

Putnam County School District

Middleton Burney 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	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Middleton Burney Elementary School

1020 HUNTINGTON RD, Crescent City, FL 32112

www.putnamschools.org/o/mbes

Demographics

Principal: Tiffany Scranton

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 (46%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	23

Middleton Burney Elementary School

1020 HUNTINGTON RD, Crescent City, FL 32112

www.putnamschools.org/o/mbes

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	73%

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.

Middleton-Burney Elementary School will ensure high levels of learning for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Middleton-Burney Elementary will work with families and the community to ensure that all students are provided a high level, equitable education that promotes life-long, collaborative learners. Our students will succeed in the 21st century using innovative skills in a goal oriented technology rich environment. (Innovative skills: communication, creativity, critical thinking, collaboration)

In order for all students at Middleton-Burney to learn at high levels we will:

Build positive relationships with families and students.

Commit to being a Professional Learning Community.

Create goals and hold everyone accountable to the achievement of these goals.

Differentiate to fit the enrichment and intervention needs of all students. (there is always room for improvement)

Celebrate all perseverance and hard work.

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
Shelby, John	Principal	Instructional Leader, Professional Development, School Vision and Mission, Staffing, Community Outreach and Business Partnerships, Student Data Monitoring, and Evaluations
Brady, Yolanda	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, Professional Development, ESE Curriculum, Cambridge Coordinator, Student Data Monitoring, MTSS, Discipline, and Evaluations
Williams, Sharice	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, Professional Development, Instructional Coach Leadership Reading Intervention Leader, SAC and Title I Oversight, Student Data Monitoring, School Budgeting, and Evaluations
Wylie, Jade	Math Coach	Instructional Coach for Math, iReady Implementation, and Progress Monitoring Support. Continued support for K-6 teachers in Math Curriculum, Planning, and Instructional Delivery.
Paul, Kerry	Instructional Coach	Support Best Practices in all classrooms, K-6. Implementation of LSI Teaming Strategies Coach and supporting Planning, Delivery, and Reflection of quality instruction.
Fryer, Amanda	Other	MTSS Coordinator and support for Tier 2 and 3 Reading interventions
Slaughter, Shakita	Dean	Maintain Positive Discipline environment at MBES. In addition, she is the Testing Coordinator for MBES.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Tiffany Scranton

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

63

Total number of students enrolled at the school

932

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

6

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	135	150	138	164	109	131	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	961
Attendance below 90 percent	28	59	53	57	44	49	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	340
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	9	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	12	9	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	12	24	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	27	39	57	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	24	39	58	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	178
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	28	57	63	77	24	37	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	317

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	0	1	20	24	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

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	12	9	27	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	122	141	140	135	146	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	812
Attendance below 90 percent	30	23	22	27	34	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	3	8	9	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	38	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	41	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	38	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	0	6	41	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	5	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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	122	141	140	135	146	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	812
Attendance below 90 percent	30	23	22	27	34	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	3	8	9	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	38	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	41	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	38	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	0	6	41	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	5	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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				37%	46%	57%	33%	43%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	55%	58%	42%	45%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	54%	53%	40%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				43%	51%	63%	47%	52%	62%
Math Learning Gains				56%	56%	62%	52%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	43%	51%	46%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				30%	41%	53%	40%	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	33%	41%	-8%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	43%	-4%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2021					
	2019	37%	42%	-5%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	37%	46%	-9%	62%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	53%	-1%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	44%	-5%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	28%	38%	-10%	53%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

IReady Reading and Math Grades K--6. ALEKS Math for 6th Grade.

USA Test Prep for 5th Grade Science.

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

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

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	39	59	20	24	24	17				
ELL	25	43	43	28	39	40	19				
BLK	17	27		14	5		13				
HSP	30	42	44	31	40	41	25				
MUL	39	30		28	30		30				
WHT	39	61		44	46		46				
FRL	29	41	48	28	32	17	26				
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	30	54	50	34	56	40	24				
ELL	30	50	40	37	54	38	19				
BLK	19	52		27	42		21				
HSP	34	54	44	41	55	39	24				
MUL	40	54		40	46						
WHT	52	55	64	54	64	70	43				
FRL	35	55	54	40	55	47	28				
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	19	36	34	25	37	43	13				
ELL	22	36	40	40	51	47	27				
BLK	20	35	27	31	52		19				
HSP	30	42	40	47	54	50	33				
MUL	40	47		55	40						
WHT	45	42		55	50		67				
FRL	32	43	42	47	51	45	39				

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	35
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	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	283

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	35
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	15
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	37
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	31
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

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	47
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	33
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?

Consistent with historical data, our overall Proficiency in ELA and Math are well below state average. With African-American ESSA subgroup falling below the 41% proficiency in 2019, there would have been an increase in ESSA subgroups identified based on local analysis. The Reading and Math standards instruction needs to improve overall and students need to have access to Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

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

Reading in all grade levels is still the priority, but Math is still a major concern after a local analysis of the 2021 FSA scores. Historically low Reading is now matched in low Math after the impact of COVID.

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

After a significant loss of instructional time and face-to-face learning interruptions, students have reduced proficiency to within two percentage of previous lowest scoring in the last five years. Implementing LSI strategies (Teaming 101 and Common Board expectations) quality instruction during all Tier 1 instructional time is critical and ensuring all this time is spent on grade level will be the key. Taking advantage of additional Tier 2 and Tier 3 remedial opportunities will also play a major

role in Learning Gains. Administration has revitalized the Master Schedule for all students, Grades K-6, to make sure Reading exceeds the state requirements with 150 minutes of Reading and provides Math aligned activities in Science coursework.

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

Increased Proficiency in 4th and 5th grade was promising at the time. Since the data is two years old, it is no longer valid or reliable. The two year upward trends were wiped away based on local data analysis of the 2021 FSA scores and some of the iReady progress monitoring in 2020-2021.

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

According to conversations with current and previous administration, students in Reading Block received rigorous instruction using grade level texts and were focused on vocabulary and comprehension. Much of the remediation school-wide was focused on Phonics. With a focus on Tier 3 and Tier 2 remediation, students in need of phonics support will also have time to receive additional support in Comprehension and Vocabulary before the end of the year.

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

The new Cambridge Program will allow students who are nearly at, at, and above grade level to accelerate in all core content areas. This will also include Project-based learning opportunities aligned to the Global Perspectives curriculum for elementary students. The key focus will be on a safe and clean campus.

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.

Teachers and administrators will participate (potentially) in Cambridge face-to-face trainings as available throughout the school year. If those trainings are not available, then online learning opportunities will be offered to our teachers.

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

Our teachers in Grades 2-6 were involved in Teaming 101 training from LSI. This can be used across all disciplines to increase student collaboration and teacher facilitation vs. excessive teacher talk. In addition, the iReady Math supports are in place for students to gain access for remedial opportunities during and after school hours. As we transition standards in Reading and Math, all teachers and administrators will take advantage of professional learning opportunities and be immersed in hands-on learning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA Subgroup for African American students was below the minimum 41% proficiency in 2019 and continued in initial analysis of 2021 school data returns from FSA Reading scores.
Measurable Outcome:	African American subgroup will score at or above 41% proficiency in Reading in Grades 3-6 on the Spring of 2022 on the Florida Standards Assessment.
Monitoring:	Throughout the year, we will monitor student targeted proficiency using iReady for Reading. In addition, students will be supported with Tier 2 interventions using iReady and LLI for Reading, which is analyzed and re-evaluated three times per year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Fryer (afryer@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Direct Instruction for Tier I using Teaming Strategies from LSI. Remedial Strategies for Tier 2 and 3 using iReady, LLI, and SIPPS by Reading Certified/Endorsed Teachers to increase proficiency percentile. Small Group instruction is provided to our Tier 3 students in groups of six or less.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	LSI strategies have shown significant positive impacts in our district over the last three years at the elementary and middle school level. Tier 2 and 3 interventions have been part of the District Reading Plan for two or more years. iReady has been part of a statewide curriculum alignment for three years.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a schedule for Conditions Walks to include local and district support members. Work with the three administrators to collaborate on evidence from Conditions Walks and iObservation data to help classroom teachers provide quality instruction to students.

Person Responsible John Shelby (jshelby@my.putnamschools.org)

Provide LSI Teaming strategy support to all teachers to meet fidelity of practices need in all classrooms.

Person Responsible Kerry Paul (kpaul@my.putnamschools.org)

#2. 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 28% of students in third grade, 25% in fourth grade, and 36% in fifth grade scored a level 3 or above on the ELA FSA. Historical and recent local data review of 2021 FSA data indicates a low level of Proficiency in Reading. It is likely that additional subgroups would have been added to the ESSA Subgroups based upon the 41% expectations.
	We have set a goal of 40% proficiency for all students in Grades 3-6 on the FSA and FSAA for the Spring 2022 testing in Reading.
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>35 Percent in Grade K (Currently 34 students in Tier 2/3)</p> <p>35 Percent in Grade 1 (Currently 90 students in Tier 2/3)</p> <p>35 Percent in Grade 2 (Currently 85 students in Tier 2/3)</p> <p>Increase students scoring Level 3 or above on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Targets for Grades 3-6 include:</p> <p>35 Percent in Grade 3 (Currently 104 students in Tier 2/3)</p> <p>42 Percent in Grade 4 (Currently 46 students in Tier 2/3)</p> <p>42 Percent in Grade 5 (Currently 52 students in Tier 2/3)</p> <p>42 Percent in Grade 6 (Currently 40 students in Tier 2/3)</p>
Monitoring:	There are 3 iReady Assessments for Progress Monitoring that have shown statistically accurate results at the elementary level in the past. This raw data will allow our teachers and administrators to monitor student mastery as the year continues.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kerry Paul (kpaul@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>LSI Teaming 101 Strategies will be used in the classroom for small group instruction. District Unit builds with Rigorous Learning Targets and Tasks are specific to standards mastery. Pacing instruction which aligns to the District Curriculum Map will also be a focal point to ensure all students have been provided the instruction in all state standards in ELA/Reading. Teacher PLC's also provide data driven conversations for student data and allow for direct and remedial instruction based upon student evidence.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>LSI has statistical data that shows increased scores in multiple schools within our district. LSI Learning Targets and Success Criteria allow for Target and Task alignment for state standards driven instruction at a pace that provides the rigor and completion of all standards prior to state assessments in the Spring. Student data monitoring in PLC's has proven for many years to have a positive impact on teacher development and student achievement. 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.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

ESSA Subgroup for African American students was below the minimum 41% proficiency in 2019 and continued in initial analysis of 2021 school data returns from FSA Math scores.

Measurable Outcome: African American subgroup will score at or above 41% proficiency in Math in Grades 3-6 on the Spring of 2022 on the Florida Standards Assessment.

Monitoring: Throughout the year, we will monitor student targeted proficiency using iReady for Math, as well as ALEKS Math. In addition, students will be supported with after school tutoring in Math if they choose to attend.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jade Wylie (jwylie@my.putnamschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Direct Instruction for Tier I using Teaming Strategies from LSI. Supported Tier I Direct Instruction for Math will be enhanced by classroom modeling and support by our Math Coach, Mrs. Jade Wylie.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

LSI strategies have shown significant positive impacts in our district over the last three years at the elementary and middle school level. iReady has been part of a statewide curriculum alignment for three years and shows data trends that are reliable growth measures for student mastery and learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a schedule for Conditions Walks to include local and district support members. Work with the three administrators to collaborate on evidence from Conditions Walks and iObservation data to help classroom teachers provide quality instruction to students.

Person

Responsible John Shelby (jshelby@my.putnamschools.org)

Push-in support for Math Teachers after each PLC Meeting and at the request of our Teachers.

Person

Responsible Jade Wylie (jwylie@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.

The overall reduction in discipline referrals has been a success at MBES. We had a total of 16 students with one or more suspensions. Only three students had two or more suspension incidents, so we limited the impact of behavior minimizing instructional time. For the three students with more than one suspension, our Dean will be in close contact with those students and teachers to support PBIS, behavior support in the classroom, and if necessary a Behavior Plan to help modify existing negative behaviors.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The MBES Faculty and Staff are consistently addressed as "Family". The culture and climate within the school is consistently positive in nature and when concerns arise, that allows for administration, grade levels, Leadership Team members, and individual Faculty and Staff to create a conversation that leads back to an understanding of our school Mission, Vision, and Values. The TRIBE expectations are part of our student, faculty and staff daily expectations that are addressed daily in the morning announcements as such:

I am Trustworthy
I show and give Respect
I act with Integrity
I demonstrate what it means to be Brave
I exhibit Excellence in all that I do

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

Principal and Assistant Principals deliver the TRIBE Expectations daily.
Guidance Counselors consistently work with Social Emotional Learning opportunities.
Leadership Team provide positive feedback to teachers and students as they mentor and monitor for learning.
Dean holds high expectations for positive behavior, and provides rewards for those who hold themselves accountable for positive behavior.
Classroom teachers implement PBS in all classrooms.
All Faculty and Staff are involved in Family environment and uphold their positive relationships with peers as a norm.

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				\$46,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22

			0251 - Middleton Burney Elementary	Other		\$46,000.00
			Notes: Additional Reading Intervention Teacher paid for by Bottom 300 Funding to support Lowest 25% in Reading Proficiency.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American				\$0.00
Total:						\$46,000.00