

Putnam County School District

# Browning Pearce Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>25</b>

# Browning Pearce Elementary School

100 BEAR BLVD, San Mateo, FL 32187

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

## 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.**

The Bear Mission Statement  
Browning Pearce Elementary School will:

-Empower teachers to create a challenging learning environment where students are expected to excel in all academic standards, encouraged to think critically and persevere, and are inspired to be creative problem solvers as they engage in collaborative tasks with their peers.

-Foster positive relationships between staff, students, families, and the community we serve by providing a variety of academic and social emotional supports.

-Maintain a safe and healthy learning environment where our students and their cultures are respected, their unique abilities are valued, and students have a voice in their educational pursuits so that they are ready for 21st Century demands.

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

The Bear Vision Statement  
At Browning Pearce, we are a unified family of learners who nurture & challenge each student to excel in the classroom & community.

The Bear Motto  
EVERY CHILD. EVERY DAY.

### 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
Brady, Yolanda	Principal	Conducts Business Between School and District Office School Improvement Plan Creates and Monitors Budget Non-Instructional Evaluation Plans for Professional Development Hires and Manages Employees Leads Administration Team Leads Data Analysis/Prepares District Data Presentations Threat Assessment Team Member Teacher Observations and Evaluations via Effective Educators SAC Team Member Student Drop Off/Pick Up
Jackson, Molly	Assistant Principal	Parent and Family Engagement Plan PBIS Coordinator Threat Assessment Team Member EOP and Safety Public Relations/Website/Social Media Title 1 Audit Box Master Scheduling Teacher Observations and Evaluations via Effective Educators Student Discipline Support Student Drop Off/Pick Up
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.
Fussell, Ashley	Instructional Coach	Supports implementation of Math curriculum, Florida Reveal Supports the use of Aleks Monitor and plan for K-6 grade level Math PLC meetings Math Instructional Support Testing Coordinator for State Assessments School Advisory Council Secretary
Hoare, Ashley	Instructional Coach	K-6 i-Ready Diagnostics and Monitoring Coordinates T2 and T3 Reading Interventions Monitors and collects data for K-6 ELA PLC meetings Supports implementation of Benchmark Advance and Open Court 3rd grade portfolio contact

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pinkerton, Amanda	Dean	Provides behavioral support to K-6 teachers Bus Discipline Monitors school discipline data SEL Behavior Threat Assessment Team Member
Ramirez, Donna	School Counselor	ESOL and WIDA Coordinator 504 Plans ESE Contact MTSS Coordinator Mental Health Contact DCF Contact
Shettel, Lara	Reading Coach	Work with and support ELA teachers assisting with the development of strategies, skills, tools, and techniques to effectively teach ELA 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 which are also a make-up of the school leadership team are the principal, voted teachers, voted staff, voted parents, as well as community leaders, and business partner. Their input is used in the SIP development process and review of the SIP throughout the school year. The School Advisory Council meets 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))

We will use the data to monitor each subgroup paying particular close attention to African Americans. We will review data after each progress monitoring assessment to determine if the plan needs to be revised and updated.

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6



<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	41%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

## 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	48	45	43	25	37	29	0	0	244
One or more suspensions	1	4	10	3	3	16	15	0	0	52
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	1	13	19	3	6	5	0	0	49
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	21	6	3	7	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	21	33	18	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	29	34	30	0	0	109
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	42	55	19	28	14	12	0	0	176

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	1	5	10	19	11	18	12	0	0	76

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	0	1	20	0	0	2	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

### 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	19	52	49	57	45	28	46	0	0	296
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	3	6	2	12	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	3	8	2	13	5	3	3	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	4	1	3	9	2	6	11	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	22	11	19	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	21	17	32	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	23	80	67	61	0	0	0	0	0	231

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	4	4	3	16	21	11	17	0	0	76

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	1	0	19	0	0	2	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

### 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	19	52	49	57	45	28	46	0	0	296
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	3	6	2	12	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	3	8	2	13	5	3	3	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	4	1	3	9	2	6	11	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	22	11	19	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	21	17	32	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	23	80	67	61	0	0	0	0	0	231

**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	4	4	3	16	21	11	17	0	0	76

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Retained Students: Current Year	6	1	0	19	0	0	2	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

## 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*	40	43	53	46	43	56	40		
ELA Learning Gains				64			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			43		
Math Achievement*	42	49	59	47	47	50	41		
Math Learning Gains				58			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			29		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	37	45	54	26	45	59	33		
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					36	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	47	56	59	54			63		

\* 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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	203
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	397
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

<b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	20	Yes	1	1
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	4	
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	41			
FRL	39	Yes	1	

<b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	41			
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	3	
HSP	47			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	52			
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	40			42			37					47
SWD	21			19			14				4	
ELL	33			36							4	47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			38							3	
HSP	41			41							4	49
MUL	52			43							3	
PAC												
WHT	42			43			40				4	
FRL	37			40			34				5	48

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	46	64	55	47	58	47	26					54
SWD	31	61	53	32	53	48	9					
ELL	38	67		35	64		10					54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	48	42	35	41	33	20					
HSP	43	68		45	68	46	7					53
MUL	58	92		53	69							
PAC												
WHT	50	64	58	51	58	50	35					
FRL	40	62	53	42	57	44	20					53

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	40	40	43	41	36	29	33					63
SWD	26	42	50	22	38	29	23					
ELL	30	40		46								63

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	21	33		24	20		27					
HSP	44	41		46	44		21					65
MUL	38			38								
PAC												
WHT	45	41	42	45	40		40					
FRL	36	44	41	35	30	25	27					63

**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	49%	45%	4%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	44%	-1%	58%	-15%
06	2023 - Spring	34%	45%	-11%	47%	-13%
03	2023 - Spring	34%	36%	-2%	50%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	53%	60%	-7%	54%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	39%	45%	-6%	59%	-20%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	51%	0%	61%	-10%
05	2023 - Spring	30%	46%	-16%	55%	-25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	36%	42%	-6%	51%	-15%

### 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.**

Our lowest component was 5th grade math. PM 1 was 7% and PM 3 was 30% change of +23. The fifth grade team consisted of three teachers for ELA, Math and Science/Social Studies. New curriculum, new standards and student behavior contributed to some of the reason for the low performance. Last year math PLC's were bi-monthly. This year math PLC's are weekly. Last year we started the year with a math teacher that left in September. We moved a 6th grade math teacher to teach 5th grade math. The Dean is revamping our school-wide PBIS plan. We have a Social/Emotional program called Caring School Communities that teachers utilize.

Our second lowest component was 6th grade ELA PM 1 23% PM 2 35% Change +12.

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

Our state switched from 2022 FSA to 2023 FAST and we will not be able to have a good correlation until we get data for the 2024 FAST assessment. Our lowest component is math.

**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.**

5th grade math School 30% state 55%

3rd grade math school 39% state 59%

3rd grade reading school 34% state 50%

5th grade had the greatest gap. New curriculum, new standards (B.E.S.T.) and student behavior contributed to some of the reason for this gap. Last year was our first year with the curriculum Florida Reveal Math. Other contributing factors include addressing gaps in number sense and fluency. Our District math coach is working with our school coach to provide support to teachers. We have departmentalized 2nd-6th grade; this allows more focus on the subject area. Grade levels have common planning time. We have weekly math PLC's. During our weekly lead team meetings we look at weekly and unit test data as well as progress monitoring data.

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

6th grade math PM 1 9% PM 2 53% change of +44

4th grade math PM 1 9% PM 2 50% change of +41

3rd grade math PM 1 4% PM 2 39% change of +35

6th grade math showed the most improvement. We had bi-monthly math PLC's. We had two math teachers; one was retired and came back. The master schedule was made so that each math teacher



pushed into the other's class to provide math interventions. The master schedule also allowed for common planning time for the math teachers.

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

Upon reviewing the EWS data, a potential area of concern is the number of 5th grade students scoring a level 1 on ELA (33) & Math (34) statewide assessments. That's roughly 1/3 of the 22/23 SY 5th grade student body.

**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 improving statewide assessments for all grade levels and ensuring all subgroups are at least 41% proficient paying particularly close attention to the African American subgroup.

**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 Black/African-American****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.

The Black/African American subgroup at BPES is the ESSA subgroup that fell below the 41% threshold of proficiency. This Area of Focus was chosen because it is the only subgroup that, as a whole, is not showing proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If we focus on active student engagement, the Black/African American subgroup will be at least 41% proficient on the FAST PM3 assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored after each progress monitoring assessment. Additionally, during weekly PLC meetings, we will discuss progress on class and district assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Yolanda Brady (ybrady@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 is High Leverage Practices 18 - Use Strategies to Promote Active Student Engagement. This intervention 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.

This school year, BPES is implementing Academic Teaming. Because promoting active student engagement has an Effect Size of .82, when implemented with fidelity, we expect to see growth. Additionally, 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.

The instructional coaches will support highly effective classroom instructional practices focusing on academic teaming and engagement. They will build capacity through modeling of effective lessons and

provide professional learning through targeted feedback cycles, PLCs, and Look & Learns. They will work collaboratively with the grade level teams to maintain the instructional pace and fidelity of the standards.

**Person Responsible:** Yolanda Brady (ybrady@my.putnamschools.org)

**By When:** Throughout the 2023-24 school year.

## #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.

Improving positive school culture is crucial because it creates an environment where students feel safe, supported, and motivated to learn. A positive culture enhances student well-being, reduces incidents of bullying and disciplinary issues, and fosters better relationships between students and teachers. This ultimately leads to improved academic performance, higher attendance rates, and better overall school experience for students and teachers. BPES has in place a PBIS schoolwide initiative to recognize positive behaviors and attendance. BPES will provide professional learning opportunities to address a positive culture and environment and improve the PBIS 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.

### 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%. Part of our data based objective outcome will be determined through the use of My Voice. It's 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 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.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Yolanda Brady (ybrady@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.

Provide professional learning opportunities to address a positive culture and environment and improve the PBIS 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.

**Person Responsible:** Yolanda Brady (ybrady@my.putnamschools.org)

**By When:** During the 2023-24 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.

**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, the following grade levels had 50% or more of the students scoring below the 40th percentile are 1st grade 67% and 2nd grade 58%. This achievement data, along with the transition to B.E.S.T. Standards for all K-6 and all new ELA adopted instructional materials in our district, confirms that we must focus on providing explicit instruction to improve Tier 1 ELA by conducting trend walks, look and learns, and embedded PL with instructional coaches.

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

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 63% and 4th grade 58%. This achievement data, along with the transition to B.E.S.T. Standards for all K-6 and all new ELA adopted instructional materials in our district, confirms that we must focus on providing explicit instruction to improve Tier 1 ELA by conducting trend walks, look and learns, and embedded PL with instructional coaches.

### **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**

If we focus on providing explicit instruction to improve Tier 1 ELA by conducting trend walks, look and learns, and embedded PL with instructional coaches then we will have 50% or more of the students in kindergarten through second grade on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

### **Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

If we focus on providing explicit instruction to improve Tier 1 ELA by conducting trend walks, look and learns, and embedded PL with instructional coaches then we will have 50% or more of the students in third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grade on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

## **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 have data chats with teachers and leadership team and modify plans as needed based on the conclusions. This ongoing monitoring will keep us aware of the data and therefore, have a positive impact on student achievement outcomes.

### **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brady, Yolanda, ybrady@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 and for intervention, we use Steps to Advance out of Benchmark. 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. Therefore, the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan and B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.

### 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 Benchmark Advance Program addresses our ELA needs and shows a proven record of effectiveness for the target population. 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
<p>BPES will focus on providing explicit instruction to improve Tier 1 ELA by conducting walk throughs using a trend walk template and Marzano evaluation system, look and learns, and embedded PL with instructional literacy coaches. The instructional literacy coach will complete coaching cycles and use analyzed student data to determine areas of focus for each participant. Teachers will attend ELA professional learning communities at the district level.</p>	<p>Brady, Yolanda, ybrady@my.putnamschools.org</p>
<p>Our Literacy Leadership Team that consists of school based administrators, instructional coaches, and teachers will meet to analyze and discuss ELA data. BPES will follow district year at a glance documents to take unit assessments as well as take state progress monitoring 3x per year and iReady reading diagnostics 3x per year.</p>	<p>Jackson, Molly, mjackson@my.putnamschools.org</p>

## 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.

BPES shares the SIP with our stakeholders several times throughout the year. We share it during the SAC meetings and during the Annual Title 1 program. We also share the SIP on our website.

**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 and to volunteer at school. We send home 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 Apptegy program. We ask for input on the PFEP during SAC meetings to get input from our parents. Our PFEP is available on our website.

**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)**

This year our school has put a priority on strong core instruction. We have weekly PLC's for ELA, Math and Science/Social Studies. We have District coaches that come in to support us with intentional



instructional planning. We use a PLC agenda to keep a focus on school goals. Our school based Reading Coach had created a shared folder for lesson plans to go. Monitoring is an ongoing process to ensure that our district provided curriculum is implemented with fidelity. Our teachers attend Learning Communities throughout the school year. In addition to strong core instruction, we have two reading intervention labs. The master schedule was developed to provide 90 minutes of uninterrupted blocks for ELA and Math. The master schedule was also developed to allow common planning time for grade levels.

**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: Black/African-American	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00

	<b>Total:</b> <b>\$0.00</b>
--	-----------------------------

**Budget Approval**

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

No