Putnam County School District

Melrose Elementary School

2018-19 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 3

School Information 4

Needs Assessment 6

Planning for Improvement 9

Title I Requirements 10

Budget to Support Goals 13

Melrose Elementary School

401 STATE ROAD 26, Melrose, FL 32666

mes.putnamschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (As Reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	88%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	A	A	A*

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/6/2018.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Melrose Elementary School is a Title I school that serves students from Pre-K through sixth grade. Melrose Elementary School has maintained a School grade of an A from 2013 - 2107, but dropped to a C in the 2017-2018 school year.

Melrose Elementary School’s mission is for every student to achieve academic growth based on his or her personal abilities.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision is for every student to achieve a year’s worth of growth as defined by the state/ district. Both the mission and the vision of the school is shared with all stakeholders via newsletters, SAC meetings, and parent nights.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title
Lundy, Leah	Principal
Wylie, Sarah	Guidance Counselor
Channell, Terri	Assistant Principal

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making

Mrs. Lundy, Ms. Channell, and Mrs. Wylie participate in bi-weekly grade level PLC's with each grade level. During these PLC's, teachers discuss their student data, needs, and any other pertinent school information. The leadership team takes an active role as instructional leaders in the meetings as well by disseminating information and monitoring student progress.
The leadership team engages stakeholders and collaborates in the decision making process by holding monthly School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings. The SAC team is comprised of students, parents, non-instructional employees, teachers, and community members. The school improvement plan, career day, and other activities are discussed and altered during these meetings (with input from all stake holders).

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	9	23	20	11	10	26	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	0	3	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	7	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	1	1	1	0	4	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 7/18/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	9	18	10	13	19	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Below grade level in grades K-3	7	10	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	1	0	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

Year 2016-17 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	9	18	10	13	19	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Below grade level in grades K-3	7	10	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	1	0	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Our 4th grade ELA data is our lowest area at this time 44% proficient). This does seem to be a trend as over the last 4 years we have dropped (a 13% drop), this year the drop was much larger. We also noticed that our 3rd grade Math Scores were lower than other grades, we were at 60% proficient this year.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

This year our 4th grade Math had the biggest decline. The score dropped from 77% proficient to 62%. We noticed that school wide we had very little growth with our L25% students. This is a huge concern and is where we will be putting a lot of focus this year.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Our 4th grade ELA had a 14% difference from the state average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Our 6th grade ELA (one class of students) and our 3rd grade Math had an improvement of 6 points this year. It does not seem to be a trend as our 6th grade ELA had dropped only the year prior and 3rd grade Math had been on a slow decline the last 3 years and we came up this year.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area

Our 3rd grade group this year was made up of a very different variety of students and they were a much smaller, better behaved group of students. They were more aware of their learning. Our teachers really began using iReady and focusing on the standards. The teachers worked closely together while planning to try to increase student achievement.

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	43%	56%	58%	43%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	45%	55%	57%	50%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	40%	48%	50%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	52%	62%	72%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	61%	55%	59%	83%	56%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	44%	47%	71%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	46%	55%	62%	37%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Attendance below 90 percent	9 (9)	23 (18)	20 (10)	11 (13)	10 (19)	26 (6)	4 (6)	103 (81)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	2 (2)	2 (0)	0 (0)	3 (3)	7 (3)	1 (0)	16 (8)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)	15 (1)	0 (0)	17 (2)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (4)	7 (14)	22 (14)	0 (0)	31 (32)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	59%	40%	19%	57%	2%
	2017	54%	42%	12%	58%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	42%	38%	4%	56%	-14%
	2017	51%	42%	9%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2018	45%	39%	6%	55%	-10%
	2017	58%	38%	20%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
06	2018	100%	42%	58%	52%	48%
	2017	94%	36%	58%	52%	42%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		42%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2018	61%	48%	13%	62%	-1%
	2017	55%	48%	7%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	62%	50%	12%	62%	0%
	2017	77%	53%	24%	64%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2018	68%	48%	20%	61%	7%
	2017	80%	45%	35%	57%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
06	2018	100%	47%	53%	52%	48%
	2017	100%	38%	62%	51%	49%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				

Subgroup Data

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
WHT	56	46	44	73	63	52	59				
BLK	24	25	17	28	40	40					
HSP	57	46		62	62						
MUL	71			86	60						
SWD	34	37	29	40	45	42	60				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
FRL	46	36	29	61	61	52	55				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**
WHT	64	60	52	75	85	68	70				
BLK	28	40		52	67						
HSP	39			71							
MUL	59	50		71	92						
SWD	16	24	33	32	52	38					
FRL	45	45	36	63	80	73	51				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Lowest 25% Students (ELA/Math)
Rationale	Our 2018 school data showed that in ELA, 4th and 5th grade we only had 20% of our L25% students show growth this year. In 4th grade Math, only 14% of our L25% students showed growth. When we looked at our subgroup data, we noticed that all areas that had data dealing with our L25% students had also declined this year with the exception of our SWD students in the area of Math. Focusing on our L25% will support continuous school grade improvement by increasing the number of students showing growth in Reading and Math and overall learning gains.
Intended Outcome	If school leadership, teachers, and staff are aware of who the L25% are, we can begin working with those students on individual needs in order to increase academic growth. We will work with each student to create a plan of action in order to meet this goal. Our L25% students' progress will be continuously monitored through monthly teacher and student data chats.
Point Person	Leah Lundy (llundy@my.putnamschools.org)
Action Step	
Description	1. Create the L25% list and distribute to teachers. 2. Develop a monthly schedule for data chats to monitor the L25% students. 3. Teachers will develop individual areas of focus for each L25% student based on FSA and iReady data. 4. L 25% students will meet with administration monthly to discuss their progress and academic goals.
Person Responsible	Terri Channell (tchannell@my.putnamschools.org)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	1. Minutes, agenda, and sign in sheets from monthly data chats will be collected by administration. 2. Teachers will provide a copy of each students area of focus to administration. 3. iReady diagnostic and standards mastery will be used to monitor growth.
Person Responsible	Leah Lundy (llundy@my.putnamschools.org)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

We will involve parents in the education of their children. Parents will be advised of all school policies, school functions, and academic expectations. Communication with parents will be through phone calls, the Alert system, student planners on a daily basis, quarterly night activities, and Terrific Kids ceremonies on a monthly basis. A parent data night will be held to discuss iReady and FSA so parents have a better understanding of assessments.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

The guidance counselor at Melrose has created a "Guidance Referral". This form is used by staff members when they feel a student could benefit from speaking with the guidance counselor. This occurs when a child is exhibiting emotions that interfere with his or her learning. This may also occur when family events may create stress on the child's social or emotional well being.

The guidance counselor also creates groups based on the social-emotional needs of the students. (Attendance, anger issues, etc. are some of the groups the guidance counselor works with on a consistent basis.)

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

The Melrose PreK teacher prepares the students for Kindergarten with an age-appropriate school-based environment instead of a day care setting. The PreK teacher teaches the SRA Imagine It! curriculum that introduces the students to language, phonemic awareness, alphabet knowledge, reading and responding, sight words, math and science and social studies so the children can easily transition into Kindergarten. The teacher also follows the school schedules so that when entering Kindergarten the routines for the children basically stay the same, and they are able to go into Kindergarten ready to learn.

In addition, the teacher that teaches the Accelerated 6th Grade Class prepares the 6th grade students for their transition to Q.I. Roberts Cambridge program by providing a challenging curriculum on the honors level that provides many opportunities for enrichment and growth. Prior to their transition, all 6th graders visit Q.I. Roberts for an orientation and tour of the campus.

In addition, the guidance counselor at Melrose meets with and communicates with Q.I.'s guidance counselor ahead of time (usually in April and before students visit the middle school) regarding potential students who will be enrolling as 6th graders. This gives the middle school a better idea of specific student needs that need to be considered before they enroll. Q.I.'s guidance counselor in turn provides Melrose students with possible electives they may take and/or other pertinent information that will make the transition that much smoother for students once they go to middle school.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

The U.S. Department of Education released proposed regulations to implement the requirements related to Federal spending in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as recently revised by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA} which states, Federal funds must supplement and may not supplant state and local funds. Regulations ensure that Federal funds are additive and do not take the place of state and local funds in low-income schools in keeping with the longstanding commitment under Title I that the nation's highest need students receive the additional financial resources necessary to help them succeed.

In accordance with ESSA Section 118 (b} (2}, the methodology used to allocate State and local funds to each school receiving assistance under this part (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. For the past several years, grades Kindergarten, first, second, and third grades have been allocated 1 teacher per 17 students. Grades four, five, six, seven, and eight are allocated 1 teacher per 21 students. Though the specific ratio may change year to year, this formula provides teachers for these grade levels at slightly below the ratio required to meet Florida's class size regulations.

Expenditures of titled funds at the school level are then 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 district school data report-outs conducted quarterly.

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.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

NA

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$0.00**