James A. Long Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

James A. Long Elementary School

1400 OLD JACKSONVILLE RD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/jal

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, 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
Nelson, Beth	Principal	School Improvement Plan Budget Creation and Monitoring Employee Evaluation Hiring Employees Coordinating Professional Development District Data Presentations Required Instruction Coordinator
Wilbur, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Safety and Security Contact Title 1 Audit Box and Parent Involvement Plan Threat Assessment Coordinator Employee Evaluation Culture Building Activities Counseling Support and Referrals
Johns, Holly	Administrative Support	MTSS Coordinator Positive Behavior Support Initiatives Community Liaison Social Security Forms Food and Clothing Closet ELL Testing and Documentation Math and Science Contact
Polite, Darrell	Administrative Support	Behavior Intervention Plans Referral Management Positive Behavior Support Classroom Management Support
McGahey, Kelli	Instructional Coach	Lesson Plan Assistance Curriculum Support and Materials Student Data Spelling Bee New Worlds Reading Coordinator Student Promotion Class Lists 504 Coordinator ESE Liaison
Brackenbury, Michelle	Administrative Support	School Website Updates Media Specialist Technology Contact Testing Coordinator
Paul, Kerry	Science Coach	Work with and support social studies and science teachers assisting with the development of strategies,

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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.
Yeomans, Laura	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 is responsible for gathering information to share with the stakeholders. Updated academic information (test scores and school data) is shared during SAC meetings as applicable. Teachers provide input for SIP during professional learning community meetings and during early release day assemblies. All stakeholders are invited to be a part of the School Advisory Council. Members included are the principal, voted teachers, voted staff, voted parents, as well as community leaders, and business partners. The School Advisory Council will meet a minimum of 4 times per year.

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 plan will be reviewed at semester to check achievement by looking at the FAST progress monitoring results and compare the first to the second administration of the test. The school will create a list of priorities and monitor progress by reviewing data and making changes to core instruction and intervention group assignments as the year progresses. The SAC will have opportunities to review and provide input as well.

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 KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education

2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	48%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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: B 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	21	36	41	39	30	37	28	0	0	232
One or more suspensions	1	4	10	9	10	12	10	0	0	56
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	13	11	8	14	2	1	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	2	14	21	8	17	1	2	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	17	31	15	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	16	37	24	0	0	82
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	12	32	23	3	5	3	0	0	83

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	7	17	13	9	14	18	0	0	78

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	6	6	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2

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	23	52	34	29	36	32	41	0	0	247
One or more suspensions	0	3	9	9	12	5	6	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA	4	9	15	1	2	4	5	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	2	8	13	0	3	1	7	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	17	17	18	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	27	23	30	0	0	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	25	26	20	12	9	12	0	0	119

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	10	12	6	16	15	19	0	0	81

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	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	23	52	34	29	36	32	41	0	0	247
One or more suspensions	0	3	9	9	12	5	6	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA	4	9	15	1	2	4	5	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	2	8	13	0	3	1	7	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	17	17	18	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	27	23	30	0	0	81
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	15	25	26	20	12	9	12	0	0	119

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	10	12	6	16	15	19	0	0	81

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	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*	46	43	53	48	43	56	37		
ELA Learning Gains				60			35		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			47		
Math Achievement*	42	49	59	46	47	50	37		
Math Learning Gains				61			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			12		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	45	45	54	44	45	59	37		
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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	180
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	387
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
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	28	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	47			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	43			

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	44			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	67			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	55			

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	46			42			45					
SWD	31			31			20				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34			30			33				4	
HSP	53			41							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54			50			51				4	
FRL	45			41			43				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	48	60	65	46	61	63	44					
SWD	27	50	61	26	48	60	39					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	52	63	26	57	58	24					
HSP	67	82		56	64							
MUL	40			50								
PAC												
WHT	56	63	68	55	62	67	59					
FRL	46	59	69	42	60	68	44					

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	37	35	47	37	35	12	37					
SWD	28	36		35	36	10	14					
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	26	45	23	26		22					
HSP	17			33								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	47	43		47	36		46					
FRL	30	42	47	28	31	8	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	45%	45%	0%	54%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	44%	0%	58%	-14%
06	2023 - Spring	47%	45%	2%	47%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	42%	36%	6%	50%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	49%	60%	-11%	54%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	46%	45%	1%	59%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	34%	51%	-17%	61%	-27%
05	2023 - Spring	38%	46%	-8%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	42%	42%	0%	51%	-9%

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.

The lowest data component was fourth grade math at 34%. The contributing factors were 3 out of 4 teachers were new to the grade level and Reveal math was a new curriculum. The 4th graders started at the lowest percentage for PM 1. All grade levels 3rd-6th were below the state average in reading and math (except 6th grade reading which was at the state average).

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

4th grade math showed a 10% decline. New teachers, new assessment platform, and new curriculum may have contributed.

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.

4th grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. There is a negative 26% difference in PM3 average compared to the state average. New teachers and new curriculum contributed.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 3rd grade math. A new action the school took was to have math students complete individual ALEKS topics.

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

There are large numbers of current 6th graders that made level 1 in reading and in math. (31 in ELA 37 in Math)
There are 23 third graders and 32 second graders who are performing at a substantial reading deficiency.

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

The highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are as follows:
Focus on Tier 1 instruction with emphasis on growing proficiency to 51% or higher
Students owning their own data by charting progress

Departmentalize ELA and MATH in 3rd-6th grade
Improving School Culture

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

Student engagement is a critical component of student learning and should be utilized in a multi-faceted ways with intentionality in all content areas.

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

If our school highlights student engagement, then by FAST progressing monitoring #3 in 2024, our student Math proficiency scores will improve from 42% to 51% and our ELA scores will improve from 44% to 51%.

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

Progress will be monitored through PM1 and PM2 data as well as Benchmark and Unit assessments, iReady data, and Aleks data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Nelson (bnelson@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.)

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

N/A

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.

Emphasis will be placed on including student engagement components in lesson plans.

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

By When: Student engagement tasks will be part of daily core instruction and will continue through May 31, 2024.

#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.

This year grade level teams will be given the autonomy to plan and implement school wide team building events that coincide with district scheduled early release days. Parent involvement will also be a priority.

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

Parent attendance will be recorded. School Voice data will be monitored.

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

Sign in sheets will be documented and placed in the Title 1 audit box. School Voice data will be evaluated for positive changes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Nelson (bnelson@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.)

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

N/A

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.

Create a calendar of parent night dates and allow the teachers to choose which date they would like to host the parent night for their grade level. Teachers will then plan and implement the parent night based on what specific needs that grade level has and what information they deem necessary to share with the parents.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Wilbur (jwilbur@my.putnamschools.org)

By When: April 25th

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

The goal for all grade levels at James. A. Long is to have literacy scores at 51% or higher in 2023-2024. Our area of focus is to increase literacy achievement by having importance placed on student centered learning through active student engagement in team tasks. iReady data from 2022-2023 showed that 51% of kindergarten students were early grade level or below. Scores from 2022-2023 PM3 showed that: First Grade 66% of students show that they are not on track to score a level 3 and Second Grade 66% of students show that they are not on track to score a level 3. Based on full-year students tested in STAR reading, the following grade levels had 50% or more of the students scoring below the 40th percentile are 1st grade 63% and 2nd grade 54%.

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

The goal for all grade levels at James. A. Long is to have literacy scores at 51% or higher in 2023-2024. Our area of focus is to increase literacy achievement by having importance placed on student centered learning through active student engagement in team tasks.
ELA FAST proficiency data from 22-23 shows:
3rd grade 42% met proficiency
4th grade 44% met proficiency
5th grade 45% met proficiency
Based on full-year students tested on FAST ELA for their grade level, the following grade levels had 50% or more of the students scoring below the 40th percentile are 3rd grade 55%, 4th grade 56%, and 5th grade 55%.

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

Outcome to achieve: The goal is for 51% of students to be at or above benchmark at the end of the year. iReady data showed that 51% of kindergarten students were early grade level or below and with 49% being on track. Scores from 22-23 FAST Progress Monitoring #3 show that: First Grade 66% of students show that they are not on track to score a level 3 with 34% being on track and Second Grade 66% of students show that they are not on track to score a level 3 with 34% being on track. If we focus on increasing literacy achievement by having importance placed on student centered learning through active student engagement in team tasks then 51% of students in kindergarten through second grade will be at or above benchmark at the end of the year.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Outcome to achieve: The goal is for 51% of students to be at or above benchmark at the end of the year. ELA FAST proficiency data from 22-23 shows: 3rd grade 42% met proficiency, 4th grade 44% met proficiency, and 5th grade 45% met proficiency. If we focus on increasing literacy achievement by having importance placed on student centered learning through active student engagement in team tasks then 51% of students in third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grade will be at or above benchmark at the end of the year.

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.

The school will participate in trend walks. The school based leadership team will monitor best practices in teaching and provide feedback. Teacher attention to student centered learning by using team tasks will be monitored during formal observations. We will follow district year at a glance documents to take unit assessments, take state progress monitoring 3x per year and iReady reading diagnostics 3x per year. Ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes by using the data to determine what and if any adjustments need to be put in place to continue toward the end goal.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Nelson, Beth, bnelson@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?

Our school is using Open Court phonics in grades K-3 and Benchmark Advance for core ELA instruction. Yes, these programs align with the district's K-12 evidence based reading plan, align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, and meet the strong, moderate, or promising definition. Our school uses iReady with an ESSA rating of moderate. iReady personalized instruction uses information from the i-Ready Diagnostic to generate an individualized program of online lessons in reading for grades K-8. i-Ready mitigates the challenges of what's next to meet each student's unique needs—whether their performance is below-grade, on-grade, or above-grade. The program helps teachers efficiently provide targeted instruction to help each student reach their academic potential and monitors how students are progressing in reading over time. Decision-making at the student, group, class, school, and district levels is explicitly driven by comprehensive, actionable reports—helping educators assess less and know more.

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?

Using an instructional materials rubric, the following components were rated: research alignment, areas of reading (vocabulary development, comprehension, writing, communication, complexity, explicit instruction, real world connections, multicultural representation, and sequential instruction. The Benchmark Advance Program addresses our ELA needs and shows a proven record of effectiveness for the target population. Open Court phonics was chosen for its proven level of effectiveness in the area of phonics. iReady helps teachers efficiently provide targeted instruction to help each student reach their academic potential and monitors how students are progressing in reading over time. Yes, 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
Literacy Leadership 1. The literacy leadership team will meet monthly to track ELA progress. 2. Walk Throughs will be scheduled using a trend walk template and Marzano evaluation system.	Nelson, Beth, bnelson@my.putnamschools.org
Literacy Coaching 1. Student data will be analyzed to determine areas of focus. 2. The academic literacy coach will complete coaching cycles with targeted participants.	McGahey, Kelli, kmcgahey@my.putnamschools.org
Assessment 1. Follow district year at a glance documents to take unit assessments. 2. Take state progress monitoring 3x per year and iReady reading diagnostics 3x per year. 3. Use the data and make decisions regarding ELA instruction throughout the school year.	McGahey, Kelli, kmcgahey@my.putnamschools.org
Professional Learning 1. Teachers will attend ELA professional learning communities at the district level. 2. Teachers will utilize Kickup to implement their bridge to practice activities for professional development.	Nelson, Beth, bnelson@my.putnamschools.org

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 information in this SIP will be shared at faculty and staff meetings, on the school webpage, during school advisory council meetings, and during our Title 1 annual meeting.

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))

The school will create a parent involvement plan. The plan will be posted on the school webpage.
Parents will be invited to parent events and encouraged to sign up for access to Skyward where parents can monitor their child's grades and state testing results.

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))

The school plans to departmentalize 3rd-6th grade classes for the 2023-2024 school year. Teachers will be assigned either math/science or ELA/social studies. Teacher planning and training sessions in 3rd-6th will be subject specific.
5th graders who score a 3 or above on the 2022-2023 FAST test will be placed in advanced math for 6th grade. Applications are always being accepted for our Cambridge program. The school uses a test of cognitive abilities called CogAT to identify accelerated students. We have at least one Cambridge class per grade.
Each grade level will formulate a plan to have students track their own academic progress using data tracking charts.

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: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$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