

Putnam County School District

Interlachen Jr Sr High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Interlachen Jr Sr High School

126 N STATE RD 315, Interlachen, FL 32148

www.putnamschools.org/o/ihs

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.

To ensure the academic program of Interlachen Jr.-Sr. High School is rigorous, relevant, and provides the students with the tools and necessary skills needed for post secondary life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Interlachen Jr.-Sr. High School focuses on pushing students towards their individual full potential through challenging curriculum, positive relationships, extra-curricular activities, and community involvement.

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
Symonds, Amber	Principal	Serve as the educational leader and chief administrator of Interlachen Jr-Sr High School, responsible for implementing and managing the policies, regulations and procedures of the Board of Education to ensure that all students are supervised in a safe, child-centered learning environment that meets and exceeds the State Core Curriculum Content Standards, following the approved curricula and directives of the school.
Haengel, Ted	Assistant Principal	To assist the Principal in providing vision and instructional leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs to ensure student achievement and a safe school program for students, staff and community.
Morris, Maeghan	Assistant Principal	To assist the Principal in providing vision and instructional leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs to ensure student achievement and a safe school program for students, staff and community.
Thompson, John	Assistant Principal	To assist the Principal in providing vision and instructional leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs to ensure student achievement and a safe school program for students, staff and community.
Thornton, Tammie	Assistant Principal	To assist the Principal in providing vision and instructional leadership to develop, administer and monitor educational programs to ensure student achievement and a safe school program for students, staff and community.
Baggs, Kim	Reading Coach	Support teachers with instructional needs, alignment, and scaffolding in Intensive Reading (Read 180)
Hudson, Kristin	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.
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.
DeLuca, Christopher	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.

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.

All stakeholders are invited to be a part of the School Advisory Council. Members included are the principal, voted teachers, voted staff, voted students, voted parents, as well as community leaders, and business partner. The School Advisory Council will meet a minimum of 4 times per year. Each year a SAC meeting is held with school staff, parents, students and business and community leaders to solicit input in the development of the SIP. School personnel also take part in analyzing the 2022-2023 data to help determine specific needs.

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 monitored by analyzing FAST progress monitoring data, frequent trend walks, Marzano observation data and MyVoice. The SIP will be reviewed and then discussed during SAC meetings. We will use this data to monitor each subgroup paying particular close attention to African Americans and Students with Disabilities.

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)	High School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	35%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

<p align="center">School Grades History</p> <p>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	2021-22: C
	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	82	229
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	67	142
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	61	124
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	60	130
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	60	168
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	36	107
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	33	95

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	35	83

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	17	72
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	7	41

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	81	638	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	43	354	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	30	314	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	30	335	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	53	397	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	37	192	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	53	397	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	31	270	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	6	81	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	4	94	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	81	199	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	43	107	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	30	81	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	30	110	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	53	151	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	37	122	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	53	151	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	31	80	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	6	49
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	4	28

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*	28		50	33	28	51	31		
ELA Learning Gains				41			36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			28		
Math Achievement*	30		38	29		38	15		
Math Learning Gains				43			21		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			23		
Science Achievement*	37		64	34	7	40	32		
Social Studies Achievement*	35		66	47	8	48	53		
Middle School Acceleration	64			63	9	44			
Graduation Rate	88		89	95	33	61	94		
College and Career Acceleration	48		65	51		67	46		
ELP Progress	50		45	50					

* 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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	380
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	88

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	564
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	95

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	31	Yes	4	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	3	
HSP	45			
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	48			

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	46			

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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	2	
HSP	43			
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	46			

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	28			30			37	35	64	88	48	50
SWD	11			19			19	18		29	6	
ELL	35			38			50				4	50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20			23			26	17		35	6	
HSP	27			29			35	26		58	7	54
MUL	39			33			56	31			4	

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	29			32			37	41	56	51	7	
FRL	28			30			35	30	66	41	8	50

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	33	41	33	29	43	45	34	47	63	95	51	50
SWD	16	29	29	15	36	43	17	19		97	24	
ELL	26	55		30	68			43				50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20	31	32	11	36	44	8	23		92	50	
HSP	33	43	30	24	36	47	28	43		94	53	
MUL	34	54		29	55		36	44				
PAC												
WHT	36	42	36	35	46	40	42	53	66	96	55	
FRL	33	41	33	29	45	46	32	44	59	94	51	

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	31	36	28	15	21	23	32	53		94	46	
SWD	16	24	24	21	15	4	44	35		90	8	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	31	20	4	11	14	29	36		88	60	
HSP	30	33	23	11	29	40	15	56		90	58	
MUL	33	21		19	25							
PAC												
WHT	34	39	33	19	21	19	39	59		96	42	
FRL	31	33	26	12	15	17	33	51		92	40	

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
10	2023 - Spring	32%	41%	-9%	50%	-18%
07	2023 - Spring	19%	36%	-17%	47%	-28%
08	2023 - Spring	28%	32%	-4%	47%	-19%
09	2023 - Spring	32%	35%	-3%	48%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	16%	21%	-5%	48%	-32%
08	2023 - Spring	52%	51%	1%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	23%	15%	8%	44%	-21%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	25%	-3%	50%	-28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	41%	39%	2%	48%	-7%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	46%	45%	1%	63%	-17%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	31%	48%	-17%	66%	-35%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	38%	42%	-4%	63%	-25%

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.

Algebra 1 grades 9-12 was the lowest performing area at 13%. Some contributing factors to last year's low performance are the lack of lesson planning, teaching below grade level standards, and the lack of target task alignment.

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

U.S. History declined 18 points from 56% in 2022 to 38% in 2023. The U.S. History teacher was new to teaching U.S. History. The teacher didn't attend the district PLC's for this content area and failed to follow the district's Year at a Glance.

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.

Civics has the greatest gap at 35%. Both Civics teachers were new to teaching, and lacked knowledge of the Civics content area. Neither teacher attended the content PLC's at the district level, therefore they were not aware of specific content and pacing as much as they could have been.

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

Biology had the most improvement from 35% in 2022 to 46% in 2023. This was due to consistency in teachers and a focus on standards based instruction.

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

Two potential areas of concern are statewide ELA and Math assessments.

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

1. Increase pass rate on Algebra and Geometry EOC's.
2. Increase pass rate on Math FAST assessment.
3. Increase pass rate on ELA FAST assessment.
4. Increase in lessons that are aligned to the learning target and task in ELA and Math.
5. Increase teacher attendance and participation in school level and district level content PLC's.

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 Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

Interlachen Jr-Sr High is identified as ATSI. 2021-2022 data indicated a rate of 35% in the low-performing subgroup of African Americans and 33% for Students with Disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If our school focuses on instructional practice specifically related to standards-aligned explicit instruction then by the end of the 2023-2024 school year, state data will reflect a minimum rate of 41% or more in all subgroups.

Monitoring:

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

PM data from district assessments platforms will be used to ensure that students are mastering grade level benchmarks after planning has been properly implemented. Our leadership team will monitor target/task alignment through classroom walkthroughs using the standard walk tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Symonds (asymonds@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.)

Explicit instruction will be used to support student learning across all grade levels and content areas. 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. Through effective promotion of student engagement, teachers will acquire and implement a wide repertoire of research-supported active student response practices such as fluency-building activities, guided notes, class-wide peer tutoring, digital tools, and collaborative learning strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Supporting teachers in explicit instruction will support teachers in creating and implementing high leverage practices. We will continue to implementing Academic Teaming. Promoting active student engagement has an Effect Size of .82, when implemented with fidelity, we expect to see growth. We will use PCSD's Trend Walk tool that has an element that focuses on students interacting with partners and teams.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Our leadership team will create a calibration walk calendar.

Our leadership team will provide staff development in calibration walks.

Our leadership team will create a school calendar that includes assessment dates, Professional Learning Sessions and data meetings.

Our leadership team will review data analysis of assessments and progress monitoring data for student growth.

Our leadership team will monitor teacher use of data.

Instructional coaches will assist in planning with continuous coaching feedback of benchmarks and target/task alignment.

Person Responsible: Maeghan Morris (mmorris@my.putnamschools.org)

By When: The action steps will continue throughout the school year. Teachers will be provided with feedback frequently through iObservation and professional development will be provided during coaching sessions and district PLC's.

#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.

A review of our data from 22-23 school year indicates a need to focus on attendance of students and teachers. We will provide professional learning opportunities to address a positive culture and environment and improve this initiative during the upcoming school year. There are built in early release days each month where the staff will participate in these structured PL opportunities. We will monitor the attendance of students, attendance of teachers, as well as determine the number of teachers retained at the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our focus with our positive culture and environment is to better increase student attendance, teacher attendance, as well as teacher retention by 2%. Our data based objective/outcome will be determined through the use of My Voice, a survey tool that is used for faculty and student input.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor progress with culture building initiatives using the data collection resource, My Voice, three time per year to review the trend of culture.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Symonds (asymonds@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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is implementation of structured professional learning that results in change in teacher knowledge and practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective professional development is defined as structured professional learning that results in changes to teacher knowledge and practices, and improvements in student learning outcomes. Professional learning is conceptualized as a product of both externally provided and job-embedded activities that increase teachers' knowledge and help them change their instructional practice in ways that support student learning. Thus, formal PD represents a subset of the range of experiences that may result in professional learning.

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 3 - Promising 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.

- * Teachers will complete the MyVoice survey a minimum of 3 times per school year.
- * SAC meetings will be held frequently throughout the school year at a minimum of 4 times per school year
- * Teachers will participate in district PLC's to promote professional learning and planning
- * Teachers will participate in PL on the early release days each month to promote a positive culture and environment
- * District instructional coaches will meet with teachers frequently to provide support

Person Responsible: Amber Symonds (asymonds@my.putnamschools.org)

By When: The action steps will continue throughout the school year.

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.

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.

The SIP plan will shared and discussed at a SAC meeting with SAC members and school stakeholders. The SIP will also be published on the school website and a copy will be available in the front office for review.

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))

School stakeholders are encouraged to attend SAC meetings to provide feedback and collaboration. We also encourage communication through the school's social media pages. Parents are encouraged to access Skyward to view student grades and attendance. The district has also provided the Rooms App for parents to communicate with teachers and for school personnel to communicate with parents.

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)

Instructional personnel will receive support from district curriculum coaches biweekly during teacher planning as well as at district professional learning communities. Administration will provide teachers with support and feedback in instructional practices.

The master schedule is designed to maximize students learning time and offer students a variety of opportunities to participate in acceleration. Interruptions to the school day will be limited to protect instructional time of standards based explicit instruction.

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.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

We provide a wide variety of post secondary preparation. Our acceleration programs include AICE, Dual Enrollment, Pre-AP, AP, and Collegiate HS. Our CTE programs include: Welding, Allied Health, Building Construction, Business Entrepreneurship, Digital Informational Technologies, AG, Animal Science, Agritechnologies, OJT and Coding Fundamentals.

During the school year we do a College and Career night to give our families access to colleges and businesses in the area to increase their awareness of opportunities in both sectors. We also host a job fair with local businesses where student interview for current vacancies. Students are able to meet a wide variety of employers from the business sector.

Counselors meet regularly with students to promote opportunities in both college and career pathways to ensure all students have a post secondary pathway prior to graduating.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

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: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$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