

Putnam County School District

Ochwilla 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 7/1/2019

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)	99%
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 (48%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (44%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

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.

It is the mission of Ochwilla Elementary School 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.

We shape the future of our community by preparing all students for success in college, career, and life.

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
Leary, Beth	Principal	Overall school leadership, quality of teaching and learning, safety and security. Monitors progress aligned with the SIP, iReady Reading, new FAST Assessment Data, and effectiveness of interventions and the MTSS team. Participate in: individual student MTSS/IEP meetings to help remove barriers and align resources, weekly PLCs to establish and monitor expectations in all academic outcomes.
Shelby, John	Assistant Principal	Support school leadership, quality of teaching and learning, safety and security, student behavior and school discipline plan. Support the effectiveness of the MTSS team. Participate in: individual student MTSS/IEP meetings to help remove barriers and align resources, attend PLCs to support expectations and academic outcomes. Monitor FAST Assessment Data and test coordination. In addition, support lesson planning, lead for Title I documentation, maintains all Emergency Operations Plan expectations/protocols, conducts various safety drills that are required monthly and reports that information to the facility director. Establishes effective schedules for Paraprofessional/Custodians to support throughout the school.
Rhymes, Kimberly	School Counselor	MTSS Leadership, Testing Coordinator, Social Emotional Health Instruction and Leadership, Student Counseling, Supports the Data Clerk for student enrollment/placement, Behavior Threat Team Member, and PBS Coordinator.
Barnard, Katherine	Instructional Coach	MTSS Coordinator, Data Analysis for Progress Monitoring/FAST Testing, Assists Teachers with implementation of Tier 2 and 3 progress monitoring, Academic Coaching, Supports Test Coordinator, Provides Professional Learning and PLC Leadership, Supports all core content area instruction and curriculum implementation, BTA Team Member.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Beth Leary

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.*

1

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

21

Total number of students enrolled at the school

391

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

1

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

3

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	56	48	59	52	53	48	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	371
Attendance below 90 percent	18	14	31	25	24	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	1	10	5	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	1	2	9	6	6	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	0	1	9	5	3	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	16	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	16	15	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	24	11	23	17	9	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	3	12	11	14	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	1	0	1	11	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/28/2022

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	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

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	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

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	33%	43%	56%				50%	46%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	49%						47%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						38%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	37%	47%	50%				51%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	62%						48%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						14%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	45%	59%				53%	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	50%	41%	9%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	43%	12%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	42%	2%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
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	47%	46%	1%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	53%	-2%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	44%	5%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	49%	38%	11%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

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	13	39	39	24	49	44	7				
ELL	22	53		27	50						
BLK	17	40	42	20	60	55					
HSP	26	54		24	46						
MUL	12	55		24	50						
WHT	46	50		52	69		46				
FRL	31	49	53	35	64	68	41				
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				

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
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%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
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	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41

Hispanic Students	
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	35
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
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	50
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?

The overall ELA Proficiency is below the state and district proficiency levels. The overall ELA proficiency increase was equal to the overall state increase for the previous school year.

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

Increased Proficiency in Grades 3-6 on ELA Standards and Assessments, which are new to teachers and students.

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

Significant impact over the last two years with low attendance and students not attending face-to-face instruction. Some of the staff are new to these content areas and are learning the skills for quality instruction. The new B.E.S.T. Standards and F.A.S.T. Assessment present challenges for our teachers to transition quickly to new expectations for student outcomes.

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

Science Achievement grew by 17% in one year, and Math Achievement grew by 7% in one year as well. In both cases, teacher placement played a key role in student achievement and additional time was provided for instruction in each content area.

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

In both cases, teacher placement played a key role in student achievement and additional time was provided for instruction in each content area. The teachers have remained the same, additional time for instruction/remediation is still being provided.

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

Identifying our students in Tier 2 for Reading will play a key role for remediation for students closest to proficiency that have a higher statistical likelihood to move toward proficiency by the month of May 2023. Then, successfully implementing the Tier 2 strategies while continuing to implement high yield strategies for Tier 1 instruction throughout the school year. Supporting teachers in their professional development and implementation of instruction aligned to the new standards is critical to the success of student achievement.

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.

District led PLC's, School-based PLC's, support from the school-based MTSS Coordinator, and quality feedback from the administrators during Teacher Observations throughout the school year.

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

Novice Teacher Mentors provide support for Teachers in years 0-4 with their instructional practice. District Learning Communities support teachers in learning the new Reading curriculum, new B.E.S.T. standards in order to help students be successful and prepare for the new FAST assessment. School PLC's will continue to support the teachers deeper understanding of each standard, the curriculum being implemented, and the remedial practices needed to meet the individual needs for all students.

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 Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

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

Historical data indicates the school has a potential to increase Proficiency to be at or above 41%. Our ESSA Subgroups below the 41% threshold are Students With Disabilities, Black/African American Students, and Multiracial Students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we identify and remediate our students in Tier 1 and 2, implement high yield strategies for Tier 1 instruction throughout the school year, support teachers in their professional development and implementation of instruction aligned to the new standards, then by PM3, our Students With Disabilities,, Black/African American, and Multiracial Student will increase proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

The PM1, PM2, Tier 1 & 2 intervention data will all be disaggregated as the year continues on a monthly basis. Also, teachers will focus on the Year-at-a-Glance, instructional strategies, and formative assessment outcomes in PLC meetings with the District Coaches, MTSS TOSA, and Administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Leary (c2leary@my.putnamschools.org)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Professional Learning Communities for planning and implementing High Yield Instructional Strategies for Tier 1 and Tier 2 Strategies. Open Court Curriculum is part of the Tier 1 Instruction for Grades K-3.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Evidence for teacher impact on instructional outcomes has the highest impact on student achievement. Teachers have a new curriculum aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standards and supports student understanding of the STAR and F.A.S.T. Assessment with ongoing Progress Monitoring.

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.

The TOSA and District Coaches will support planning and implementing High Yield Instructional Strategies. The TOSA will support teachers with classroom walkthroughs and specific feedback in addition to administrative observations.

Person Responsible

Katherine Barnard (kbarnard@my.putnamschools.org)

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

Based on 21-22 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, the percentage of students in kindergarten through second grade, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment are as follows:

Kindergarten (6) 13%

Grade 1 (24) 47%

Grade 2 (25) 49%

Implementation of the K-3 Open Court Curriculum and providing High Yield Instructional Strategies aligned to the FL BEST Standards through the Benchmark Curriculum Tools and District Pacing Guide. Continued monitoring of Formal, Informal, and Progress monitoring and providing differentiation and Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction are required best practices.

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

Based on 21-22 FSA ELA data, the percentage of students below Level 3 are as follows:

Grade 3 (30) 57%

Grade 4 (38) 76%

Grade 5 (25) 53%

Implementation of the High Yield Instructional Strategies aligned to the FL BEST Standards through the Benchmark Curriculum Tools and implementing the District Pacing Guide with fidelity are required. Continued monitoring of Formal, Informal, and Progress monitoring, as well as providing differentiation, Tier 2, and Tier 3 instruction are required best practices.

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)

Grade K will score 75% proficiency based on the STAR Assessment.

Grade 1 will shift from 87% proficiency on IReady to 60% proficiency based on the STAR Assessment.

Grade 2 will grow from 53% proficiency on iReady to 58% proficiency based on the STAR Assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Grade 3 will grow from 47% proficiency on iReady to 50% proficiency based on the F.A.S.T. Assessment.

Grade 4 will grow from 24% proficiency on FSA ELA to 50% proficiency based on the F.A.S.T. Assessment.

Grade 5 will grow from 47% proficiency on FSA ELA to 50% proficiency based on the F.A.S.T. Assessment.

Grade 6 will grow from 40% proficiency on FSA ELA to 50% proficiency based on the F.A.S.T. Assessment.

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.

The district assessment calendar provides specific dates for the STAR and F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring and Cumulative Assessments. In addition, iReady will be utilized to compare year-to-year growth for students with previous scores to analyze. The school leadership team will collaborate with teachers during monthly PLC's to monitor Reading assessment data and monitor pacing aligned to the district pacing guide.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Leary, Beth, c2leary@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?

For Tier 1 Instruction, Students in Grades K-3 will receive 30 minutes per day of Open Court Phonics instruction to increase Phonemic Awareness and Phonics in a vertically aligned curriculum to support the fundamental skills in Reading. Students in Grades 4-6 will receive direct instruction with high yield strategies for fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Those students in Grades 4-6 will have standards-based instruction using the new FL B.E.S.T Benchmarks and be monitored regularly with formal and informal assessments. PLC's, planning, and implementation for teachers in Grades K-6 will be monitored by the Administrators, TOSA, District Reading Coach and direct feedback will be provided through iReady and informal conversations related to instructional practice.

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?

Historical evidence indicates Open Court increases students fundamental skills in Reading over time in grades K-3. Standards-aligned instruction also increases student proficiency on informal, formal, and standardized assessments. In each grade level, proficiency is the goal and additional measures for support are in place for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction aligned to the District K-12 Reading Plan.

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
Principal, Vice-Principal, TOSA, District Reading Coach, Reading Interventionist, and Guidance Counselor are the members of the OES Literacy Leadership Team. Their role will be to monitor student data, conduct classroom walkthroughs for trend analysis, guide PLC focal points, and communicate with District Teaching and Learning Department on any needs for Professional Learning and support.	Leary, Beth, c2leary@my.putnamschools.org
Provide Professional Learning in Literacy to ELA Teachers, grades K-6. This will be provided through PLC's twice per month and ongoing support for the remainder of each month for formal and informal support as she is available to our teachers two days per week.	Shettel, Lara, lshettel@my.putnamschools.org
Additional support from the TOSA to all teachers in Grades K-6. She will provide ongoing instructional strategies and Tier 2 strategies for all teachers formally and informally throughout the school year.	Barnard, Katherine, kbarnard@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.

Faculty and staff input is sought using Google forms throughout the year on Title 1 funds, professional development, master schedule and more. In pre-planning, administration shared how positions are allocated and how Title 1 funds are used to make staff aware of how funding is used. My Voice and 5E Data Reflection provide information on how staff are feeling throughout the year so that concerns can be addressed.

Parents are communicated with via Facebook, school newsletter, School Messenger, Class Dojo, Remind and will be implementing Rooms during the school year. Parent events are activities that parents are interested in participating with their children. Parents and teachers are encouraged to conference to discuss student concerns and collaborate together for the good of the child. Parents were asked for their input on a variety of topics and to become members of the SAC, PIDAC or PTO at the Title 1 annual meeting.

Administration maintains an open door policy to parents and staff. Greeting parents as they drop off students in the mornings or pick up their child in the afternoon allows opportunities to make contact with a large number of parents who often share things that help us help their child. Administration makes returning phone calls the same day or no later than 24 hours a priority, letting parents know they are valued.

Pre-planning and Early Release Days provide continuous opportunities to refine the school culture by

building on the positive culture that already exists through team building activities and celebrations of successes.

Leaders value the School Climate and Culture and prioritize the impact on student learning.

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

Principal has spent the last four years working diligently to build a family environment with the faculty, staff, students, and community. There is evidence as you enter the campus with so many of the parents and students knowing all of the staff on a personal level.

Parent Involvement Committee plans and produces events that parents enjoy with their children along with learning how to help their child at home.