

Putnam County School District

# Kelley Smith 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>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>25</b>

# Kelley Smith Elementary School

141 KELLEY SMITH SCHOOL RD, Palatka, FL 32177

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

## 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 Kelley Smith Elementary School is to provide a culture of inclusivity coupled with positive relationships that fosters social, emotional, and academic learning while focusing on developing each child into a future leader of tomorrow.

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

We will inspire every student to think, to learn, to achieve, to care, and to become a successful and responsible citizen of the community.

### 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
Tucker, Mike	Principal	
Burnett, Joni	Assistant Principal	
Jones, Martisha	Math Coach	
Raburn, Shelly	Instructional Coach	
Simpson, Megan	Other	
David, Cynthia	School Counselor	
Surrency, Ricky	Dean	
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.
Wilds, Michelle	Reading Coach	Work with and support teachers with the development and successful demonstration and application of knowledge, strategies, skills, tools, and techniques to effectively teach reading and writing to all students.

### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

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))

The SIP will be monitored during SAC meetings for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards. We will use the data to monitor each subgroup paying particular close attention to African Americans and Students with Disabilities.

### Demographic Data

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

<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>	42%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	96%
<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)* 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: B 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	29	55	51	57	45	43	44	0	0	324
One or more suspensions	1	12	9	12	12	10	13	0	0	69
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	5	7	6	14	15	4	4	0	0	55
Course failure in Math	3	1	4	10	4	1	4	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	29	22	29	0	0	98
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	17	15	16	0	0	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	7	8	9	8	9	9	0	0	58
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	12	11	13	15	15	19	0	0	88

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	8	5	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	4

### 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	38	61	42	55	35	44	46	0	0	321
One or more suspensions	1	7	2	16	12	15	11	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA	2	10	2	2	4	6	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	3	1	2	3	4	7	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	25	23	15	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	29	19	25	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	39	40	28	41	18	20	7	0	0	193

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	9	4	14	15	17	18	0	0	80

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	8	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	5

**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	38	61	42	55	35	44	46	0	0	321
One or more suspensions	1	7	2	16	12	15	11	0	0	64
Course failure in ELA	2	10	2	2	4	6	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	3	1	2	3	4	7	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	17	25	23	15	0	0	80
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	29	19	25	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	39	40	28	41	18	20	7	0	0	193

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	9	4	14	15	17	18	0	0	80

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	8	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	5

**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*	51	43	53	52	43	56	56		
ELA Learning Gains				60			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			35		
Math Achievement*	62	49	59	57	47	50	58		
Math Learning Gains				65			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			41		
Science Achievement*	43	45	54	38	45	59	44		
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					36	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		56	59						

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

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

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	203
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	376
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

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

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	2	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	21	Yes	4	1
HSP	50			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	42			

**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	39	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	3	
HSP	49			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	47			

**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	51			62			43					
SWD	30			39			29				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22			38			13				4	
HSP	42			58							2	
MUL	62			69							2	
PAC												
WHT	67			74			55				4	
FRL	42			53			34				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	52	60	49	57	65	55	38					
SWD	26	48	46	29	51	51	20					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	51	56	26	53	58	15					
HSP	35	42		48	72							
MUL	60	42		67	92							
PAC												
WHT	69	68	44	73	68	52	48					
FRL	38	54	52	42	60	56	26					

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	56	52	35	58	54	41	44					
SWD	36	33		38	33		31					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	31		29	31		12					
HSP	25			25								
MUL	62			77								
PAC												
WHT	69	58	50	70	61	36	54					
FRL	49	52	36	46	48	40	38					

### 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	47%	45%	2%	54%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	44%	7%	58%	-7%
06	2023 - Spring	65%	45%	20%	47%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	47%	36%	11%	50%	-3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	83%	60%	23%	54%	29%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	45%	13%	59%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	51%	12%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	46%	11%	55%	2%

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.**

Proficiency dropped in 5th grade ELA to 49%. Our students with disabilities and African American subgroups did not meet the 41% expectancy percentile. One of the factors that contributed to the gap was that we had a teacher who left midyear, and that teacher was replaced with a first year teacher. There was a lack of understanding of the 5th grade standards.

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

Proficiency dropped in 5th grade ELA to 49%. Our students with disabilities and African American subgroups did not meet the 41% expectancy percentile. We had an ELA teacher leave in December.

**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.**

Our biggest gap when compared to the state average was 5th grade ELA. The state average was 55%, whereas the school average was 48%. One of the factors that contributed to the gap was that we had a teacher who left midyear, and that teacher was replaced with a first year teacher. There was a lack of understanding of the 5th grade standards.

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

6th grade math was 85% proficient. Students who were level 3 and above took an advanced math class. Our math coach also supported our 6th grade math teachers.

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

Our attendance rate is a concern. For example, 57% of our 3rd graders attended less than 90% of the time. We have implemented an attendance incentive through PBIS this school year and our attendance goal is 95% daily school-wide. Our attendance rate is announced daily during our morning announcements. Classes that have 100% daily are rewarded a shark tooth.

**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 to continue to build and improve on our school culture including PBIS and support students and teachers with scaffolding instruction.

**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.

Teacher shortages and teacher retention have impacted our schools and communities. In order to retain and attain teachers, KSES will work to maintain the positive school culture of the staff and students and will continue to build relationships within the community and with the parents. Our focus with our positive culture and environment is to better increase student attendance as well. We will provide professional learning opportunities to address a positive culture and environment during the upcoming school year. There are built in early release days each month where the staff will participate in these structured PL opportunities.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If KSES focuses on maintaining and improving some areas of culture with its staff and students, then by the end of the year teacher retention and applications will improve as well as student behaviors causing a reduction in referrals by 15%.

**Monitoring:**

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

We will use My Voice survey data throughout the year to monitor the culture of the staff and also discipline data from Skyward to monitor the number of referrals written and processed. We will also use data from School City to monitor any changes in student culture.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Joni Burnett (jburnett@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.

New teachers and teachers new to our district will meet with a district teacher mentor weekly and Admin will check in with all teachers at least weekly. MY Voice survey will be completed by staff throughout the year.

**Person Responsible:** Joni Burnett (jburnett@my.putnamschools.org)

**By When:** Mrs. Burnett and Mr. Tucker will work closely to check in with teachers weekly and My Voice will be completed three times per year.

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:** Joni Burnett (jburnett@my.putnamschools.org)

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

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction****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 African American and Students with Disabilities (SWDs) subgroups at KSES are the ESSA subgroups that fell below 41% threshold of proficiency. This area of focus was chosen because it will address all of the students within both of these subgroups.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our goal is to increase achievement above 41% among SWDs and the African American subgroups by providing scaffolded instruction to students.

**Monitoring:**

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

Administration will monitor through direct observation during walkthroughs, PLC meetings, and will also work closely with the school-based instructional coach and district reading coach to obtain feedback on their observations.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Mike Tucker (mtucker@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.)

Teachers will scaffold by structuring task difficulty from easier to more difficult for students, focusing on essential knowledge and skills, provide only the amount of scaffolded support necessary to allow a student or group to perform at a level they could not have performed at independently. Teachers will gradually release responsibility back to students or fade their support to promote independence with concepts/tasks. They will intentionally plan for varying supports (technology, checklists, graphic organizers), but are attune to, and adjust for, students' moment by moment support needs.

High Leverage Practices 18 - Use Strategies to Promote Active Student Engagement. This strategy provides students with opportunities to respond and encourages students to engage with peers. 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.

By providing scaffolded supports, students will be able to access the curriculum at different levels and monitor their understanding. Student achievement will increase as the students monitor their understanding of the benchmarks and their performance as their supports are faded.

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

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will work collaboratively during PLCs to develop scaffolded supports  
Admin and Instructional coaches will conduct walkthroughs to monitor the scaffolded supports implemented within the classroom setting.

**Person Responsible:** Joni Burnett (jburnett@my.putnamschools.org)

**By When:** Teachers will begin to meet in PLCs during the month of August and will meet every other week.

### CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

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

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

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

### Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

Based on full-year students tested in STAR reading, NONE of the Kindergarten, first or second grade levels had 50% or more of the students scoring below the 40th percentile. 2023 STAR PM3 indicated 49% of K-2 students are not proficient. Our area of focus for improving our proficiency will be to continue to focus on standards aligned instruction alongside collaborative planning through PLCs and district lead learning communities. These two areas of focus will ensure instruction is aligned and at the appropriate DOK as well as lexile.

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

Grade 3 FAST PM3 (ELA): Level 1: 34% Level 2: 23%

Grade 4 FAST PM3 (ELA): Level 1: 25% Level 2: 24%

Grade 5 GAST PM3 (ELA): Level 1: 28% Level 2: 27%

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 54%, 4th grade 51%, and 5th grade 52%.

Our area of focus for improving our proficiency will be to continue to focus on standards aligned instruction alongside collaborative planning through PLCs and district lead learning communities. These two areas of focus will ensure instruction is aligned and at the appropriate DOK as well as lexile.

**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 our school implements standards aligned instruction alongside collaborative planning through PLCs and district lead learning communities, then by spring of 2024, ELA achievement will improve in the FAST progress monitoring 3 assessment. 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 our school implements standards aligned instruction alongside collaborative planning through PLCs and district lead learning communities, then by spring of 2024, ELA achievement will improve in the FAST progress monitoring 3 assessment. 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 use the Benchmark Unit Assessments, interim assessments, iReady reading diagnostics in fall, winter, and spring for K-6, and FAST PM 1-2 to progress monitor data for grades K-6. We will have data chats every quarter with teachers and leadership team and modify plans as needed based on the conclusions. We will use the School City platform to progress monitor all standards based assessments. This ongoing monitoring will keep us abreast 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.

Tucker, Mike, mtucker@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 school implements BenchMark Advanced for its core curriculum in grades K-6. Benchmark Advances is aligned to the BEST standards. K-3 utilized Open Court for phonics instruction. For intervention we have a reading endorsed teacher to oversee our interventions. Our interventions include LLI, SIPPS, and STEPS to Benchmark. Students are placed in the program that is the most appropriate to meet the need of the student.

Our school uses iReady with an ESSA rating of moderate. iReady personalized instruction uses information from the i-Ready Diagnostic to generate an individualized program of online lessons in reading for grades K-8. i-Ready mitigates the challenges of what’s next to meet each student’s unique needs—whether their performance is below-grade, on-grade, or above-grade. The program helps teachers efficiently provide targeted instruction to help each student reach their academic potential and monitors how students are progressing in reading over time. Decision-making at the student, group, class, school, and district levels is explicitly driven by comprehensive, actionable reports—helping educators assess less and know more. 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 programs are included in our District's k-12 Reading Plan. The Benchmark Advance Program addresses our ELA needs and shows a proven record of effectiveness for the target population. Open

Court phonics was chosen for its proven level of effectiveness in the area of phonics. iReady helps teachers efficiently provide targeted instruction to help each student reach their academic potential and monitors how students are progressing in reading over time.

**Action Steps to Implement**  
 List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Weekly school-based PLCs focused around standards aligned planning. Collaborative planning in ELA and planning for standards aligned instruction.	Raburn, Shelly, sraburn@my.putnamschools.org
Teachers will participate in district learning communities to develop a better and deeper understanding of the BEST standards. Teachers will also work alongside their teams and district personnel to plan their curriculum pieces.	Azula, Jennifer, jazula@my.putnamschools.org
Teachers will participate in peer observations to observe specific instructional literacy components for individual growth.	Burnett, Joni, jburnett@my.putnamschools.org
The literacy leadership team will meet to track ELA progress. Walk Throughs will be conducted using a trend walk template and Marzano evaluation system.	Burnett, Joni, jburnett@my.putnamschools.org
Teachers 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. This data will help drive ELA instruction during the school year.	

## Title I Requirements

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

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

The SIP plan will be discussed and shared during SAC meetings with SAC members and stakeholders. The SIP will be available on our school website as well as in our front office.

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

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

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

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

Instructional personnel will receive support from district curriculum coaches biweekly during teacher planning as well as at district professional learning communities. Administration will provide teachers with support and feedback in instructional practices. The master schedule is designed to maximize students learning time and offer students a variety of opportunities to participate in acceleration. Interruptions to the school day will be limited to protect instructional time of standards based explicit instruction.

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

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

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

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

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

Schools implementing CSI, TSI, or ATSI activities may use available funds, including Federal title funds,



to support implementation of identified activities in the schoolwide improvement plan.

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

**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: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$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