

Clay County Schools

# Montclair Elementary School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# Montclair Elementary School

2398 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://mce.oneclay.net>

## Demographics

**Principal: Bill Miller**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: B (54%) 2014-15: C (52%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

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, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</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)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	B	C	B

### 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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Miller, William	Principal	
	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	

### Early Warning Systems

#### Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

42

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 8/21/2019

**Prior Year - 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	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 with two or more early warning indicators:**

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

**Prior Year - 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	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 with two or more early warning indicators:**

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### 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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	65%	57%	50%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	62%	58%	45%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	54%	53%	35%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	70%	63%	54%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	66%	62%	51%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	56%	51%	42%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	65%	53%	40%	55%	51%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	6 (0)	4 (0)	12 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (2)	6 (5)	4 (1)	12 (8)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (2)	6 (5)	3 (1)	11 (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.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	48%	68%	-20%	58%	-10%
	2018	63%	68%	-5%	57%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	64%	-20%	58%	-14%
	2018	40%	62%	-22%	56%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
05	2019	37%	62%	-25%	56%	-19%
	2018	56%	59%	-3%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	52%	64%	-12%	54%	-2%
	2018	61%	63%	-2%	52%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	71%	-22%	62%	-13%
	2018	54%	70%	-16%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	69%	-18%	64%	-13%
	2018	48%	66%	-18%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	39%	64%	-25%	60%	-21%
	2018	63%	65%	-2%	61%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
06	2019	57%	70%	-13%	55%	2%
	2018	71%	68%	3%	52%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	63%	-22%	53%	-12%
	2018	62%	64%	-2%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b>
SWD	16	38	38	24	45	39	17				
ELL	23	44	50	45	50	50					
BLK	28	39	36	39	50	36	18				
HSP	32	51	55	40	49	50	44				
MUL	60	68		48	53						
WHT	55	56	35	57	51	25	48				
FRL	34	45	42	45	56	40	36				
<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
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				
<b>2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
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						
WHT	60	51	53	65	58	46	49				
FRL	43	38	32	47	48	42	27				

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	47
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Our SWD and Black/ African American subgroups performed the lowest. We have used LLI the past 2 years for students scoring more than 1 grade level below in ELA, and this program has proven ineffective for these students. Small groups must be a priority for our Math students, especially our lower performing students.

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

Our Math learning gains for lower quartile showed the greatest decline, especially with our SWD population. A combination of new teachers in tested grade levels and the pacing of instruction contributed to the decline. Small group instruction focused on closing learning gaps was not a priority in some classrooms.

**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 Math learning gains for lower quartile showed the greatest decline, especially with our SWD population. A combination of new teachers in tested grade levels and the pacing of instruction contributed to the decline. Small group instruction focused on closing learning gaps was not a priority in some classrooms.

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

ELA Learning Gains improved by 4% from last year. The actions that contributed to this success was our small group initiative. We have provided training and time for teachers to analyze diagnostic assessments to tailor interventions to meet student needs. Our WOW time allows collaborative work to analyze student data and align tasks with standards. Our Title 1 teacher and assistants focused their time on small group instruction.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Attendance is a concern that we have addressed through a new intervention system developed for this school year. We will be proactive with families to ensure students are not missing instructional minutes. These students did not perform well on FSA. We will work with families to increase attendance school wide.

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

1. Small group instruction tailored to student needs in ELA, Math, and Science.
2. Incorporate best practices in SEL with a focus on community building and classroom management that best facilitates student learning.
3. Continue WOW - monthly grade level data meetings with a focus on grade appropriate tasks.
4. PLCs focused on District Vision Priorities - Strong Instruction, High Expectations, Student Engagement
5. Attendance Interventions - every instructional minute matters

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#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. Our bottom quartile did not improve and were below the district average (ELA lowest quartile 14% below, Math lowest quartile 19% below).
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Students who are proficient in Reading, Math and Science will be able to perform at or above grade level. Our learning gains will increase by 10% in ELA and in Math with a focus on the lowest quartile.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Group students accordingly based on academic needs and remediate through the use of LLI (primary only), i-Ready Toolbox, i-Reading Tools for Instruction, FCRR activities, SIPPS, Rewards/ SRA Decoding (LQ students), Achieve 3000, Eureka, HMH resources, instructional coaches, assistants, and Interventionist to support the small group instruction. Professional development for teachers and paraprofessionals in SIPPS, LLI and i-Ready will be initiated within the first 10 days of school. Teams meet once a month for WOW Wednesday with a focus on grade appropriate tasks and data driven instruction. Demonstration classes will be used throughout the year to strengthen our instruction. Our Extended Day will use learning games for ELA, Math 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 and integrate Science vocabulary into content areas. District specialists will assist in professional development.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Based on FSA data these strategies will be implemented in order to increase learning gains and proficiency in Math, Reading, and Science
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Professional Learning Community sessions that focus on district priorities: SEL/ Engagement, Strong Instruction, High Expectations</li> <li>2. WOW Wednesdays - monthly grade level meetings that focus on grade appropriate tasks</li> <li>3. Collaboration with district specialists to plan professional development and assist with coaching select teachers</li> <li>4. Resource team plan and implement STEAM lessons for students during WOW Wednesdays</li> <li>5. Title 1 staff and admin plan small grouping collaboratively with grade levels and monitor progress weekly</li> <li>6. Extended Day planned based on i-Ready and Achieve 3000 data to ensure grouping tailored to need.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

#2	
<b>Title</b>	Increase engagement and investment in learning
<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 referral increased from 107 in 2017-18 to 176 in 2018-19. If teachers incorporate best practices in SEL with a focus on community building and classroom management that best facilitates student learning, student performance will improve.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Students will take ownership of their behavior / learning. This will be evidenced by a decrease in discipline referrals and an increase in attendance as students learn to self monitor and resolve their own conflicts. Increased student engagement will result in increased performance, which can be measured through ongoing assessments.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Foundations committee, behavior plan notebook for faculty with procedures and expectations, Class Dojo, shared team drive, guidance counselor, 7 Mindset Resources, character building plan and Attendance Intervention Form.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</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 referral increased from 107 in 2017-18 to 176 in 2018-19.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Train staff on Attendance Intervention Plan</li> <li>2. Monthly Attendance Meetings to address attendance concerns</li> <li>3. Train staff on PBIS plan</li> <li>4. Monthly Foundation Meetings</li> <li>5. Mr. Bilbray plans and implements SEL lessons to students during WOW Wednesdays</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)

#3	
<b>Title</b>	Strengthen Science instruction
<b>Rationale</b>	Our Science proficiency decreased by 21% partly due to the implementation of the PITSCO lab in fifth grade. The ELA teacher was also responsible for Science instruction and the Math teacher was responsible for PITSCO missions.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase student proficiency by 21% to meet the district average
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Use HMH curriculum with fidelity in all k-6 classrooms, Title coach, professional development, and PM assessments. Ongoing professional development based on teachers' instructional needs will continue, and we will use demonstration classrooms to strengthen our implementation of the lessons.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Because we have new teachers to the curriculum, we will provide training and observations to ensure teachers are familiar with the components of the lesson (5Es).
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use HMH curriculum with fidelity</li> <li>2. Use coaches to model and provide classroom assistance for best practice</li> <li>3. Resource use PM data to plan STEAM lessons and integrate concepts into content area</li> <li>4. Small group instruction based on PM data</li> <li>5. Alternate WOW Wednesdays to include Science data driven instruction cycles</li> <li>6. Plan PD and coaching cycles with district specialists</li> <li>7. Monitor implementation through learning walks and assessment data</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

The focus areas will be addressed by planning in collaboration with district specialists to implement

- 1) Monthly Data Driven Instruction Cycles through WOW meetings with each grade level,
- 2) Modeling and training on intentional planning and best practice,
- 3) Calibration walks through classrooms.

## 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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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. Our SAC committee meets quarterly with parents, teachers, and community stakeholders to promote communication, involvement, and understanding within the school and the community. In addition to building these relationships, the Parent Portal, Class Dojo, showcase data events, and parent conference nights are all used for relay information to parents on current student academic progress and behaviors.

**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.**

During the first nine weeks, our professional learning community focuses on SEL practices. Our guidance counselor, behavior site coach and instructional coach plans and implements training using 7 Mindset resources. We have a guidance counselor on campus at all times who is available to meet with small groups, provide individual counseling and behavioral interventions. In addition, our guidance counselor meets with students during WOW Wednesdays to implement lessons from 7 Mindset. 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. Right Path provides individual and group support for students upon parent consent. An attendance intervention system is in place to ensure students are in school receiving instruction. Students who have been identified as struggling with academics and/ or behavior are provided support through MTSS, which is monitored monthly during WOW and is displayed in the data room in order to consistently monitor progress for our at risk students.

**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.

## Part V: Budget

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Deepen standards based academic small groups tailored to students' needs in Reading, Math and Science.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase engagement and investment in learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Strengthen Science instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00