Kelley Smith Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Kelley Smith Elementary School

141 KELLEY SMITH SCHOOL RD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/kses

Demographics

Principal: Mike Tucker

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2019

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)	96%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (42%)
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

Kelley Smith Elementary School

141 KELLEY SMITH SCHOOL RD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/kses

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	97%

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	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.

Our mission at Kelley Smith Elementary School is to provide a culture of inclusivity coupled with positive relationships that fosters social, emotional, and academic learning while focusing on developing each child into a future leader of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will inspire every student to think, to learn, to achieve, to care, and to become a successful and responsible citizen of the community.

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
Tucker, Mike	Principal	Observing, coaching, and monitoring the goals and practices put into place for the faculty, staff, and students at KSES.
Oyster, Cathy	Assistant Principal	Responsible for observing, coaching, and mentoring the goals and practices put into place for the faculty, staff, and students of KSES.
Buckles, Tami	Teacher, K-12	Provide intensive interventions to tier 2 and tier 3 three students for students in K-3.
David, Cynthia	School Counselor	Provide valuable input into the decision making process from their experience with teachers and students. Our counselor provides an array of support to our students and families in the form of mental and emotional health.
Jones, Martisha	Instructional Coach	Instructional coach focused on mathematics instruction and academic teaming K-6
Player, Kimile	Teacher, ESE	Provides ESE services and for ESE students.
Raburn, Shelly	Instructional Coach	Provide coaching to instructional staff in areas of ELA. Also oversees the MTSS process and implementations of interventions.
Simpson, Megan	Teacher, K-12	Provide intensive interventions to tier 2 and tier 3 students in grades 3-6.
Surrency, Ricky	Dean	Oversees discipline and school wide implementation of behavior systems.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 6/1/2019, Mike Tucker

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
38

Total number of students enrolled at the school
710

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
13

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	119	92	97	97	101	108	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	711
Attendance below 90 percent	30	37	40	42	40	45	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
One or more suspensions	2	5	7	7	3	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	6	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	9	10	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	19	24	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	24	26	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	10	17	22	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
	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	2	2	6	8	16	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	5	6	4	13	7	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	67	79	58	90	84	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	465
Attendance below 90 percent	29	15	17	23	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	11	4	7	8	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	7	1	2	5	16	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	3	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	67	79	58	90	84	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	465
Attendance below 90 percent	29	15	17	23	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	11	4	7	8	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	7	1	2	5	16	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	3	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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				39%	46%	57%	42%	43%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	55%	58%	40%	45%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	54%	53%	34%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				49%	51%	63%	47%	52%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	56%	62%	42%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	43%	51%	38%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				33%	41%	53%	29%	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	35%	41%	-6%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	35%	43%	-8%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	42%	-3%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

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	49%	53%	-4%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	44%	4%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	30%	38%	-8%	53%	-23%
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	36	33		38	33		31				
BLK	29	31		29	31		12				

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
HSP	25			25							
MUL	62			77							
WHT	69	58	50	70	61	36	54				
FRL	49	52	36	46	48	40	38				

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	28	49	48	38	61	57	20				
BLK	25	45	46	37	57	50	16				
WHT	53	57	75	59	61	55	50				
FRL	35	49	55	44	56	48	30				

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	29	33	33	26	38	44	12				
BLK	28	37	32	31	32	39	12				
HSP	60			70							
WHT	52	42	38	60	50	31	41				
FRL	41	40	35	47	42	39	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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	340
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	26
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	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	57
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	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Overall proficiency increased across all grade levels and subjects. While learning gains were able to maintain around the same percentage as the previous year, our bottom quartile students had the most regression in both ELA and math.
Our black subgroup continues to emerge as a group not making the same growth as their peers.

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

Our greatest need for improvement is our bottom quartile students in both ELA and math. ELA showing the highest priority with a 20 percentage point regression from the 2019 school year. Our math regressed by 9 percentage points. Also, our black subgroup continues to not make the necessary growth.

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 biggest contributing factor was ultimately the pandemic and a high rate of absenteeism. While the school provided continual virtual instruction, we learned virtual instruction was not the most suitable for students who are already academically behind their peers and lacked the support system at home while working virtually. Even though we are still actively in a pandemic, we have hired several tutors to support our bottom quartile students and ESSA subgroup in ELA and math. We have built in remediation blocks into all our ELA and math blocks for targeted instruction.

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

ELA proficiency showed the most improvement with fourth grade showing the greatest growth. Fourth grade scored above the state average in proficiency and learning gains.

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

Our teachers on that grade level implemented academic teaming and also included a remediation block within each ELA and Math block. We also implemented a three man wheel in our standard classes to allow for a double block of ELA to occur.

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

We plan to continue to be very strategic with our interventions and tutoring. We have added two math tutors to target our bottom quartile and ESSA groups. We also plan to continue with academic

teaming to increase student autonomy. Core instruction will continue to be a high priority ensuring aligned and rigor match the standard.

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.

1) Academic Teaming
2) Weekly PLCs geared towards alignment and rigor between the standard, instruction, materials, and resources.

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

We have added an instructional coach to the leadership team to help with academic teaming and math instruction. We have also added an MTSS coordinator to help ensure students are being monitored and tracked properly. We have added two interventionist to our team who will each provide iii to tier two and three students while also monitoring the implementation of our interventions across all grade levels.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If we build in remedial time into each ELA and math block it will allow for teachers to close the learning gap. We will also have a certified teacher tutors designated for ELA and math targeting this subgroup to help bridge the learning gap currently being exhibited. With this targeted remediation and intervention, our ESSA subgroup's performance should increase both proficiency, learning gains, and bottom quartile for ELA and math.
Measurable Outcome:	Our ESSA subgroup (African-American) will increase our overall Federal Index from 39% to 45%. ELA Bottom Quartile will increase from 35% to 45% Math Bottom Quartile will increase from 41% to 50%
Monitoring:	We will use our Diagnostic 2 data to monitor the desired outcome. We will also monitor student growth monthly in the intervention data to determine if the intervention meeting the needs of the student.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cathy Oyster (coyster@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategically focused Professional Learning Communities. Intentionally structure instructional core to allow for remediation time and interventions. Implementation of evidenced based and state approved interventions by a certified teacher.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows students who receive intentional remediation by a highly qualified teachers, are far more likely to show more than a years worth of growth.

Action Steps to Implement

Hire interventionists for ELA and math

Person Responsible	Mike Tucker (mtucker@my.putnamschools.org)

Using the most up to date data, create a spreadsheet and determine students who would fall into the ESSA subgroup and Bottom Quartile.

Person Responsible	Cathy Oyster (coyster@my.putnamschools.org)

Create a schedule for interventionist to target students in grades K-6.

Person Responsible	Cathy Oyster (coyster@my.putnamschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our proficiency rates have increased over the past two years, however, we recently increased our student body by 225 students. After recalculating our school grade with the additional students included in the data, we can account for a 10% drop across the proficiency cells in both subject areas. Implementing academic teaming and rigor conditions across all content areas, it will increase the opportunity for student engagement resulting in higher proficiency and growth rates.
Measurable Outcome:	Overall ELA proficiency will increase from 39% to 53%. Overall Math proficiency will increase from 49% to 55% Science Achievement will increase from 44% to 46%
Monitoring:	We will use iReady Diagnostics for ELA and Math and USA Test Prep for science to monitor proficiency rates.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cathy Oyster (coyster@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementing academic teaming structures across content areas to increase to increase the opportunity for more student ownership.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Brain research shows that multiple parts of the brain are utilized when students are explaining their understanding and coaching one another. Academic student teaming structures will increase the classroom opportunities for more student talk, justification of viewpoints, and peer teaching.

Action Steps to Implement

Hire an instructional coach that specializes in academic teaming.

Person Responsible	Mike Tucker (mtucker@my.putnamschools.org)

Provide PD on Academic Teaming 101 and set expectations for implementation.

Person Responsible	Cathy Oyster (coyster@my.putnamschools.org)

Conduct condition walks weekly.

Person Responsible	Mike Tucker (mtucker@my.putnamschools.org)

Coach and model academic teaming in classrooms.

Person Responsible	Martisha Jones (mjones@my.putnamschools.org)

Reflect on trends in the Trend Tracker monthly and determine next steps for teachers, coach, and administration.

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.

Looking over the data, a primary concern would be the number of suspensions in 2019-20. We currently are working on behavior management systems to manage behaviors before emotions escalate. The secondary concern would be monitoring students who receive multiple referrals and providing check in opportunities in an effort to defuse behaviors prior to them occurring.

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.

Kelley Smith Elementary School has made monumental strides in improving the collaboration between the school, home, and community. Our school established a PTO and continue to build relationships in the community with business partners and outside agencies. We also work to model service and sacri ce and frequently do outreach projects to build a positive outreach into the community. In the beginning of the year we conduct an Open House during the 1st nine weeks of school to promote education of Title I status and promote home/ school communications and ways to support student learning. Parents will be given a needs survey at that time. We will continue to hold School-wide Data Chats to keep parents informed and updated on their child(ren)'s goals and how they are meeting/not meeting them according to the Pupil Progression Plan. In September we will host Bring your Dad to School, Dads or a representative will enjoy donuts in the cafeteria with their child. In October we hold a family fall night to promote positive relationships. In November, we plan to bring our Bingo For Books Night back to the school to support our other community areas that are closer to the school. In December, host a Christmas literacy night. In February, we plan to have an Invention Convention night for parents and students to show parents the inventions the classes have been working on as they learn the scienti c process during the 2nd semester. In March, we will hold a Spring Parent Night that will focus on upcoming testing in grades 3-5 as well the last IReady diagnostic. Families will be able to ask questions and receive important information related to preparing for testing. From September through March we host a food truck Wednesday lunch. We bring in a local food truck to encourage families to come eat with their child while also promoting a local business. Each month we focus on supporting local charities, facilities, or families to encourage service of others. Finally, in conjunction with the Kiwanis Club of Palatka we hold quarterly Terri c Kids ceremonies to highlight students from each class that have demonstrated good character. We are dedicated to supporting our students' growth/ achievement in all academic areas of Kelley Smith Elementary School.

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

Mike Tucker and Cathy Oyster, administration, foster and promote a culture of inclusivity and positivity with the faculty, staff, students, families, and community
Shelly Raburn and Tish Jones, instructional coaches, promote professional and personal growth of our teachers. They work to remove barriers and support our teachers lending to a healthy supportive culture.
Cindy David, guidance counselor, works with students and local entities to provide for our students who struggle emotionally and financially.
Ricky Surrency, dean, work with students who exhibit chronic behavior issues and develops coping strategies to reduce aggressive behaviors.
PTO acts as a liaison between the school, families, and community.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00