

Clay County Schools

# Montclair Elementary School



## 2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Montclair Elementary School

2398 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://mce.oneclay.net>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay County School Board.

### 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.

(\*Title I Schoolwide Plan/SIP/PFEP Made available in most languages.)

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

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

The School District of Clay County exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title
Miller, William	Principal
Williams, Robbin	Teacher, K-12
Pugh, Melissa	Teacher, K-12
White, Michelle	Teacher, K-12
Weaver, Heather	Teacher, K-12
Brown, Anita	Teacher, ESE
Larson, Cheryl	Assistant Principal
Nebesnyk, Heidi	Teacher, K-12
Thompson, Lynda	Teacher, K-12
Hildebrandt, June	Teacher, K-12
Giannini, Karen	Teacher, K-12

#### Duties

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

The School Based Leadership Team is comprised of a K-6 grade level representative and representatives from ESE, Resource and the Administration Team. Members meet monthly to review or discuss instructional strategies, instructional changes, and/or concerns based on acquired instructional data. The team works together to develop plans, trainings, and timelines for school wide initiatives. Each member then ensures that their grade level/ content area teams are informed of monthly discussions and initiatives.

## 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	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	1	3	8	7	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 9/5/2018

### 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	1	0	0	0	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	0	0	0	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

### 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	1	0	0	0	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

**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	0	0	0	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

## 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?**

Although our ELA Bottom Quartile in Grades 4-6 improved from 35% to 42%, it is still our lowest area. This is a trend from previous years data.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

The data components did not decline from the previous year.

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

ELA Lowest Quartile had the biggest gap with 6% compared to the state.

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

Science Achievement went up from 40% to 65% - a 25% percent increase. This was not a trend because this was the first year where we created a plan of action, made small groups, and used Extended Day to teach science standards.

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

Plan of action, data conferences were held with each student, used data to form small group instruction, resource team was involved in integrating standard

### 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	56%	63%	56%	48%	58%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	59%	55%	55%	55%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	50%	48%	54%	47%	46%
Math Achievement	60%	69%	62%	57%	61%	58%
Math Learning Gains	65%	68%	59%	58%	59%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	56%	47%	57%	49%	46%
Science Achievement	65%	66%	55%	52%	56%	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	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (3)	5 (2)	1 (6)	8 (12)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (2)	0 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (2)	5 (2)	1 (4)	8 (8)

### 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	63%	68%	-5%	57%	6%
	2017	62%	70%	-8%	58%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	40%	62%	-22%	56%	-16%
	2017	36%	61%	-25%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
05	2018	56%	59%	-3%	55%	1%
	2017	54%	59%	-5%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
06	2018	61%	63%	-2%	52%	9%
	2017	43%	61%	-18%	52%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	54%	70%	-16%	62%	-8%
	2017	42%	67%	-25%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	48%	66%	-18%	62%	-14%
	2017	47%	65%	-18%	64%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2018	63%	65%	-2%	61%	2%
	2017	64%	58%	6%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
06	2018	71%	68%	3%	52%	19%
	2017	58%	66%	-8%	51%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	62%	64%	-2%	55%	7%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

### 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
SWD	24	34	43	30	50	52	27				
ELL	42			42	50						
BLK	51	52		53	71	53	62				
HSP	41	38	50	51	67	67					
MUL	55	45		48	43						
WHT	61	53	39	66	64	37	68				
FRL	46	41	42	54	59	46	56				
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
SWD	24	25	20	23	31	37					
BLK	28	28	15	23	29	40	30				
HSP	38	30	25	53	50	43					
MUL	42	56		40	47						



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	60	51	53	65	58	46	49				
FRL	43	38	32	47	48	42	27				

### 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	
<b>Title</b>	Deepen standards based academic small groups tailored to students' needs in Reading, Math and Science.
<b>Rationale</b>	Continue to move bottom quartile students to proficiency and close the gaps between them and their peers. ELA lowest quartile increased by 7%; however it is 6% below the state average. Math lowest quartile increased by 5% but is 9% below the district average.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	Students who are proficient in reading and math will be able to preform at grade level. Our learning gains will increase by 8% in Reading with a focus on the lowest quartile and increase by at least 10% in Math with a focus on the lowest quartile.
<b>Point Person</b>	Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	Group students' accordingly based on academic needs and then remediate through the use of LLI, iReady Toolbox, iReady Tools for Instruction, Leveled libraries, SIPPS, Eureka, HMH resources, instructional coaches, assistants, and Achieve3000. We will use both our Title 1 coaches and well as our .5 Interventionist to support the small group instruction. Professional development for teachers and paraprofessionals in SIPPS, LLI and iReady will be initiated within the first 10 days of school. Teams meet once a month for WOW Wednesday with a focus on aligning tasks with standards and providing data driven instruction. Demonstration classes will be used throughout the year to strengthen our instruction. Our Extended Day will use learning games for ELA and Science to motivate students and increase participation. our resource team will assist based on weak standards in Science through monthly STEAM lessons during WOW Wednesdays. The resource team is also integrating Science vocabulary into their content areas. We have connected with the District Specialists in Reading and Science to assist in our WOW meetings. The Title 1 Coach is also assisting with the PITSCO lab and missions. K-1 are integrating Capstone Science related trade books to strengthen students' vocabulary and understanding of Science concepts.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
<b>Description</b>	BAS(K-6), iReady Reading Diagnostics(K-6), iReading Math Diagnostics(K-6), Achieve3000(4-6), SIPPS Skill Assessments (K-2), FSA(3-6), Performance Matters Assessments
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

Activity #2	
<b>Title</b>	Expand Eureka Implementation
<b>Rationale</b>	Our overall math proficiency increased by 6% from 2016-2017; however we are 2% below the state average and 9% below the district average. We saw in the grade levels that implemented Eureka in the 2017-2018 school year students showed significant growth in the area of math as compared to their peers who were instructed through Go Math. Because the highest gains last year were the grade levels supported by our coach, we will encourage teachers to seek our coaches assistance.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	Increase student proficiency by 9% in the area of Math with the use of Eureka in all K-6 classrooms.
<b>Point Person</b>	Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	Use Eureka with fidelity in all K-6 classrooms, math coach, professional development, iReady Math, K-1 Number Talks, and Increased time for Math Block. Ongoing professional development based on teachers' instructional needs will continue, and we will use the demonstration classroom to strengthen our implementation of various components of the lesson.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
<b>Description</b>	Eureka Exit Tickets, Mid-Module Assessments, End of Module Assessments, iReady Math Diagnostics, FSA Math
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

Activity #3	
<b>Title</b>	Strengthen our PBIS
<b>Rationale</b>	If all teachers implement a school wide positive behavior system with fidelity, then we should see an increase in student engagement and student ownership of their behavior as evidenced by our EWS and referral rates. Last year our referrals decreased from 185 in 2016 to 107 in 2017.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	Students will take ownership of their behavior and disciple referrals will decrease as students learn to self monitor and resolve their own conflicts.
<b>Point Person</b>	William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	Foundations committee, behavior plan notebook for faculty with procedures and expectations, class dojo, shared team drive, guidance counselor, character education sample lessons, character education book of the month, first nine days character building plan
<b>Person Responsible</b>	William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
<b>Description</b>	Observations of student engagement, safety of students, decreased disciple referrals, EWS, and exit ticket assessments
<b>Person Responsible</b>	William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)

## 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, Â§ 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.**

Montclair has a rich history of parent involvement. It is fostered by activities that are part of our school culture. We meet monthly at the flag pole, have yearly bbq's, and encourage parent and staff involvement in our evening and summer activities. In addition to building these relationship, the Parent Portal is used for communication and current student progress.

#### 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 adopted ELA curriculum, Making Meaning and Being a Writer, have social and emotional components built into the programs. We have a guidance counselor on campus at all times who is available to meet with small groups, provide individual counseling and behavioral interventions. Our ISS

assistant communicates with each grade level in order to proactively support students with behavioral challenges and works with teachers to counsel students before disciplinary action is needed.

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

The administration meets with all kindergartners when they begin school. The student code of conduct is explained to the students in language that the students can comprehend. Parents of kindergartners are encouraged to join the principal for a Kindergarten MCE 101 where parents receive an introduction to Montclair.

All kindergarten students begin with staggered enrollment, this allows them to adapt to the classroom environment more easily. They are given tours of the school and meet key personnel that they might not encounter on a daily basis so that they are more comfortable. Academically all children entering Kindergarten are screened and supported appropriately.

We have a guidance program that we begin at the end of the sixth grade school year. This program helps to transition their social and emotional maturity from elementary to junior high school. Students do a variety of activities including role playing and being introduced to the organizational skills needed for junior high.

**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.**

Grade levels meet monthly for WOW Wednesday to work on aligning tasks with standards. Grade levels also meet quarterly with administration to review formative and summative data collected. Through the data collection and grade-level discussions, benchmarks are established and students' outcomes are analyzed.

Based on our findings, professional development is sought from Model Schools, county trainings, and curriculum specialists to provide teachers with insight into new strategies/frameworks to improve their professional practice. Schedules have been developed so para-professionals and ESE staff can push-in with classroom teachers to provide remediation and enrichment support to all grade levels. Resources have been purchased with the assistance of the Instructional Department to ensure that Montclair has a common tools to assess students' reading levels K-6th grade and researched based materials, curriculum, and software for remediation.

\*Title 1, Extended Day/Staffing, 21st Century Grant

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

Collaborating with feeder junior high schools, students are given the opportunity to transition through orientations/tours.

Both junior high schools come to campus to provide course selections and explain various opportunities available. LSJH's band and chorus come to perform and recruit for next year.

Resource teachers do relay activities at the end of the year to prepare students for junior high.