

Putnam County School District

Ochwilla 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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Ochwilla Elementary School

299 N STATE ROAD 21, Hawthorne, FL 32640

www.putnamschools.org/o/oes

Demographics

Principal: Beth Leary

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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)	99%
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 (43%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (45%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Ochwilla Elementary School

299 N STATE ROAD 21, Hawthorne, FL 32640

www.putnamschools.org/o/oes

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	44%

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 is to provide a student centered, safe and caring environment that promotes academic excellence, reflects diversity, celebrates the joy of learning, and equips all students with knowledge and tools to achieve their full potential in an ever-changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ochwilla Elementary School, in partnership with stakeholders and the entire community, will shape the future of our community by preparing all students for success in college, career, and life.

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
Leary, Beth	Principal	Serves as the educational leader, selecting and supervising implementation of curriculum, ensures that all students are supervised in a safe, child-centered learning environment that meets and exceeds the state standards, monitors learning through classroom observations, hires new staff members and ensures they have the training and coaching needed to successfully educate students. As chief administrator, implements and manages the policies, regulations and procedures of the Board of Education and of the Putnam County School District.
Haengel, Ted	Assistant Principal	Serves as support for the Principal, ensuring the education of students meets or exceeds the state standards and implementation of policies and procedures as outlined by the Board of Education and the Putnam County School District.
Lee, Jillian	Instructional Coach	Monitors MTSS within the school, supports teachers in implementing curriculum, effective instructional practices, strategies for students to learn and coordinates PLCs. Coaches and mentors teachers who need support or may be struggling. Collects and evaluates student data.
Rhymes, Kimberly	School Counselor	Serves as counselor and support for students with social emotional needs, MTSS for behavior, testing coordinator, truancy coordinator, and provides behavioral support to students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Beth Leary

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.*

12

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

19

Total number of students enrolled at the school

382

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

13

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

14

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	50	51	53	67	54	50	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	379
Attendance below 90 percent	8	23	16	29	16	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	11	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	6	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	11	20	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	21	17	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	11	15	15	30	5	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	0	3	13	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	2	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	54	55	52	68	53	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	340
Attendance below 90 percent	25	21	26	13	21	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	3	4	1	4	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	17	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	21	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	3	0	3	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	54	55	52	68	53	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	340
Attendance below 90 percent	25	21	26	13	21	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	3	4	1	4	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	17	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	21	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	3	0	3	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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				50%	46%	57%	41%	43%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	55%	58%	43%	45%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	54%	53%	57%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				51%	51%	63%	50%	52%	62%
Math Learning Gains				48%	56%	62%	45%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				14%	43%	51%	29%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				53%	41%	53%	44%	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	50%	41%	9%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	43%	12%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	42%	2%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	47%	46%	1%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	53%	-2%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	44%	5%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

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.

The data below was taken from the I-Ready ELA and Math Diagnostics that are given three times a year. Students scoring on/above grade level were used in the data for this chart. Below are our 2 ESSA Subgroups which are SWD and Black (in the ELL section). This is data from our 2020-21 I-Ready Diagnostic Assessments in the Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18%	24%	69%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0%	17%	57%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28%	20%	41%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	17%	17%	29%
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17%	14%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28%	20%	41%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	17%	17%	29%
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34%	40%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	33%	44%	66%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22%	32%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0%	44%	55%
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38%	13%	11%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22%	32%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0%	44%	55%
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38%	13%	11%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22%	32%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0%	44%	55%
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38%	13%	11%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22%	32%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0%	44%	55%
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38%	13%	11%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22%	32%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0%	44%	55%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37%	43%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	25%	60%	80%
	English Language Learners	47%	30%	53%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12%	23%	38%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0%	60%	80%
	English Language Learners	18%	15%	24%
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13%	30%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0%	8%	15%
	English Language Learners	9%	0%	18%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0%	15%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	16%
	English Language Learners	0%	18%	36%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26%	26%	26%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	9%	18%	9%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19%	22%	22%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	10%	13%	10%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			45%
	Students With Disabilities			33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	English Language Learners			
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	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	15			22	11		10				
ELL	24			29							
BLK	21	17		12			7				
HSP	21			33							
WHT	43	24		40	17		31				
FRL	31	24	36	29	18	20	21				
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	23	32	27	33	38	20	33				
ELL	64			55							
BLK	27	42		28	39		50				
HSP	46	50		46	36						
WHT	57	46	36	56	49	8	55				
FRL	45	40	37	46	41	17	45				
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	23	32		42	43						
BLK	21	55	70	32	30						
HSP	47	46		45	43						
WHT	44	33		56	47		55				
FRL	37	48	55	44	43	22	41				

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	27
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	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	217
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	12
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	11
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	27
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	31
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	28
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 trends show that our student population proficiency rate decreases as students progress from 1st grade to 6th grade in ELA. I-Ready ELA Diagnostic shows that in the Spring first graders have a proficiency rate of 69%, fourth graders have a proficiency rate of 34%, and fifth graders have a proficiency rate in of 26%.

The trend also shows that the number of students who are proficient in ELA is higher than those that score in the proficiency range in Math. Our first through fifth graders have an average ELA proficiency rate on the Spring I-Ready Diagnostic of 47%. The Spring Math I-Ready Diagnostic average for first through fifth graders is 34%.

Students With Disabilities continues to be the subgroup with the lowest proficiency rate. In 2019 our SWD population was 23% proficient and 32% showed growth.

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

Our greatest need for improvement is our Students With Disabilities subgroup. FSA data shows their ELA proficiency rate (23%) and learning gains (32%) are far below those in our other subgroups.

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

Transitions in the teaching position for our ESE self-contained and resource students, along with changes in students who previously were alternatively assessed now having to take FSA.

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

There were no components that showed great improvements. Our white students improved ELA proficiency from 44% in 2018 to to 57% in 2019.

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

We required all of our ELA teachers to implement the "Unit Builds" the district provided. This curriculum focused on our standards and provided our students with the rigor that correlates with the standard.

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

Research proven, evidence based strategies will be used with students scoring below grade level on the I-Ready Diagnostic. Students will be evaluated three times a year to provide the appropriate interventions for each child to become successful. Highly qualified, reading endorsed teachers will be providing daily interventions to all students scoring below grade level according to the I-Ready Diagnostic.

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.

Intervention teachers will be given training in the approved intervention programs listed in the district K-12 Reading Plan. Professional development and planning support on a weekly basis by the district reading coach and biweekly by the district math coach.

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

We have scheduled a 45 minute intervention block for each grade level every day. Tier 2 and Tier 3 students in kindergarten through sixth grades will be remediated at the level and in the areas they are deficient as determined by our I-Ready Diagnostic. Students will be placed in homogenous small groups that focus on their needs. Tier 1 students will receive enrichment to enhance their reading abilities.

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 36% of students in third grade, 29% in fourth grade, and 28% 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 60 Percent in Grade 1 60 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>36 Percent in Grade 3 53 Percent in Grade 4 44 Percent in Grade 5 43 Percent in Grade 6</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Core ELA instruction will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs and observations. Progress monitoring in all grades through iReady and 2nd - 6th grades using Standards Mastery assessments.</p> <p>Tier 2 and 3 students' progress will be monitored through formative assessments in their intervention class as well as their progress on their I-Ready Diagnostic. Students are assessed biweekly to ensure they are progressing appropriately.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beth Leary (c2leary@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are using both LLI and SIPPS to provide intervention strategies to our Tier 3 students. Tier 2 students will also receive lessons from FCRR, I-Ready and ACT to target their deficiencies.
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

1. Administration created a master schedule that allows for 45-minutes at each grade level during which interventions occur.
2. Identify students in Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 based on iReady Fall Diagnostic and the Putnam County School District K-12 Reading Plan.
3. Assign Tier 3 students to Reading Endorsed Teacher to provide interventions. Assign Tier 1 and 2 students a teacher to provide interventions or enrichment.
4. Teachers, ESE teacher trained in providing interventions.
5. Student growth will be measured by bi-weekly assessments and documented on a Progress Monitoring Log,
6. SWD and Black/African American subgroup data will be monitored by the Leadership Team. Adjustments will be made accordingly.
7. All students will receive on grade level instruction in a 90-minute reading block.

Person Responsible Beth Leary (c2leary@my.putnamschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In 2019, 23% of Students with Disabilities scored a Level 3 or higher on the ELA portion of the FSA.
37% of our subgroup, African Americans, scored a level 3 or higher on the ELA portion of the FSA.

Measurable Outcome: 40% of our Students with Disabilities will score at or above Level 3 on the ELA portion of the FSA.
40% of our African American students will score a level 3 or higher on the ELA portion of the FSA.

Monitoring: Interventionist will identify and monitor the progress of our African American students and students with an IEP. She will place them in intervention groups that will focus on their deficiencies. These groups will meet for 45 minutes daily. Their progress will be monitored bi-weekly and adjusted accordingly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Beth Leary (c2leary@my.putnamschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: We are using both LLI and SIPPS to provide intervention strategies to our Tier 3 students. Tier 2 students will also receive lessons from FCRR, I-Ready and ACT to target their deficiencies.

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

1. Administration created a master schedule that allows for 45-minutes at each grade level during which interventions occur.
2. Identify students in Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 based on iReady Fall Diagnostic and the Putnam County School District K-12 Reading Plan.
3. Assign Tier 3 students to Reading Endorsed Teacher to provide interventions. Assign Tier 1 and 2 students a teacher to provide interventions or enrichment.
4. Teachers, ESE teacher trained in providing interventions.
5. Student growth will be measured by bi-weekly assessments and documented on a Progress Monitoring Log,
6. SWD and Black/African American subgroup data will be monitored by the Leadership Team. Adjustments will be made accordingly.
7. All students will receive on grade level instruction in a 90-minute reading block.

Person Responsible Beth Leary (c2leary@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.

We are implementing Caring Schools Community. This curriculum helps students make choices that benefit themselves as well as their peers. Our discipline data put our school in number 2 for the district. We are proud of our data and look forward to continuing this. Working with our guidance counselor, MTSS Coordinator, and Interventionist we can help all students learn the strategies needed to persevere in the classroom and deescalate situations.

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.

Parents were asked to provide feedback for our Home-School Compact. We also encourage our families to communicate with us concerning any questions or concerns they may have.

We have weekly PLC's that address curriculum, academic, and social/emotional needs.

Our school has a variety of committees that address academics, PBIS, rewards, incentives, attendance, etc.

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

The Leadership Team comprised of the Principal, Vice Principal, Guidance Counselor and MTSS TOSA encourage and promote the PBIS committee. The PBIS Committee is made up of teachers, paraprofessionals, and other staff members who establish school wide expectations, rewards for individual students and classes who represent the Ochwilla Owl expectations.

The Leadership Team set goals and promotes incentives for students to achieve those goals.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
---	--------	---	--------

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00