

Putnam County School District

Robert H. Jenkins, Jr Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Robert H. Jenkins, Jr Elementary School

251 S STATE ROAD 315, Interlachen, FL 32148

www.putnamschools.org/o/ies

Demographics

Principal: Paula Adams

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (45%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: 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	ATSI
* 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Robert H. Jenkins, Jr Elementary School

251 S STATE ROAD 315, Interlachen, FL 32148

www.putnamschools.org/o/ies

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	27%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Putnam County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Weaver, Libby	Principal	Libby Weaver, principal, will accept responsibility for the instructional vision and management of all school functions by delegating, observing, following through, and coaching of the employees. She will evaluate all employees and keep the leadership team focused on the mission of ensuring student success.
Lee, Chris	Assistant Principal	Chris Lee will accept responsibility for assisting the principal to maintain the instructional vision and management of all school functions by delegating, observing, following through, and coaching of the employees. He will assist with the evaluation of all employees and with keeping the leadership team focused on the mission of ensuring student success.
Holley, Mary Arlene	Dean	Arlene Holley will process discipline referrals, assist teachers with classroom management, insure compliance with behavior threat assessment protocols, support conflict resolution efforts and support the administration with maintaining a positive school culture.
DeLoach, Jennifer	Other	Jennifer DeLoach will plan and manage school wide PBIS efforts, maintain school social media, plan and implement rewards and incentives, plan activities and incentives to promote a positive staff morale and establish, implement and support systems for an overall positive school culture.
Redman, Valerie Lynn	Other	Lynn Redman will lead the MTSS/RtI process at Jenkins Elementary and work in conjunction with Lisa Massey, lead intervention teacher, to provide, monitor and support identified interventions for students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 of the MTSS process. Mrs. Redman will also facilitate the school wide Accelerated Reading Effort.
Mason, Ashley	Instructional Coach	Ashley Mason will support highly effective classroom practices focusing on academic teaming and engagement. She will provide professional development through targeted feedback cycles and PLCs.
Massey, Lisa	Other	Lisa Massey will provide, monitor and support identified interventions for students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 of the MTSS
Farrar, Susan	School Counselor	Susan Farrar will provide SEL support to students and staff and be the voice of and advocate for our most vulnerable children as well as manage state testing.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mills, Georgette	Other	George Mills will serve as bridge between the deans office and the guidance office. She will be a student advocate who focuses on social skill development for students who need additional support beyond the classroom.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Paula Adams

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Total number of students enrolled at the school

908

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

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	118	131	118	146	104	126	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	869
Attendance below 90 percent	28	67	61	76	50	54	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	397
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	1	2	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	2	25	25	31	14	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Course failure in Math	2	11	16	29	12	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	26	25	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	27	26	29	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	142
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	54	57	62	66	46	58	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	404

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	23	20	38	20	17	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	153

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	8	8	33	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/2/2022

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	5	13	18	25	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	2	0	23	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	5	13	18	25	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	2	0	23	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	40%	43%	56%				44%	46%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						52%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						53%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	39%	47%	50%				48%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	57%						58%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						41%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	45%	59%				45%	41%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	36%	41%	-5%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	43%	3%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	44%	42%	2%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	43%	46%	-3%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	53%	1%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	43%	44%	-1%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	44%	38%	6%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	16	35	28	18	49	47	21				
ELL	27	47		32	57						
BLK	33	50		29	56						
HSP	33	52	40	31	56	44	27				
MUL	43	59		48	71						
WHT	41	52	37	42	57	50	43				
FRL	36	48	34	35	57	53	33				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	13	12	13	18	12	6	15				
ELL	14			23							
BLK	16			16							
HSP	30	38		27	20		33				
MUL	41			50							
WHT	33	34	29	36	32	27	32				
FRL	31	38	33	31	32	17	34				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	19	50	50	24	51	45	21				
ELL	38			56	70						
BLK	25			40							
HSP	48	63	67	53	63		30				
MUL	42	32		50	55		40				
WHT	44	52	51	47	57	40	49				
FRL	41	50	51	43	53	43	38				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	46
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

All content areas saw between a five and eight percent increase in proficiency with overall learning gains ranging between 17 and 26 percent. Bottom quartile gains ranged between 13 and 34 percent. Although overall increases were noted in each area, proficiency numbers still trail the pre COVID effort from four to nine percent.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

All areas of proficiency demonstrate a need for improvement. Bottom quartile reading is the component of greatest concern.

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

Multiple factors contributed to this need for improvement including: high absenteeism of students, high absenteeism of teacher, and holes in foundational learning as a result of the COVID 19 Pandemic.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Mathematics Learning Gains showed the greatest improvement.

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

Contributing factors include: more consistent instruction as a result of returning to brick and mortar schooling, the consistent implementation of the use of student teaming, learning targets and success criteria, close monitoring and adherence to the district pacing guide as well as a focus on teacher planning and preparation.

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

First and foremost, instructional personnel must become intimately familiar with the B.E.S.T. standards for Reading and Mathematics. Also, continue the consistent implementation of the use of student teaming, learning targets and success criteria. Close monitoring and adherence to the district pacing guide. A continued focus on teacher planning and preparation with an emphasis on target/task alignment.

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.

Bimonthly whole school PLCs focused on: school culture, data disaggregation and strategy development
Participation in formal coaching cycles
Planning with a district coach
Countywide Grade Level Learning Communities
Side by side coaching opportunities using school based strategy coach and/or district content specialists
Increased implementation of school based Look and Learns

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

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

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The SWD sub group was identified as an area of critical need because the data reviewed indicated that SWD overall Federal Index was 31% falling well below the 41% threshold.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

JES will increase the SWD Federal Index to 42% for grades three through six.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored using: PCSD Trend Walk data, Marzano's Evaluation and Coaching Tool, Benchmark Advance Unit Assessments, Florida Reveal Mathematics Unit Assessments, iReady Diagnostic Results, ALEKS Progression, and F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Libby Weaver (eweaver@my.putnamschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The evidence-based strategies being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome are:

K-3 Open Court Foundational Skills Kits

K-6 Benchmark Advance

K-6 Florida Reveal Mathematics

(SIPPS) Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words

(LLI) Leveled Literacy Intervention

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The identified evidence-based strategies meet Florida's definition of evidence-based and are adopted curricula of the PCSD.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

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 2022 iReady Reading Diagnostic showed 43% scoring early grade level or below grade level - 10% of kindergarten students still scoring early grade level or below grade level, 55% of first grade students scoring early grade level or below grade level and 65% of second grade students scoring early grade level or below grade level.

Based on this data, instruction in reading must be rigorous, targeted and standards aligned.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

This school has been identified under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence Act (RAISE) as needing to focus on improving student reading outcomes. FSA data from Spring 2022 showed 60% of students in grades 3 - 6 scoring below grade level - 35% of 3rd grade students below grade level, 50% of 4th grade students below grade level and 39% of 5th grade students below grade level.

Based on this data, instruction in reading must be rigorous, targeted and standards aligned.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Increase students scoring at or above grade level on the Spring F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring Assessment. Targets for Grade Levels include:

K = 75%

1st = 60%

2nd = 55%

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Increase students scoring Level 3 or above on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Targets for Grades 3-6 include:

3rd = 50 %

4th = 50 %

5th = 55 %

6th = 50 %

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

This area of focus will be monitored using: PCSD Trend Walk data, Marzano's Evaluation and Coaching Tool, Benchmark Advance Unit Assessments, iReady Diagnostic Results, and F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Weaver, Libby, eweaver@my.putnamschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The evidence-based strategies being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome are:

K-3 Open Court Foundational Skills Kits

K-6 Benchmark Advance

(SIPPS) Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words

(LLI) Leveled Literacy Intervention

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The identified evidence-based strategies meet Florida's definition of evidence-based, are aligned to the Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, align with the PCSD K-12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan and are adopted curricula of the PCSD.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership: We will need to strengthen core instruction by: adhering to the adopted county curriculum, guarding academic learning time, increasing student ownership through academic teaming and aggressively target teacher growth and development.	Weaver, Libby, eweaver@my.putnamschools.org
Literacy Coaching - Bimonthly whole school PLCs focused on: school culture, data disaggregation and strategy development, Participation in formal coaching cycles, Planning with a district coach, Countywide Grade Level Learning Communities, Side by side coaching opportunities using school based strategy coach and/or district content specialists	Mason, Ashley, amason@my.putnamschools.org
Professional Learning - Bimonthly whole school PLCs focused on: school culture, data disaggregation and strategy development, Participation in formal coaching cycles, Planning with a district coach, Countywide Grade Level Learning Communities, Side by side coaching opportunities using school based strategy coach and/or district content specialists	Weaver, Libby, eweaver@my.putnamschools.org
Assessment - Use progress monitoring data gathered from Benchmark Advance Unit Assessments, iReady Reading Diagnostic Assessments, and F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring Assessments to drive instruction and inform remediation. Data disaggregation will be incorporated into monthly school wide PLCs. Data from progress monitoring assessments will be used to inform W.I.N. Lab Placement (Tier 2 and 3 Interventions) as well as Tier 1 small group interventions.	Redman, Valerie Lynn, vredman@my.putnamschools.org

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

Parent and family involvement is necessary for maintaining a positive school culture. Our goal is to have 95% of all parents involved in some capacity in their child's education at Jenkins. We would like this involvement to contain 2-way communication. This will be accomplished and documented through the acknowledgement and input in the development of the ParentStudent-Teacher compact, in-pup into the PFEP, as well as soliciting parent input into how parent and family involvement funds are spent. As always, more traditional communication like face to face parent conferences, positive and concern based phone calls, and notes home will be utilized. We will offer activities at varied times

throughout the school year as well as provide food and child care when necessary to alleviate barriers preventing parent attendance.

(Sign in sheets, agendas and related handouts will serve as documentation of this effort.)

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

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

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

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

Prior to the start of school, faculty and staff were trained in the basics of trauma informed care and the importance of establishing and maintaining positive relationships. A renewed emphasis was placed on the establishment of positive school wide behavior interventions, establishing and adhering to the common language of Responsibility, Integrity, Safety and Effort. A new school pledge was established around this common language as well as the school theme for the year, "Rams on the R.I.S.E."