

Putnam County School District

Robert H. Jenkins, Jr Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

Robert H. Jenkins, Jr Elementary School

251 S STATE ROAD 315, Interlachen, FL 32148

www.putnamschools.org/o/ies

Demographics

Principal: Paula Adams

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 PK-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 (49%) 2017-18: C (42%) 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	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Robert H. Jenkins, Jr Elementary School

251 S STATE ROAD 315, Interlachen, FL 32148

www.putnamschools.org/o/ies

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 PK-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	26%

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.

Our mission at Robert H. Jenkins, Jr Elementary School is to provide engaging and effective standards-based instruction that will allow students to reach academic proficiency. Through collective responsibility, our students will grow and learn in a positive environment where all students, faculty, staff, parents and community members work together to foster successful outcomes.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Robert H. Jenkins, Jr Elementary School is dedicated to achieving our school mission through educating our students by staying focused on learning, creating a collaborative culture and monitoring the results of student growth to inform and improve best practices for success.

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
Weaver, Libby	Principal	Libby Weaver, principal, will accept responsibility for the instructional vision and management of all school functions by delegating, observing, following through, and coaching of the employees. She will evaluate all employees and keep the leadership team focused on the mission of ensuring student success.
DeLoach, Jennifer	Dean	Jennifer DeLoach will process discipline referrals, assist teachers with classroom management and plan and manage the school wide PBIS efforts. In addition Mrs. DeLoach will assist the district math coach in supporting mathematics especially as it relates to pacing.
Lee, Chris	Assistant Principal	Chris Lee will accept responsibility for assisting the principal to maintain the instructional vision and management of all school functions by delegating, observing, following through, and coaching of the employees. She will assist with the evaluation of all employees and with keeping the leadership team focused on the mission of ensuring student success.
Holley, Mary Arlene	Dean	Arlene Hollely will process discipline referrals, assist teachers with classroom management and plan and manage the school wide PBIS efforts. In addition, she will serve at the Cambridge contact for Jenkins Elementary School.
Farrar, Susan	School Counselor	Susan Fararr will provide SEL support to students and staff and be the voice of and advocate for our most vulnerable children as well as manage state testing.
Redman, Valerie Lynn	Other	Lynn Redman will lead the MTSS/Rtl process at Interlachen Elementary and work in conjunction with Lisa Massey, lead intervention teacher, to provide, monitor and support identified interventions for students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 of the MTSS process. Mrs. Redman will also facilitate the school wide Accelerated Reading Effort.
Mason, Ashley	Instructional Coach	Ashley Mason will support highly effective classroom practices focusing on academic teaming and engagement. . She will provide professional development through targeted feedback cycles and PLCs.
Massey, Lisa	Other	Lisa Massey will provide, monitor and support identified interventions for students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 of the MTSS process. As a member of the lead team, she will be tasked with ensuring that W.I.N. labs operate efficiently and to fidelity.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Paula Adams

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

867

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

8

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

19

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	132	116	117	144	110	126	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	867
Attendance below 90 percent	18	53	46	59	36	45	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	312
One or more suspensions	1	2	7	6	5	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	15	10	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	11	14	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	29	48	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	35	45	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	157
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	32	18	25	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	127

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	1	5	13	18	25	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	2	0	23	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	102	113	116	119	116	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	673
Attendance below 90 percent	60	32	47	28	35	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	240
One or more suspensions	5	7	11	7	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	39	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	41	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	4	2	8	6	18	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	102	113	116	119	116	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	673
Attendance below 90 percent	60	32	47	28	35	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	240
One or more suspensions	5	7	11	7	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	39	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	41	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	4	2	8	6	18	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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				44%	46%	57%	40%	43%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	55%	58%	42%	45%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	54%	53%	32%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	51%	63%	47%	52%	62%
Math Learning Gains				58%	56%	62%	47%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	43%	51%	34%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				45%	41%	53%	54%	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	36%	41%	-5%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	43%	3%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	42%	2%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	46%	-3%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	53%	1%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	44%	-1%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	44%	38%	6%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool used to compile the data below was iReady Diagnostic.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23/24%	71/77	83/90
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/15	71/77	83/90
	Students With Disabilities	7/27	16/73	21/95
	English Language Learners	0/0	3/25	9/75
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8/9%	58/65	74/83
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/9	58/65	74/83
	Students With Disabilities	4/22	11/52	18/86
	English Language Learners	0/0	3/27	6/55
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19/17%	44/40	69/63
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/15	44/40	69/63
	Students With Disabilities	7/27	9/41	13/59
	English Language Learners	0/0	10/11	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18/16	41/39	64/60
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/16	41/39	64/60
	Students With Disabilities	5/22	10/48	9/43
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/11	0/0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19/17%	46/41	61/54
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/17	46/41	61/54
	Students With Disabilities	3/16	8/42	9/47
	English Language Learners	0/0	3/27	4/36
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10/9	24/22	58/54
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/9	24/22	58/54
	Students With Disabilities	3/18	4/24	10/59
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/18	8/45
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48/39%	67/55	70/58
	Economically Disadvantaged	48/39	67/55	70/58
	Students With Disabilities	1/11	11/39	14/50
	English Language Learners	1/9	3/29	3/29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9/7	30/25	50/42
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/7	30/25	50/42
	Students With Disabilities	3/10	8/31	12/46
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/14	2/29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29/24	45/37	46/38
	Economically Disadvantaged	29/24	45/37	46/38
	Students With Disabilities	6/24	8/33	7/29
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/18	3/27
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11/9	34/30	62/54
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/9	34/30	62/54
	Students With Disabilities	1/5	6/27	8/36
	English Language Learners	1/9	2/20	4/40
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	23/21	35/31	38/34
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/21	35/31	38/34
	Students With Disabilities	6/13	6/15	5/13
	English Language Learners	2/20	3/33	3/33
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/13	34/31	42/39
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/13	34/31	42/39
	Students With Disabilities	4/11	7/19	8/22
	English Language Learners	1/11	4/44	3/33

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	13	12	13	18	12	6	15				
ELL	14			23							
BLK	16			16							
HSP	30	38		27	20		33				
MUL	41			50							
WHT	33	34	29	36	32	27	32				
FRL	31	38	33	31	32	17	34				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	19	50	50	24	51	45	21				
ELL	38			56	70						
BLK	25			40							
HSP	48	63	67	53	63		30				
MUL	42	32		50	55		40				
WHT	44	52	51	47	57	40	49				
FRL	41	50	51	43	53	43	38				
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	21	36	27	30	37	25	27				
ELL	10			36							
BLK	42	60		42	50						
HSP	31	44	38	36	45	21	21				
MUL	35	27		39	50						
WHT	43	42	33	50	47	46	57				
FRL	36	39	27	43	45	36	54				

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	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	258

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	13
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	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	16
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	34
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	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	32
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	34
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?

All grade levels saw between a 17 to to 28 percentage decrease in student growth resulting in a 12 to 18 percent decrease in overall proficiency.

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

Bottom quartile learning gains in both reading and math demonstrate a great need for improvement. Bottom quartile math is the component of greatest concern.

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

Multiple factors contributed to this need for improvement including: digital instruction, high absenteeism of students, high absenteeism of teachers, lack of systems to support student growth and development and lack of systems to support teacher growth and development.

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

None. All components were lower than progress monitoring and 2019 state assessment results.

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

N/A

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

We will need to strengthen core instruction by: adhering to the adopted county curriculum, guarding academic learning time, increasing student ownership through academic teaming and aggressively target teacher growth and development.

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.

LSI Teaming 101, Bimonthly whole school PLCs focused on: school culture, data disaggregation and strategy development, Participation in formal coaching cycles, Planning with a district coach, County-wide Grade Level Learning Communities, Side by side coaching opportunities using school based strategy coach and/or district content specialists

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

Create a school culture of growth and achievement
Establish a master schedule that respects academic learning time
Establish expectations for targeted and meaningful PLCs
Implement on going weekly Strategy Focuses
Create systems of remediation and enrichment that allow for prescriptive interventions

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 33% of students in third grade, 31% in fourth grade, and 31% in fifth grade scored a level 3 or above on the ELA FSA. Based on this data, instruction in reading must be rigorous, targeted and standards aligned. Since our largest sub group is the economically disadvantaged subgroup, It will be our primary area of focus.
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>58 Percent in Grade K 56 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>55 Percent in Grade 3 55 Percent in Grade 4 50 Percent in Grade 5 50 Percent in Grade 6</p>
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored using the LSI Rigor Walk Tool, Marzano's Evaluation and Coaching tool as well as iReady Standards Mastery, Growth Monitoring and Diagnostic data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Libby Weaver (eweaver@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>The evidence-based strategies being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome are:</p> <p>K-3 Open Court Foundational Skills Kits K-2 Benchmark Advance 3-6 LSI Unit Builds (1st semester) Benchmark Advance (2nd semester) (SIPPS) Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (LLI) Leveled Literacy Intervention</p> <p>Strategies are monitored using the i-Ready Reading Diagnostic assessment and program specific progress monitoring.</p>
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

Professional development on evidence-based strategies

Person Responsible Libby Weaver (eweaver@my.putnamschools.org)

Assisting with implementing data-informed instruction

Person Responsible Libby Weaver (eweaver@my.putnamschools.org)

Use of high-quality instructional materials

Person Responsible Chris Lee (c2lee@my.putnamschools.org)

Multi-tiered system of supports

Person Responsible Valerie Lynn Redman (vredman@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.

Interlachen Elementary reported a low occurrence of incidents involving violence, a very low occurrence of incidents involving property damage, but a very high occurrence of drug incidents - which were related to tobacco and weapons. We will attempt to address the high occurrence category through alcohol, drug and tobacco awareness programs, PBIS goals, and consistent rule enforcement. We will formally review incident data and behavior threat data a minimum of once monthly.

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.

Parent and family involvement is necessary for maintaining a positive school culture. Our goal is to have 95% of all parents involved in some capacity in their child's education at Jenkins. We would like this involvement to contain 2-way communication. This will be accomplished and documented through the acknowledgement and input in the development of the ParentStudent-Teacher compact, in-put into the PFEP, as well as soliciting parent input into how parent and family involvement funds are spent. As always, more traditional communication like face to face parent conferences, positive and concern based phone calls, and notes home will be utilized. We will offer activities at varied times both at the school and virtually as well as provide food and child care when necessary to alleviate barriers preventing parent attendance. (Sign in sheets, agendas and related handouts will serve as documentation of this effort.)

Social and emotional wellness is a cornerstone of positive school environment. In an effort to support and promote social emotional learning, all staff will be trained in Collaborative Classroom's Caring School Community Curriculum. At a minimum, bi-monthly class councils will be required. In addition, all staff has been trained in Mental Health First Aid. In addition, we have an on site guidance counselor the district employs Mental Wellness Counselors to support our most at risk students.

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

Students, faculty, staff are all tasked with remaining informed and prepared for school. Parents are asked to insure that their children, are clean, fed, well rested and arrive to school on time. It is the responsibility of every stakeholder to believe the best in each other, want the best for each other and expect the best from each other. Communication will be the key to establishing this type of culture.

Various community groups such as the local VFW, several local churches and independent donors also help to support a positive culture and environment by assisting with student awards and incentives, providing for the basic needs of less fortunate children and encouraging faculty and staff through motivational incentives.