

Putnam County School District

# Kelley Smith Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Kelley Smith Elementary School

141 KELLEY SMITH SCHOOL RD, Palatka, FL 32177

[www.putnamschools.org/o/kses](http://www.putnamschools.org/o/kses)

## Demographics

**Principal: Mike Tucker**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (39%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Kelley Smith Elementary School

141 KELLEY SMITH SCHOOL RD, Palatka, FL 32177

[www.putnamschools.org/o/kses](http://www.putnamschools.org/o/kses)

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-6</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">96%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">42%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	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 Kelley Smith Elementary School is to provide a culture of inclusivity coupled with positive relationships that fosters social, emotional, and academic learning while focusing on developing each child into a future leader of tomorrow.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

We will inspire every student to think, to learn, to achieve, to care, and to become a successful and responsible citizen of the community.

### 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
Tucker, Mike	Principal	Observing, coaching, and monitoring the goals and practices put into place for the faculty, staff, and students at KSES.
Oyster, Cathy	Assistant Principal	Responsible for observing, coaching, and mentoring the goals and practices put into place for the faculty, staff, and students of KSES.
Buckles, Tami	Teacher, K-12	Provide intensive interventions to tier 2 and tier 3 three students for students in K-3.
David, Cynthia	School Counselor	Provide valuable input into the decision making process from their experience with teachers and students. Our counselor provides an array of support to our students and families in the form of mental and emotional health.
Jones, Martisha	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Instructional coach focused on mathematics instruction and academic teaming K-6
Player, Kimile	Teacher, ESE	Provides ESE services and for ESE students.
Raburn, Shelly	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Provide coaching to instructional staff in areas of ELA. Also oversees the MTSS process and implementations of interventions.
Simpson, Megan	Teacher, K-12	Provide intensive interventions to tier 2 and tier 3 students in grades 3-6.
Surrency, Ricky	Dean	Oversees discipline and school wide implementation of behavior systems.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Mike Tucker

**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.*

2

**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.*

18

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

40

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

747

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

3

**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	126	126	99	109	89	107	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	751
Attendance below 90 percent	38	61	42	55	35	44	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	321
One or more suspensions	1	7	2	16	12	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA	2	10	2	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	3	1	2	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	25	23	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	13	29	19	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	39	40	28	41	18	20	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	193



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	9	4	14	15	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	7	8	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	119	92	97	97	101	108	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	711
Attendance below 90 percent	30	37	40	42	40	45	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
One or more suspensions	2	5	7	7	3	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	6	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	9	10	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	19	24	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	24	26	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	10	17	22	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	2	6	8	16	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	5	6	4	13	7	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	119	92	97	97	101	108	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	711
Attendance below 90 percent	30	37	40	42	40	45	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
One or more suspensions	2	5	7	7	3	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	6	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	9	10	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	19	24	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	24	26	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	10	17	22	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	2	2	6	8	16	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

**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	5	6	4	13	7	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	52%	43%	56%				39%	46%	57%

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	60%						51%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						55%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	57%	47%	50%				49%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						59%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						50%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	45%	59%				33%	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	35%	41%	-6%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	43%	-8%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2022					
	2019	39%	42%	-3%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

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					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	49%	53%	-4%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	44%	4%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	30%	38%	-8%	53%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

### 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	26	48	46	29	51	51	20				
BLK	22	51	56	26	53	58	15				
HSP	35	42		48	72						
MUL	60	42		67	92						
WHT	69	68	44	73	68	52	48				
FRL	38	54	52	42	60	56	26				
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	36	33		38	33		31				
BLK	29	31		29	31		12				
HSP	25			25							
MUL	62			77							
WHT	69	58	50	70	61	36	54				
FRL	49	52	36	46	48	40	38				

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	28	49	48	38	61	57	20				
BLK	25	45	46	37	57	50	16				
WHT	53	57	75	59	61	55	50				
FRL	35	49	55	44	56	48	30				

### 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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	376
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
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	40
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	49
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	65
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	60
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	47
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?**

Proficiency dropped across ELA, Math, and Science where as learning gains and bottom quartile in both ELA and Math made overall gains. Our students with disabilities and African American subgroups did not meet the 41% expectancy percentile. Our third grade level is our critical grade level of focus.

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

Third grade proficiency in ELA and math are our critical areas of focus. Both made significant declines last year.

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

We had two new teachers in the third grade level. Coaching and support was provided, however, the implementation of the coaching, modeling and support was not sufficient for the needs of the school. Over 40% of third grade came to us new and were significantly below grade level. This was also a statewide trend. Students made gains, however, it was not enough for students to be proficient. We have a new curriculum and supports are in place to help novice teachers. We have already conducted and will continue to conduct data chats with the third grade teachers regarding last year's data and this year's data. We also have included an ESE push in support this year for both ELA and Math. The push in supports will work with both of our underperforming subgroups.

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

ELA and Math learning gains showed the most improvements. ELA LG went from 48% to 61% and Math LG went from 37% to 66%.

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

Small group instruction and targeted instructional practices allowed us to improve our learning gains. Teachers strategically targeted learning gaps based on data and provided remedial instruction.

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

We will need to continue our targeted approach with instruction and small group remediation. We also need to continue to plan and unpack standards to ensure instruction is aligned to the new BEST standards.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Teachers will attend district planning sessions as well as weekly PLCs with district and school coaches. During each of these sessions teachers will work to learn the new curriculum and standards while improving their instructional practices.

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

We will be able to use SchoolCity as our data collection platform to house all our data creating a uniform systematic approach to data collection and analysis. This will allow us to continuously progress monitor more frequently and efficiently.

**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.**

Our SWD and African American subgroups were both averaged below 41%. Our African American subgroup data averaged 40% and our students with disabilities averaged 39%.

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

If our school continues our targeted approach with instruction and small group remediation, plan and unpack standards, and implement standards aligned instruction alongside collaborative planning, then by spring of 2023, students will increase proficiency in Math and Science.

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

We will monitor our area of focus using the FAST Math for grades 3-6 in the fall, winter, and spring.  
 We will monitor USA Test Prep for science grade 5.  
 We will use the SchoolCity platform to progress monitor all standards based assessments.  
 We will also have data chats every quarter with teachers and leadership team and modify plans as needed based on the conclusions.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Mike Tucker (mtucker@my.putnamschools.org)

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

We will implement standards aligned instruction alongside collaborative planning school wide and across subjects areas to ensure alignment and rigor are at or above the state expectations.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Implementing standards aligned instruction and collaborative planning will increase the rigor, text complexity and DOK of questioning in the classroom which will result in higher achievement. Both of these practices show strong evidence of high impact on student achievement.

**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.

Collaborative planning for math and planning for standards aligned instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Martisha Jones (mjones@my.putnamschools.org)

Classroom observations monitoring the aligned, rigor and DOK of instructional materials and instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Cathy Oyster (coyster@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

2022 iReady D3 Data:

1st Grade: 15% yellow

2nd: 31% yellow, 1% red

Our area of focus for improving our proficiency will be to focus on standards aligned instruction alongside collaborative planning through PLCs and district lead learning communities. The two areas of focus will ensure instruction is aligned and at the appropriate DOK and as well as reading lexile.

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

2022 iReady D3 Data:

3rd Grade: 32% yellow, 6% red

4th Grade: 20% yellow, 21% red, FSA 63% below proficiency

5th Grade: 34% yellow, 9% red, FSA 42% below proficiency

6th Grade: 27% yellow, 21% red, FSA 42% below proficiency

Our area of focus for improving our proficiency will be to focus on standards aligned instruction alongside collaborative planning through PLCs and district lead learning communities. The two areas of focus will ensure instruction is aligned and at the appropriate DOK and as well as reading lexile.

**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)**

If our school implements standards aligned instruction alongside collaborative planning through PLCs and district lead learning communities, then by spring of 2023, ELA achievement will improve on the FAST progress monitoring 3 assessment.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

If our school implements standards aligned instruction alongside collaborative planning through PLCs and district lead learning communities, then by spring of 2023, ELA achievement will improve on the FAST progress monitoring 3 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.

We will use the Benchmark Unit assessments, interim assessments, iReady reading diagnostics in fall, winter, and spring for K-6, and FAST PM 1-2 and STAR PM 1-2 to progress monitor data for grades K-6. We will also have data chats every quarter with teachers and leadership team and modify plans as needed based on the conclusions. We will use the SchoolCity platform to progress monitor all standards based assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Tucker, Mike, [mtucker@my.putnamschools.org](mailto:mtucker@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 school implements Benchmark Advanced for its core curriculum in grades K-6. Benchmark Advanced is aligned to the BEST standards. K-3 utilized Open Court for phonics instruction. For intervention we have two reading endorsed teachers who oversee our interventions. Our interventions include LLI and SIPPS. Students are placed in the program that is most appropriate to meet the need of the student.

**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 programs are approved through the What Works Clearinghouse and included in our District's 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
Weekly school based PLCs focused around standards aligned planning. Collaborative planning in ELA and planning for standards aligned instruction.	Raburn, Shelly, sraburn@my.putnamschools.org
Teachers will participate in district lead learning communities to develop a better and deeper understanding of the BEST standards. Teachers will also work alongside their teams and district personnel to plan with their curriculum pieces.	Azula, Jennifer, jazula@my.putnamschools.org
Teachers will participate in peer observations to observe specific instructional components for individual growth.	Oyster, Cathy, coyster@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.

Kelley Smith Elementary School has made monumental strides in improving the collaboration between the school, home, and community. Our school established a PTO and SAC and continue to build relationships in the community with business partners and outside agencies. We also work to model service and sacrifice and frequently do outreach projects to build a positive outreach into the community. In the beginning of the year we conduct an Open House during the 1st nine weeks of school to promote education of Title I status and promote home/ school communications and ways to support student learning. Parents will be given a needs survey at that time. We will continue to hold School-wide Data Chats to keep parents informed and updated on their child(ren)'s goals and how they are meeting/not meeting them according to the Pupil Progression Plan. In September we will host Bring your Dad to School, Dads or a representative will enjoy donuts in the cafeteria with their child. In October we hold a family fall night to promote positive relationships. In November, we plan to bring our Bingo For Books Night back to the school to support our other community areas that are closer to the school. In December, host a Christmas literacy night. In February, we plan to have an Invention Convention night for parents and students to show parents the inventions the classes have been working on as they learn the scientific process during the 2nd semester. In March, we will hold a Spring Parent Night that will focus on upcoming testing in grades 3-6 as well the last IReady diagnostic. Families will be able to ask questions and receive important information related to preparing for testing. From September through March we host a food truck Wednesday lunch. We bring in a local food truck to encourage families to come eat with their child while also promoting a local business. Each month we focus on supporting local charities, facilities, or families to encourage service of others. Finally, in conjunction with the Kiwanis Club of Palatka we hold quarterly Terrific Kids ceremonies to highlight students from each class that have demonstrated good character. We are dedicated to supporting our students' growth/ achievement in all academic areas of Kelley Smith Elementary School. We create a sense of belonging with our faculty and staff by allowing ownership and creation of our school vision, mission, and goals while also supporting and nurturing their social, emotional, and physical needs.

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

Mike Tucker and Cathy Oyster, administration, foster and promote a culture of inclusivity and positivity with the faculty, staff, students, families, and community

Shelly Raburn and Tish Jones, instructional coaches, promote professional and personal growth of our teachers. They work to remove barriers and support our teachers leading to a healthy supportive culture.

Cindy David, guidance counselor, works with students and local entities to provide for our students who struggle emotionally and financially.

Ricky Surrency, dean, works with students who exhibit chronic behavior issues and develops coping strategies to reduce aggressive behaviors.

PTO and SAC acts as a liaison between the school, families, and community.