

Putnam County School District

Melrose Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Melrose Elementary School

401 STATE ROAD 26, Melrose, FL 32666

www.putnamschools.org/o/mes

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Melrose Elementary School's mission is for every student to achieve academic growth based on his or her personal abilities.

Note: Melrose Elementary School is a Title I school that serves students from Pre-K through sixth grade. Melrose Elementary School has maintained a School grade of an A from 2013 - 2017, but dropped to a C in the 2017-2018 school year. Melrose did increase to a B in the 2018-2019 academic school year. Due to Covid, we did not have scores during the 2019-2020 school year. Although we did not opt in for the 2020-2021 year, we were a "C" only 4 points from a "B". For the 2021-2022 school year, we were less than a point away from a "B".

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision is for every student to achieve a year's worth of growth as defined by the state/district. Both the mission and the vision of the school is shared with all stakeholders via newsletters, SAC meetings, and parent nights.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lundy, Leah	Principal	<p>Establish and promote high standards for expectations for all students and staff for academic performance and for behavior (this includes making sure everyone knows the expectations and monitoring the expectations). Lead the school management team, manage operations of the school. Collect and analyze data regarding the needs of the school and achievement of students. Lead school level planning (including PLCs, all school level professional development). Supervise the instructional programs, evaluate lesson plans, observe classes on a regular basis, encourage the use of researched base instructional strategies. Build a rapport with all stakeholders, ensure the safety and well being of all students, faculty, and staff. Communicate/ participate with district staff on district goals. Overall: be responsible for all aspects of the school which includes: safety, maintenance, progress monitoring, academic achievement, etc.</p>
Valentine, Tammie	Assistant Principal	<p>Establish and promote high standards for expectations for all students and staff for academic performance and for behavior (this includes making sure everyone knows the expectations and monitoring the expectations). Lead the school management team, manage operations of the school. Collect and analyze data regarding the needs of the school and achievement of students. Lead school level planning (including PLCs, all school level professional development). Supervise the instructional programs, evaluate lesson plans, observe classes on a regular basis, encourage the use of researched base instructional strategies. Build a rapport with all stakeholders, ensure the safety and well being of all students, faculty, and staff. Communicate/ participate with district staff on district goals. Overall: be responsible for all aspects of the school which includes: safety, maintenance, progress monitoring, academic achievement, etc.</p>
Wylie, Sarah	School Counselor	<p>Designs and implements a data-driven, comprehensive school counseling program for all students to address barriers to student learning and to close the achievement/opportunity gap. Provides counseling curriculum while doing classroom lessons, small group counseling, and preventative and responsive services. Sits in on IEP meetings, leads the PBIS/MTSS programs at Melrose. Uses school data to identify and assist individual students who do not perform at grade level and do not have opportunities and resources to be successful in school. Fosters family and community partnerships to support the social/emotional and academic development of all students. Supports the continuum of mental health services, including prevention and tiered intervention strategies, and collaborates with both school-based and community mental health providers to enhance students success.</p>
Semione, Angela	Instructional Coach	<p>As an instructional coach for the school, this person has the ability to utilize technology in designing and facilitating learning experiences for educators, families, caregivers, and students. Has knowledge of the Florida's current ELA, Math, SS, and Science standards. Knowledge of the selected and prescribed curriculum, instructional materials, and supplemental resources. Ability to plan, facilitate, and evaluate adult learning and instructional support</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		via various professional development and growth structures. Willingness to work with teachers in and out of the classroom. Serve as a role model for students and colleagues, demonstrating the importance and relevance of learning, accepting responsibility, and demonstrating pride in the profession of education. Create and support learning environments that are conducive to growth and continuous improvement.
Maynard, Spring	Teacher, K-12	Develop and implement ambitious goals and evidence-based reading intervention plans based on data and informed by grade level expectations. Instruct students in small groups and individually using intervention strategies and programs for the purpose of improving success in reading, as approved and outlined in the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan. Learn and effectively integrate multisensory strategies and techniques through approved evidence-based reading interventions. Administer various programmatic, formative assessments and analyze assessment data to inform instruction. Maintain accurate and up-to-date records, including and not limited to recording, monitoring, and displaying intervention progress and student attendance. Communicate frequently and professionally in oral and written form with parents and guardians, general education and ESE teachers, supervisors, guidance counselors, MTSS coordinators, etc. Confer regularly with general and ESE educators who support the same students. Work with school staff, district coaches, and colleagues to ensure that all interventions adhere to designated timelines and time frames. Engage in problem-solving protocols and share input regarding intervention options, progress, and goal attainment with school leaders, teachers, and staff.
Paul, Kerry	Science Coach	Work with and support social studies and science teachers assisting with the development of strategies, skills, tools, and techniques to effectively teach social studies and science to all students.
Kellner, Asia	Math Coach	Work with and support mathematics teachers assisting with the development of strategies, skills, tools, and techniques to effectively teach mathematics to all students.
Shettel, Lara	Reading Coach	Work with and support teachers with the development and successful demonstration and application of knowledge, strategies, skills, tools, and techniques to effectively teach reading and writing to all students.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The leadership team reviews data in the summer to determine areas of success and areas where we need to improve. Preliminary goals are determined for then school and will be shared with all stakeholders at the beginning of the school year (in meetings with all staff, SAC meetings, etc) to help determine the best goals for all of our students. The SIP and goals will be adjusted based on input from all of the stakeholders where needed.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be used as a guideline at all SAC meetings to share information on how we are doing in reference to meeting our goals and will be used in PLCs once a month to monitor student data. We will have lists of students who have the greatest achievement gap and will progress monitor those students not only with the state progress monitoring system but also on grade level unit test scores. We will then implement new plans for students who are not moving forward academically to ensure that they have the best opportunity possible to improve.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	24%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	79%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	

DJJ Accountability Rating History	
--	--

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	17	19	26	15	14	13	8	0	0	112	
One or more suspensions	1	1	7	2	3	6	2	0	0	22	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	5	4	2	2	11	4	4	0	0	32	
Course failure in Math	1	3	1	2	7	2	4	0	0	20	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	9	3	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	4	8	0	0	21	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	3	5	0	14	11	5	0	0	45	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	4	5	3	7	6	1	0	0	31

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	17	27	12	19	22	10	11	0	0	118	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	7	
Course failure in ELA	3	4	0	4	2	0	1	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	3	0	1	2	2	2	2	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	7	9	12	0	0	33	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	3	4	11	0	0	20	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	30	14	2	12	6	5	10	0	0	79	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	4	1	4	3	1	5	0	0	21

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	6	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	17	27	12	19	22	10	11	0	0	118	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	7	
Course failure in ELA	3	4	0	4	2	0	1	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	3	0	1	2	2	2	2	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	3	4	0	4	2	0	1	0	0	14	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	3	0	1	2	2	2	2	0	0	12	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	30	14	2	12	6	5	10	0	0	79	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	4	1	4	3	1	5	0	0	21

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	6	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	57	43	53	52	43	56	59		
ELA Learning Gains				46			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			44		
Math Achievement*	68	49	59	63	47	50	63		
Math Learning Gains				65			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			35		
Science Achievement*	67	45	54	44	45	59	46		
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					36	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		56	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	245
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	66			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	65			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	52			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	45			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	57			68			67					
SWD	37			39							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44			56							2	
HSP	63			69							2	
MUL	50			71							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	59			69			78				4	
FRL	51			58			52				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	52	46	40	63	65	63	44					
SWD	25	23	23	40	45	62	25					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	63		29	63							
HSP	25			53								
MUL	43			71								
PAC												
WHT	56	45	33	68	65	70	50					
FRL	43	39	36	52	57	58	32					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	59	57	44	63	38	35	46					
SWD	27			37								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	30		24	20							
HSP	69			54								
MUL	85			77								
PAC												
WHT	58	55	50	68	42		50					
FRL	52	63		54	35	50	33					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	54%	45%	9%	54%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	44%	23%	58%	9%
06	2023 - Spring	56%	45%	11%	47%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	36%	12%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	66%	60%	6%	54%	12%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	45%	14%	59%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	87%	51%	36%	61%	26%
05	2023 - Spring	70%	46%	24%	55%	15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	67%	42%	25%	51%	16%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Based on the 2022-2023 state Progress monitoring tools, F.A.S.T. and STAR, reading is still an area that is our biggest concern. Although we did better this year than in previous years, we still are not where we should be at this time. This year our 3rd grade scores in the area of Reading and Math were the lowest schoolwide. We feel that a new curriculum and a new testing platform created some of the low scores this year. Teachers are working to continue to get a good grasp on the BEST standards and ensure that

students are moving forward. I can't say that this is a trend as last year our 3rd graders scored much better.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The area where we saw some decline was the cohort group that was our 5th grade group in the area of ELA. They decreased by about 4% over their previous year scores. We did put a new teacher in 5th grade who we believe will be very successful.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The biggest gaps we had when compared to the state were 4th grade ELA, we were above the state by 10%, our 4th grade Math was above the state by 26% and in Science we were above the state by 16%. This year we did very well on our testing. The two areas we were a little bit below the state average was 3rd grade ELA, where we were 2% below the state and 5th grade ELA where we were 1% below the state. In Math we were above with the exception of 3rd grade where we were at the same percentage as the state. We feel that part of the growth is the new testing and progress monitoring that we are doing and also the fact that the teachers are becoming more comfortable with teaching the BEST standards.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The cohort group that had the largest amount of growth was our 6th grade students in the area of Math. Last year they were only at 49% proficient and this year, they jumped to 66% proficient. Our Math teacher was in her second year and has become more familiar not only with the curriculum but with the standards. She used academic teaming quite a bit in the classroom and we believe that allowed the students to stake in what they were learning which helped them to increase their scores.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance has been and will continue to remain an area of concern for our school. Although when you really break it down, it is several families that create the largest part of our attendance data. We are always looking for new ways to encourage parents to get their students to school everyday and on time.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Attendance
Monitoring that 3rd grade cohort
Instruction in 3rd grade

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

When looking at our ESSA subgroup data, (not from the state, our collected data) it appears that our Hispanic students improved. Our Hispanic group is a smaller group this year but according to our data, it appears that 60% were proficient in Reading and Math. Our focus this school year will be on the Student's With Disabilities (SWD) subgroup. Data shows that 37% were proficient in ELA and 41% were proficient in Math. Our 4th grade SWD students did very well while our 3rd, 5th, and 6th have room for improvement. Our 3rd grade SWD students did better in than Reading while 5th and 6th grade needs to be a priority focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we focus on explicit instruction, then all of our ESSA subgroups will exceed the 41% requirement from the state by the end of the 2023-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor the weekly progress monitoring tools that are used with students to determine if students are improving. We will also use the FAST progress monitoring data to look for improvement. We will also do bi-weekly check-ins with students to make sure they are on track with their daily work.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Semione (asemione@my.putnamschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will be using SIPPS/LLI/iReady personalized instruction for the area of Reading Interventions. LLI has a strong evidence-base and SIPPS and iReady have a moderate evidence-base. Students will also receive Math intervention daily where they will have explicit instruction in a small group and they will recognize and articulate mathematical concepts and notation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We have chosen to use SIPPS/LLI/iReady because research shows that student growth is significant when using these programs. Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) is a short-term, supplementary, small-group literacy intervention designed to help struggling readers achieve grade-level competency. The intervention provides explicit instruction in phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, oral language skills, and writing. LLI helps teachers match students with texts of progressing difficulty and deliver systematic lessons targeted to a student's reading ability. Also, these programs have a positive effect on general reading achievement and reading fluency. In the area of Math, research shows that students who receive explicit instruction show growth on the work they are doing.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Using LLI/SIPPS/FAST data, we will determine which students need T2/T3 intervention for Reading and Math.

Person Responsible: Angela Semione (asemione@my.putnamschools.org)

By When: Weekly check-ins with our SWD from our ESE Resource teacher and bi-weekly check-ins with our MTSS coordinator.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our focus with our positive culture and environment is to better increase student attendance. This year we will continue to work to improve attendance with our students and decrease the number of referrals we have throughout the year. We will provide professional learning opportunities to address a positive culture and environment during the upcoming school year. There are built in early release days each month where the staff will participate in these structured PL opportunities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase the number of days that we have a schoolwide attendance rate of 90%. We also plan to decrease the number of referrals by 20% from last year.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor attendance daily and monitor the number of referrals on a bi-weekly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Wylie (swylie@my.putnamschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

This year we will monitor attendance by using an MTSS Attendance Intervention system. High Leverage Practices 18 - Use Strategies to Promote Active Student Engagement. This strategy provides students with frequent and varied opportunities to respond and encourages students to engage with peers as well. If we promote active student engagement and student ownership, our plan is to have student and teachers feel as if they are needed and do not want to be absent. They will realize they need to be in attendance to engage with their peers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By developing an attendance system, we will be able to work with our parents and students in order to improve attendance. Promoting active student engagement has an Effect Size of .82, when implemented with fidelity, we expect to improve attendance with our students and decrease the number of referrals we have throughout the year.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Daily attendance announced. Starbucks earned for classes with perfect attendance and when the whole school is at 95% present regarding attendance.

Person Responsible: Sarah Wylie (swylie@my.putnamschools.org)

By When: Mrs. Wylie will work with our data clerk and do this daily.

Restructure our BIP process and discipline guidelines with staff.

Person Responsible: Sarah Wylie (swylie@my.putnamschools.org)

By When: We will complete this process on August 10, 2023.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

District staff from multiple departments support schools with additional funding to ensure schools supplement and do not supplant.

With allocated funds for school improvement, such as UniSIG, school leaders must seek approval through the Department of Strategic Initiatives and School Improvement before expending funds. This collaboration ensures that expenditures follow grant RFPs, are aligned with approved budgets, and meet school needs based on data.

The district has ongoing systems in place to provide resources to schools based on needs. Along with a general fund set-aside for school improvement, district staff from multiple departments provide additional support throughout the school year when student, teacher, and school needs are identified.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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 full-year students tested in STAR reading, NONE of the Kindergarten, first or second grade levels had 50% or more of the students scoring below the 40th percentile.

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

Based on full-year students tested on FAST ELA for their grade level, the only grade level that had 50% or more of the students scoring below the 40th percentile was 3rd grade with 51%.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Since NONE of the Kindergarten, first or second grade levels had 50% or more of the students scoring below the 40th percentile, we will continue doing what we are doing and 51% or more of our students will score a level 3 or higher.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

This year our goal is that 51% or more of our students in grades 3-6 will score a level 3 or higher.

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

We will monitor student achievement using interim reports, our Benchmark Unit tests (that will be discussed at data PLCs), PM1 and PM2 and we will also monitor data using the SchoolCity platform. We will have monthly data discussions to monitor this data to see where our students are at that time and take actions accordingly. This will have a positive impact on student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lundy, Leah, llundy@my.putnamschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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?

Benchmark Advance is used for our core curriculum in all grades, it is aligned to the BEST standards. Our K-3 students use Open Court for phonics instruction. For intervention, we use LLI, SIPPS, and this year we will be using Steps to Advance out of Benchmark for some students. We follow our District Reading Plan and work with our District Literacy coaches to determine the best programs to meet the needs of our students.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The programs that we are using are approved through the What Works Clearinghouse and they are all part of our District Reading Plan. The evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need and show proven record of effectiveness for the target population.

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 data dissemination from Unit tests and standards aligned planning.	Semione, Angela, asemione@my.putnamschools.org
Teachers will participate in peer observations to observe specific instructional components for individual growth.	Lundy, Leah, llundy@my.putnamschools.org
Teachers will participate in district level learning communities to continue to improve in teaching the BEST standards.	Azula, Jennifer, jazula@my.putnamschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

We share our SIP with our stakeholders several times throughout the year. We share it at our SAC meetings (usually the first meeting and in the middle of the year with a progress monitoring update). We share the information at our Annual Title 1 program. We share the SIP on our website and we send information in our monthly newsletter letting parents know where they can get this information. Our website is: <https://melrose.putnamschools.org/o/mes/documents>

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Throughout the year we provide different parent nights to build relationships with parents as well as to provide opportunities for parents to participate in activities with their children. We encourage all stakeholders to participate in our SAC, Friends of MES, and to just volunteer at school. We send home monthly newsletters, progress reports after testing, report cards, and mid terms to keep parents in the loop of how their children are doing. We communicate with our parents through the Thrillshare and Apptegy programs. We ask for input on the PFEP during SAC meetings to get input from our parents. Our PFEP is available on our website: <https://melrose.putnamschools.org/o/mes/documents>

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We create a master schedule that has reading and math interventions worked into the schedule to ensure that students get that additional help when needed. We work with our district staff to ensure that we are using the most high yield strategies in our classrooms. Our afterschool program provides extra help for those that are struggling as well as enrichment activities for all students.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

In accordance with ESSA Section 118 (b) (2), the methodology used to allocate State and local funds to each school receiving assistance under Title I, Part A ensures that the school receives all the State and local funds it would otherwise receive if it were not receiving Federal funds. The District has a methodology for support, not supplant when allocating State and local funds to each school.

Each school year, the District's Chief Financial Officer assures State and local funds are distributed at an equal level by preparing a report showing comparability across all schools for the allocation of instructional staff. Staff allocations are based on a formula applied consistently so that all schools that are comparable receive allocations in a comparable manner. The report is audited by the State yearly to assure the District meets this mandate.

The funding formula is based on Florida Public Schools Full-time Equivalent (FTE) data. Expenditures of all Federal title funds at the school level are monitored to ensure expenditures supplement the general curriculum and fulfill the intent of grant funding. All expenditures are reviewed by the Federal Programs Office to ensure compliance with applicable Federal and State guidelines.

Additionally, the school leadership team conducts a district unified Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) towards the end of each school year. The CNA reports on how resources including personnel, instruction, and curriculum are aligned to identified needs. Student programming outcomes are monitored both in the CNA and quarterly district-admin data conversations.

Schools implementing CSI, TSI, or ATSI activities may use available funds, including Federal title funds, to support implementation of identified activities in the schoolwide improvement plan.

Federal funding projects are monitored for auditing purposes by the Office of Federal Programs. Audit boxes for each program are maintained and aligned to pertinent work papers and Federal and State guidance.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No