parents sign a Compact at the beginning of the year which is an agreement to partner with the school to help their child progress academically.

- J.A.L. partners with Q.I. Roberts to promote participation in the Cambridge Program.
- The North Point Youth Organization teams with our school to provide an after school program.
- SMA provides a quality drug awareness program for our 5th graders.
- Palatka High School students help promote positive school spirit by donating their time and talents.