

Putnam County School District

Robert H. Jenkins, Jr Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Robert H. Jenkins, Jr Elementary School

251 S STATE ROAD 315, Interlachen, FL 32148

www.putnamschools.org/o/ies

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.

Our mission at Robert H. Jenkins, Jr Elementary School is to provide engaging and effective standards-based instruction that will allow students to reach academic proficiency. Through collective responsibility, our students will grow and learn in a positive environment where all students, faculty, staff, parents and community members work together to foster successful outcomes.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Robert H. Jenkins, Jr Elementary School is dedicated to achieving our school mission through educating our students by staying focused on learning, creating a collaborative culture and monitoring the results of student growth to inform and improve best practices for success.

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
Adams, Paula	Principal	Paula Adams, principal, will accept responsibility for the instructional vision and management of all school functions by delegating, observing following through, and coaching of the employees. She will evaluate all employees and keep the leadership team focused on the mission of ensuring student success.
Champion, Vanessa	Assistant Principal	Vanessa Champion will accept responsibility for assisting the principal to maintain the instructional vision and management of all school functions by delegating, observing, following through, and coaching of the employees. He will assist with the evaluation of all employees and with keeping the leadership team focused on the mission of ensuring student success.
Holley, Mary Arlene	Dean	Discipline & MTSS Discipline Arlenes will process discipline referrals, assist teachers with classroom management, insure compliance with behavior threat assessments protocols, support conflict resolution efforts and support conflict resolution efforts and support the administration with maintaining a positive culture.
Mason, Ashley	Instructional Coach	Independent and Whole group coaching Ashley Mason will support highly effective classroom practices focusing on academic teaming and engagement. She will provide professional development through targeted feedback cycles and PLCs. She will coordinate and plan with district coaches in all areas of core instruction.
Redman, Valerie Lynn	Administrative Support	Lynn Redman will manage state testing and schedules for school-wide testing days. She will coordinate with other lead members to support ESE, ELL, 504 students and train all employees for each session of testing. She will also schedule the iReady diagnostic 3 times a year.
Mills, Georgette	Administrative Support	Georgette Mills will serve as a bridge between the deans office and guidance office. She will be a student advocate who focuses on social skills development for students who need additional support beyond the classroom. She will be planning small group conflict resolution trainings. This position has been deemed as our Student Success Mentor.
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.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
Hawk, Lacey	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL, 504, MTSS Assistance, Cambridge-Enhancement; and ESE/Gifted
Clemons, Jessica	Administrative Support	Oversees intervention for Tier 2 and 3 students and collaborates with teachers to ensure skills/foundations are being met.

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 lead members were a part of the foundational portions of the plan. Data was taken from all teachers/grade levels, etc. 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 partners which are also a make-up of the school leadership team. Their input is then used during the SIP development process. 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))

SIP Monitoring will take place once monthly when the whole staff meets together; at the release of quarterly grades and at end of diagnostics and state progress monitoring assessment windows. We will use the data to monitor each subgroup paying particular close attention to 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)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes

ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: 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	30	75	64	68	57	47	74	0	0	415	
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	4	5	4	21	0	0	39	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	7	15	27	25	14	8	13	0	0	109	
Course failure in Math	7	9	12	18	16	6	25	0	0	93	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	55	34	48	0	0	152	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	33	25	30	0	0	99	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	16	23	43	9	9	15	0	0	123	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	11	22	18	16	15	23	0	0	110

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	9	14	3	15	1	1	6	0	0	49
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	1	4	1	0	0	9

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	28	67	61	76	50	54	61	0	0	397
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	1	2	4	21	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	2	25	25	31	14	7	7	0	0	111
Course failure in Math	2	11	16	29	12	6	4	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	26	25	42	0	0	126
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	26	29	60	0	0	142
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	54	57	62	66	46	58	61	0	0	404

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	1	23	20	38	20	17	34	0	0	153

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	8	8	33	1	0	2	0	0	54
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	6

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	28	67	61	76	50	54	61	0	0	397	
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	1	2	4	21	0	0	35	
Course failure in ELA	2	25	25	31	14	7	7	0	0	111	
Course failure in Math	2	11	16	29	12	6	4	0	0	80	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	26	25	42	0	0	126	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	26	29	60	0	0	142	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	54	57	62	66	46	58	61	0	0	404	

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	1	23	20	38	20	17	34	0	0	153

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	8	8	33	1	0	2	0	0	54
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	6

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*	39	43	53	40	43	56	32		
ELA Learning Gains				52			35		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			25		
Math Achievement*	51	49	59	39	47	50	34		
Math Learning Gains				57			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			17		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	43	45	54	39	45	59	31		
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					36	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	46	56	59	43			53		

* 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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	215
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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	4	
ELL	26	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	45			
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	31	Yes	3	1
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	41			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	46			
FRL	42			

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	39			51			43					46
SWD	24			30			37				4	
ELL	13			18							3	46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17			44							2	
HSP	36			40			33				5	48
MUL	42			42							2	
PAC												
WHT	41			55			46				4	
FRL	37			51			42				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	40	52	38	39	57	51	39					43
SWD	16	35	28	18	49	47	21					
ELL	27	47		32	57							43
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	50		29	56							
HSP	33	52	40	31	56	44	27					43
MUL	43	59		48	71							
PAC												
WHT	41	52	37	42	57	50	43					
FRL	36	48	34	35	57	53	33					38

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	32	35	25	34	31	17	31					53
SWD	13	12	13	18	12	6	15					
ELL	14			23								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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	16			16								
HSP	30	38		27	20		33					53
MUL	41			50								
PAC												
WHT	33	34	29	36	32	27	32					
FRL	31	38	33	31	32	17	34					53

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	42%	45%	-3%	54%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	44%	-4%	58%	-18%
06	2023 - Spring	42%	45%	-3%	47%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	33%	36%	-3%	50%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	65%	60%	5%	54%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	44%	45%	-1%	59%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	51%	4%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	46%	4%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	40%	42%	-2%	51%	-11%

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.

In grades 3-6 in ELA, all grade levels showed between 14-29% growth from PM1 to PM3. Sixth grade showed the least amount of growth with only 14% increase, which is 4% higher than the state and 3% higher than the district. Fourth grade has the second lowest growth in ELA with 18% increase which is 2% lower than the state and district. Third grade ELA has the lowest proficiency in PM3 33%. This is 17% lower than the state and 3% lower than the district.

In grades 3-6 Math, all grade levels showed between 37-54% growth from PM1 to PM2. Fifth grade showed the least amount of growth with only 37% increase, which is 3 lower% than the state, but 3% higher than the district. Third grade was a close second with 38% growth, which was 12% lower than the state and 1% lower than the district. Third grade also had the lowest proficiency with 44%. This was 15% lower than the state average and 1% lower than the district.

Science scores increased from 35% to 42%. Science achievement was commensurate with the overall reading achievement at 42%.

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

The FAST assessment is in its first year of implementation and there are no prior years scores to make a true comparison; therefore, previous years data will be used to pinpoint priority data components. In reviewing current FAST data and identifying students for tier 2 & 3 reading interventions, our largest group of students are in grades 3 & 4. Students were identified based on the criteria set forth in the 23-24 CERT plan. In third 35 of the students qualify for tier 2 & 3 interventions. In fourth, 46 students qualify for tier 2 & 3 interventions.

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.

Third grade ELA and math show the greatest gap when compared to the state average. In ELA, third grade was 9 points below the state average. In math, third grade was 12 points below the state average.

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

Fourth grade showed the most improvement in both ELA and math: In ELA, fourth grade made 29 points growth between PM1 and PM3. In Math, fourth grade made 54 points growth from PM1 and PM2. New actions include targeted learning and planning in PLC, and support for both reading and math interventions. Also, an absenteeism program will be implemented to improve student and teacher attendance.

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

Absenteeism is a widespread problem effecting all grade levels. Attendance is also a factor and will be targeted with a detailed incentive plan for "Attend Today. Achieve Tomorrow!" Reading achievement is also an area of concern, with a large percentage of students in grades 3-6 scoring level 1.

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

- 1) Absenteeism
- 2) Third Grade ELA
- 3) Tier 2 & 3 reading interventions for students based on district guidelines
- 4) SWD Learning gains in both math and reading
- 5) Third Grade math

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Based on the 2022-2023 5 Essentials survey, teacher influence was rated weak, with a rating of 32. This was an 18-point increase from the previous year. We will provide professional learning opportunities to address a positive culture and environment during the upcoming school year. There are built in early release days each month where the staff will participate in these structured PL opportunities.

The daily average school-wide attendance for the 2022-2023 school year was 88%. A daily average attendance of 95% is needed to maximize the benefits of educational opportunities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teachers will be given the opportunity to actively participate in one of six school-wide committees directly related to school improvement initiatives each early release day. By engaging in school improvement committees, teachers will rate empowerment a 3 or higher on the My Voice post-survey at the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Through clearly communicating attendance expectations and research-based benefits to the community and families, Robert H. Jenkins Elementary will increase the average daily attendance from 88% to 95% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Committees will create goals for the committees and engage in quarterly data meetings with the administration to track the team's progress. Teachers will be given quarterly surveys to measure teacher empowerment and provide feedback to the administrative team in order to make adjustments to the goal.

Average daily attendance will be calculated weekly, monthly, and quarterly by Paula Adams through the use of Skyward reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vanessa Champion (vchampion@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 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: Paula Adams (p2adams@my.putnamschools.org)

By When: During the 2023-24 school year.

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

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

The SWD subgroup has been continuously been identified low performing sub group. At 31% proficient, there is a need to implement some new strategies.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we focus on tiered intervention and tracking to fluidly shift students to best meet their needs throughout the 2023-24 SY, then all subgroups will be at or above the overall federal index of 41%. including the Students with Disabilities subgroup.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored using PCSD Trend Walk data, Marzano Evaluation Data, Schoolwide data to include, Reveal Math, Benchmark and Open Court assessments, iReady Diagnostics and Tier 1, 2, and 3 strategic Intervention data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vanessa Champion (vchampion@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 is Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI). The other evidence based strategies to be used will include all of the schools instructional Resources: K-3 Open Court; K-6 Benchmark; K-6 Reveal Math; SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight words); and a Strategic Differentiation--Scaffolding within the planning process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The identified evidence-based strategy, Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), meets Florida's definition of evidence-based and align with the Putnam County School District's K-12 Reading Plan. The LLI program addresses the identified need to improve student reading outcomes. Resources and criteria are based on the approved K-12 Decision Trees.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The instructional coaches will support highly effective classroom instructional practices with a focus on interventions. 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 focusing on interventions.

Person Responsible: Paula Adams (p2adams@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

This school has been identified under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence Act (R.A.I.S.E.) as needing to focus on improving student reading outcomes. Data from Spring 2023 iReady Reading Diagnostic showed 36% scoring early grade level or below grade level - 12% of kindergarten students still scoring early grade level or below grade level, 48% of first grade students scoring early grade level or below grade level and 47% of second grade students scoring early grade level or below

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

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

This school has been identified under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence Act (RAISE) as needing to focus on improving student reading outcomes. Data from the iReady Diagnostic from Spring 2023 showed 48% of students in grades 3 - 6 scoring below grade level - 30% of 3rd grade students below grade level, 55% of 4th grade students below grade level and 60% of 5th grade students below grade level. 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 65%, 4th grade 60%, 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

Since NONE of the Kindergarten, first or second grade levels had 50% or more of the students scoring below the 40th percentile based on full-year students tested in STAR reading, we will continue what we are doing. Our goal is to increase students scoring at or above grade level on the Spring F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring Assessment. Targets for Grade Levels include K = 75%, 1st = 60% and 2nd = 55% by the end of SY 23-24.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

If we implement reading intervention with fidelity, then by the end of SY 23-24, students scoring Level 3 or above on the 2023 statewide, standardized ELA assessment will increase for Grades 3-6 as follows: 3rd = 50%, 4th = 50%, 5th = 55%, and 6th = 50%.

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.

This area of focus will be monitored using PCSD Trend Walk data, Marzano's Evaluation and Coaching Tool, Benchmark Advance Unit Assessments, iReady Diagnostic Results, and F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring Assessments. This ongoing monitoring will drive our decisions and ultimately have a positive impact on student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Adams, Paula, p2adams@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?

The evidence-based strategies being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome are K-3 Open Court Foundational Skills Kits, K-6 Benchmark Advance, (SIPPS) Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (LLI) Leveled Literacy Intervention, with Benchmark Intervention also being used for those who are not making gains with LLI. LLI has a strong evidence-base and SIPPS has a moderate evidence-base. 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 identified evidence-based strategies meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based, are aligned to the Florida B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, align with the PCSD K-12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan and are adopted curricula of the PCSD. We have chosen to use SIPPS and LLI because research shows that student growth is significant when using these programs. Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) is a short-term, supplementary, small-group literacy intervention designed to help struggling readers achieve grade-level competency. The intervention provides explicit instruction in phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, oral language skills, and writing. LLI helps teachers match students with texts of progressing difficulty and deliver systematic lessons targeted to a student’s reading ability. Also, these programs have a positive effect on general reading achievement and reading fluency.

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 Coaching - Bimonthly whole school PLCs focused on school culture, data disaggregation and strategy development, Participation in formal coaching cycles, Planning with a district coach, Countywide Grade Level Learning Communities, Side by side coaching opportunities using school based strategy coach and/or district content specialists, Look and Learns with Academic Coach.	Mason, Ashley, amason@my.putnamschools.org
Literacy Leadership: We will need to strengthen core instruction by adhering to the adopted county curriculum, guarding academic learning time, increasing student ownership through academic teaming and aggressively target teacher growth and development.	Adams, Paula, p2adams@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 School Improvement Plan will be shared with our stakeholders via:

Apptegy, our district communication source tied to all parents

School Website found at <https://www.putnamschools.org/o/ies>

Social Media found at <https://www.facebook.com/InterlachenBabyRams>

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))

Communication via:

Apptegy, our district communication source tied to all parents

School Website found at <https://www.putnamschools.org/o/ies>

Social Media found at <https://www.facebook.com/InterlachenBabyRams>

Parent and family involvement is necessary for maintaining a positive school culture. Our goal is to have 95% of all parents involved in some capacity in their child's education at Jenkins. We would like this involvement to contain 2-way communication. This will be accomplished and documented through the acknowledgement and input in the development of the ParentStudent-Teacher compact, in-put into the PFEP, as well as soliciting parent input into how parent and family involvement funds are spent. As always, more traditional communication like face to face parent conferences, positive and concern based phone calls, and notes home will be utilized. We will offer activities, to include a literacy night, STEM night and Math night at varied times throughout the school year as well as provide food and child care when necessary to alleviate barriers preventing parent attendance.

(Sign in sheets, agendas and related handouts will serve as documentation of this effort.)

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)

One of the main areas in need of focus this year was attendance. We feel by education our students, parents, and stakeholders about the importance of attendance and the correlation to student success, we can improve the overall capacity for the children to learn.

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