James A. Long Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

James A. Long Elementary School

1400 OLD JACKSONVILLE RD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/jal

Demographics

Principal: Beth Nelson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/14/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

James A. Long Elementary School

1400 OLD JACKSONVILLE RD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/jal

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 KG-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	48%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		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.

James A. Long Elementary is committed to engaging students in a rigorous academic and student centered learning environment while maintaining positive relationships with all students and families.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The teachers and staff at James A. Long will work together to prepare our students academically, socially, and emotionally to achieve success for their futures.

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
Nelson, Beth	Principal	School Improvement Plan Budget Creation and Monitoring Employee Evaluation Hiring Employees Coordinating Professional Development District Data Presentations
Adams, Paula	Assistant Principal	Safety and Security Contact Title 1 Audit Box and Parent Involvement Plan SBTAT Leader Website Employee Evaluation
Wright-Purifoy, Jennifer	Administrative Support	Counseling Support and Referrals Social/Emotional Concerns ESE Liaison ESOL/ELL 504 Coordinator School Testing Coordinator
Johns, Holly	Administrative Support	MTSS Coordinator Postive Behavior Support Initiatives Community Liaison Social Security Forms Food and Clothing Closet
Polite, Darrell	Administrative Support	Behavior Intervention Plans Referral Review Discipline Matters Positive Behavior Support Classroom Management Support
McGahey, Kelli	Instructional Coach	Lesson Planning Assistance Curriculum Support and Materials Student Data Spelling Bee New Worlds Reading Coordinator Student Promotion 3rd Grade Portfolios

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/14/2021, Beth Nelson

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

559

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

5

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

5

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	76	101	77	72	91	65	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	561
Attendance below 90 percent	23	52	34	29	36	32	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	247
One or more suspensions	0	3	9	9	12	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA	4	9	15	1	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	2	8	13	0	3	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	17	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	27	23	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	15	25	26	20	12	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	119

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	3	10	12	6	16	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	99	82	80	87	62	79	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	555
Attendance below 90 percent	19	38	24	31	22	40	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	8	6	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	6	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	13	29	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	22	34	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	23	27	28	34	15	26	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	161

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	2	5	9	21	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	9	20	5	11	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	99	82	80	87	62	79	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	555
Attendance below 90 percent	19	38	24	31	22	40	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	8	6	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	6	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	13	29	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	22	34	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	23	27	28	34	15	26	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	161

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	2	5	9	21	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	9	20	5	11	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	48%	43%	56%				56%	46%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	55%	61%				54%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	49%	52%				41%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	46%	45%	60%				55%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	61%	58%	64%				60%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	55%	55%				40%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	36%	51%				51%	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	56%	41%	15%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	50%	43%	7%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	42%	10%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

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	53%	46%	7%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	53%	9%	64%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	44%	0%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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	27	50	61	26	48	60	39				
BLK	31	52	63	26	57	58	24				
HSP	67	82		56	64						
MUL	40			50							
WHT	56	63	68	55	62	67	59				
FRL	46	59	69	42	60	68	44				
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	28	36		35	36	10	14				
BLK	22	26	45	23	26		22				
HSP	17			33							
WHT	47	43		47	36		46				
FRL	30	42	47	28	31	8	33				
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	24	33	31	21	48	41	8				
BLK	31	41	33	35	49	38	18				
WHT	63	57	41	63	64	42	64				
FRL	46	46	39	45	55	39	47				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	387
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	44
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	67
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	45
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 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	61
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	55
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?

Our school brought up scores in every component including our subgroups.

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

The data components that show the greatest need for improvement are proficiency in math 46% and reading 48%.

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

A great number of students had poor attendance during the past few school years because of the pandemic. Attendance incentives need to be implemented.

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

The lowest quartile in reading and math showed the most improvement. Reading was 47% in 2021 and increased to 65% in 2022. Math was 12% in 2021 and increased to 63% in 2022.

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

There was small group tutoring for the targeted lowest 25% students.

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

Quality core instruction in every classroom will accelerate learning. Learning community participation (district level) will help with planning and best practices for teaching the new curriculum material.

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.

Weekly PLC meetings focused around data and planning for quality core instruction will be implemented at the school.

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

Classroom walk throughs and trend walks will take place utilizing admin team members as well as district staff. Results will be shared with teachers. District staff members who specialize in math and ELA instruction are invited and encouraged to participate in our grade level Professional Learning Communities. Title 1 money will be used to pay teachers after school to plan and collaborate to improve instruction.

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	James A. Long reading proficiency is below 50%. It is currently at 48%. James A. Long math proficiency is below 50%. It is currently at 46%
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The goal is for James A. Long students to achieve 51% proficiency or higher on the FAST ELA and math state assessment in the spring of 2023.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will monitor the results of the second iReady diagnostic as well as the second FAST. Third through sixth grade take unit tests on a platform called School City. Progress will be monitored after each unit test by grade level teams and the school based literacy team.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beth Nelson (bnelson@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Student centered learning is encouraged daily through team tasks during core instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	If students are working in groups on team tasks that are aligned with grade level benchmarks then they are all engaged and actively participating in their learning.

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.

Professional Learning Communities will focus on developing team tasks that are aligned with grade level benchmarks for every core instruction lesson.

Person Responsible	Kelli McGahey (kmcgahey@my.putnamschools.org)

Formal observations will include Element 16 (Organizing Students To Interact With Content) from iObservation. In the pre-planning conference teachers will share how they plan to organize students into groups to facilitate the learning of content. Feedback will be given regarding team tasks.

Person Responsible	Beth Nelson (bnelson@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

The goal is for all grade levels at James A. Long to have literacy scores at 51% or higher in 2022-2023. Our area of focus is to increase literacy achievement by having importance placed on student centered learning through student engagement in team tasks.

Final scores from last years' i Ready progress monitoring indicate that 67% of our kindergarten students were mid or above grade level at the end of the year, 36% of our first graders were mid or above grade level, 51% of our 2nd graders were mid or above grade level and 45 % of our third graders were mid or above grade level. This data shows that the greatest area in need of improvement would be our first graders who are now second graders.

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

The goal is for all grade levels at James A. Long to have literacy scores at 51% or higher in 2022-2023. Our area of focus is to increase literacy achievement by having importance placed on student centered learning through student engagement in team tasks.
Third, Fourth, and Fifth grade ELA proficiency scores were all below 50% and are all critical need grades. The percentage of students who were not on track on the 2022 FSA state test were as follows:
3rd-63%
4th-53%
5th-59%

The lowest performing grade level would be our third graders who are now in 4th grade.

There were three students retained in third grade who did not pass summer reading camp.

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)

Outcome to achieve: The goal is for 51% of students in K-2 to be at or above benchmark at the end of the year.

September 2022
Kindergarten-52 % not on benchmark for progress monitoring 1 in STAR Early Literacy
1st grade- 48% not on benchmark for progress monitoring 1 in in STAR Early Literacy
2nd grade- 40% not on benchmark for progress monitoring in September in STAR Early Literacy

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Outcome to achieve: The goal is for 51% of students or higher to achieve a 3 or higher on the state FAST assessment.

Third, Fourth, and Fifth grade ELA proficiency scores were all below 50% and are all critical need grades. The percentage of students who were not on track on the 2022 FSA state test were as follows:
3rd-63%
4th-53%
5th-59%

September 2022
Third-82% of students are not on track to make a level 3 according to the first FAST progress monitoring
Fourth-79% of students are not on track to make a level 3 according to the first FAST progress monitoring
Fifth-65% of students are not on track to make a level 3 according to the first FAST progress monitoring

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 school's ELA area of focus was for students to score a 51% or higher on the F.A.S.T. iReady first ,second, and third diagnostics will be monitored as well as FAST data from progress monitoring. Trend walk data will be used to monitor quality instruction. Teacher attention to student centered learning by using team tasks will be monitored during formal observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Nelson, Beth, bnelson@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?

Our school is using Open Court phonics in grades K-3 and Benchmark Advance for core ELA instruction. Yes, these programs align with the district's K-12 Evidence based reading plan, align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, and meet the strong, moderate, or promising definition.

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?

Using an instructional materials rubric, the following components were rated: research alignment, areas of reading (vocabulary development, comprehension, writing, communication , complexity, explicit instruction, real world connections, multicultural representation, and sequential instruction. The Benchmark Advance program addresses our ELA needs and shows a proven record of effectiveness for the target population. Open Court phonics was chosen for its proven level of effectiveness in the area of phonics.

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 Team 1. The literacy leadership team will meet monthly to use data to track ELA progress. 2. Walk throughs will be scheduled using a trend walk template and Marzano evaluation system.	Nelson, Beth, bnelson@my.putnamschools.org
Literacy Coaching 1. Student data will be analyzed to determine areas of focus 2. The academic coach will complete coaching cycles with targeted participants.	McGahey, Kelli, kmcgahey@my.putnamschools.org
Assessment 1. Periodic unit assessments in SchoolCity 2. State progress monitoring 3x per year and iReady diagnostics 3x per year	Nelson, Beth, bnelson@my.putnamschools.org
Professional Learning 1. Teachers will attend Professional Learning Communities at the district level. 2. Teachers will utilize Kickup to implement their bridge to practice activities for professional development.	Nelson, Beth, bnelson@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.

The faculty and staff got together over the 2022 summer break and created expectations that begin with the letters of our mascot (LIONS). L=Leading I=Inspiring Others O=Owning Our Actions N=Never Giving Up S=Staying Safe. The theme chosen with faculty and staff input is Shine On!

Daily announcements remind students of the school theme, celebrate student success, and encourage good citizenship.

Students earn individual positive behavior points and class positive behavior points for rewards.

The school teams with the Kiwanis Club quarterly to conduct the Terrific Kid Program. A student with good character is chosen to represent each class 4X per year.

Periodic dress up days are planned to celebrate special causes.

The principal sends a weekly message to faculty and staff to keep everyone informed of relevant school business.

On early release days, the guidance counselor and MTSS Coordinator hold assemblies for students and share information on the topics of : hygiene, bullying, manners, actions and consequences, and mental health.

The school participates in district Portrait of a Graduate activities.

Teachers take a My Voice survey to rate school culture. Actions are taken to improve low scoring indicators.

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

The school has an active School Advisory Council that meets at least once per quarter. The members of the school advisory council are as follows:
Beth Nelson Principal
Miranda Aldridge Chairperson/teacher
Kearron Grant Instructional Assistant
Jessica Byrd Parent
Malinda Lynn Parent
Carrie Williams Parent/secretary
Barbara Bolduc Grandparent
Joyce Sharp Community Member
Lalita Thomas Community Member
Karla Flagg Business Member
Spring Maynard Business Member
Wayne McClain Business Member

An active group of parents help raise money for school special events by organizing fundraisers and seeking donations.