

Escambia County School District

L. D. McArthur Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

L. D. Mearthur Elementary School

330 E TEN MILE RD, Pensacola, FL 32534

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Holly Magee S

Start Date for this Principal: 12/16/2006

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

L. D. Mcarthur Elementary School

330 E TEN MILE RD, Pensacola, FL 32534

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	92%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

The Mission of McArthur Elementary School is to have parents and staff working together to facilitate a safe learning environment where all children are valued as they are provided tools for successful citizenship and the foundation for life-long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We, the faculty and staff of McArthur Elementary, believe that all children are important. Our goal is to build an environment that encourages the learning and development of the individual student in all phases of academic, physical, creative and emotional experiences by providing a positive classroom climate.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vaughn, Tama	Principal	Provide a global analysis of the needs for the target populations, evaluate resources and support instructional practices that the needs of the students identified by data.
Ball, Evelyn	Teacher, ESE	Instructional leader for ESE teachers, support for academic needs and oversee the Rtl process needs for ESE students.
Arnold, Kristin	Assistant Principal	Support data analysis with the instructional staff, observe and identify instructional practices. Oversee collaboration with teachers, Inclusion ESE teachers and support staff.
Johansen, Antonia	Paraprofessional	Instructional leader for Paraprofessional staff, support for academic needs and oversee the Rtl process needs for ESE students.
Guarino, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	Instructional leader for Special Area teachers, support for academic needs and oversee the Rtl process needs for ESE students.
Jeremiah, Lindsey	Teacher, K-12	Instructional leader for ESE teachers, support for academic needs and oversee the Rtl process needs for K-2 students.
Resmondo, Mindy	Teacher, K-12	Instructional leader for ESE teachers, support for academic needs and oversee the Rtl process needs for 3-5 students.
Garmen, Kim	Teacher, PreK	Instructional leader for ESE teachers, support for academic needs and oversee the Rtl process needs for ESE students Pre-K and ASD.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 12/16/2006, Holly Magee S

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	52	111	112	118	92	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574
Attendance below 90 percent	8	23	12	16	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	1	5	4	4	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	5	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	4	6	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	4	5	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	12	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/6/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	98	108	119	93	89	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	629
Attendance below 90 percent	5	3	3	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	5	0	5	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	4	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	25	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	1	2	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	4	9	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	
Number of students enrolled	98	108	119	93	89	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	629
Attendance below 90 percent	5	3	3	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	5	0	5	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	7	4	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	25	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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	1	2	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	4	9	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	45%	53%	57%	47%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	55%	58%	50%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	52%	53%	37%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	57%	63%	53%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	60%	62%	65%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	51%	57%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	54%	53%	51%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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	2019	58%	56%	2%	58%	0%
	2018	58%	52%	6%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	52%	-13%	58%	-19%
	2018	45%	51%	-6%	56%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
05	2019	41%	51%	-10%	56%	-15%
	2018	45%	44%	1%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	55%	-2%	62%	-9%
	2018	66%	54%	12%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	58%	1%	64%	-5%
	2018	43%	58%	-15%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	63%	55%	8%	60%	3%
	2018	65%	52%	13%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	55%	-7%	53%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	57%	55%	2%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	23	23	22	28	44	30	20				
BLK	32	37	25	41	55	28	41				
HSP	65	50		70	69						
MUL	63	58		67	83						
WHT	49	44	43	67	76	71	49				
FRL	38	37	30	48	61	44	36				
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	27	39	32	33	40	30	42				
BLK	30	33	35	41	55	38	31				
HSP	60	52		60	52						
MUL	45	38		60	46						
WHT	58	53	43	66	61	35	71				
FRL	39	38	26	50	54	41	49				
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	18	40	33	25	46	55	23				
BLK	31	40	29	38	59	52	26				
HSP	39	36		61	55						
MUL	48	47		52	67		60				
WHT	57	57	53	59	70	60	65				
FRL	40	43	29	46	62	56	43				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	338
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	68
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Due to the COVID-19 Virus and school closure plan, FSA was canceled and the previous year data will be used.

The lowest performance for 2019 was in ELA Lowest 25th percentile with 34%. The year before, ELA showed the lowest performance at 38%.

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

Due to the COVID-19 Virus and school closure plan, FSA was canceled and the previous year data will be used.

The greatest decline in our data was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile from 38% in 2018 to 34% in 2019. The Students with Disabilities dropped from 32% to 22%.

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.

Due to the COVID-19 Virus and school closure plan, FSA was canceled and the previous year data will be used.

The largest gap between the McArthur data and the State data was in the performance of the lowest 25%. The State average was at 48% achievement and McArthur's average achievement was 38%. Each year the gap grows faster than instruction can catch up. More small group instruction is needed, but time limits prohibit.

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

Due to the COVID-19 Virus and school closure plan, FSA was canceled and the previous year data will be used.

The greatest improvement was in Math Learning Gains with a 11 percentage point growth, 2018 57% to 2019 68%.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Due to the COVID-19 Virus and school closure plan, FSA was canceled and the previous year data will be used.

The two areas of concern are Attendance of students. The number of students falling below 90% increased from 22 to 83 students.

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

1. Student Achievement in ELA
2. Student Achievement in Math
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus: Students will be led in direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction and have multiple opportunities for extended discussion of text meaning and interpretation through small and large group discussions to increase student comprehension and development of the inquiry process. Teachers will incorporate the inquiry based strategies that Junior Great Books offers in grades 2-5. Both fiction and non-fiction texts will be used as well as IReady workbooks to enhance the ELA curriculum.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Rationale: Students who read with understanding at an early age gain access to a broader range of texts, knowledge, and educational opportunities, making early reading comprehension instruction particularly critical. If this instruction doesn't start early the gap grows each year putting the student further behind.
 According to the National Reading Panel, students need to be able to build knowledge by comprehending different kinds of texts, mastering new vocabulary, and sharing ideas with others in order to be successful comprehenders in the middle grades through adolescent years. Research confirms that students first need to improve their reading comprehension skills before they can take full advantage of content-area instruction. Focus on explicit comprehension skills across various texts will support student success across all subjects. The greatest decline in our data was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile from 38% in 2018 to 34% in 2019. The Students with Disabilities dropped from 32% to 22%.

Measurable Outcome:

Assessment data from iReady and STAR will show 55% of our students performing at or above proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tama Vaughn (tvaughn@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Teachers will provide explicit comprehension strategies and carefully select text to teach a given strategy.
2. Teachers will provide opportunities for students to apply the comprehension strategies to different texts.
3. Teachers will provide scaffolds, or temporary supports, for difficult material and guide student practice by asking good questions and providing feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale: Students who read with understanding at an early age gain access to a broader range of texts, knowledge, and educational opportunities, making early reading comprehension instruction particularly critical. If this instruction doesn't start early the gap grows each year putting the student further behind.
 According to the National Reading Panel, students need to be able to build knowledge by comprehending different kinds of texts, mastering new vocabulary, and sharing ideas with others in order to be successful comprehenders in the middle grades through adolescent years. Research confirms that students first need to improve their reading comprehension skills before they can take full advantage of content-area instruction. Focus on explicit comprehension skills across various texts will support student success across all subjects.
 Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade
 The Institute of Education Sciences (IES)
 John Hattie, Visible Learning
 Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices

Action Steps to Implement

1. Training will be provided to teachers using the Junior Great Book Program.
2. Administration will clearly communicate to the teachers the importance of using the program to fidelity.

3. The Leadership Team will analyze all DATA to identify growth and areas of need.
4. Develop Action Plan to include changes in instructional practices and areas needing support.

Person Responsible Tama Vaughn (tvaughn@ecsdfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Area of Focus: Teachers will provide explicit vocabulary instruction, provide repeated exposure to new words in multiple contexts, and allow sufficient practice sessions in vocabulary. Students will have sufficient opportunities to practice and use new vocabulary through discussion, writing, and extended reading.

Description and Rationale: Rationale: Research supports that it is more than the scores that students achieve on standardized reading test. It also entails reading to learn in subjects that present their ideas and content in different ways. Students need to be able to build knowledge by comprehending different kinds of texts, mastering new vocabulary, and sharing ideas with others.

Measurable Outcome: Assessment data from iReady and STAR will show 55% of our students performing at or above proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tama Vaughn (tvaughn@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Provide explicit vocabulary instruction.
2. Provide repeated exposure to new words in multiple contexts.
3. Provide sufficient opportunities to practice vocabulary in a variety of contexts such as discussion, writing, and extended reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices
The Institute of Education Sciences (IES)

Explicit vocabulary strategies are beneficial because they help children learn a set of new words that are useful in meaningful contexts. Recent research indicates that vocabulary instruction is most effective when children learn more than just to recognize a word or its picture. Vocabulary knowledge is deeper, longer lasting, and has more impact on later learning when the child can tell you what the word means, even in their own, child-like way. According to the NRP, students need to build knowledge by comprehending different kinds of texts, mastering new vocabulary, and sharing ideas with others in order to be successful comprehenders in the middle grades through adolescent years. In content-area texts, vocabulary carries a large share of the meaning through specialized vocabulary, jargon, and discipline-related concepts. Learning vocabulary contributes to success of reading.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide teachers support in strengthening vocabulary and comprehension instruction.
2. Make content-area reading assignments accessible to all students.
3. Practice the strategies in the context of discussions about the meaning of texts.

Person Responsible Tama Vaughn (tvaughn@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Due to the COVID -19 impact on student learning, Instructional Practice for Remote and Virtual classes will be closely monitored to ensure rigor and focus on educational standards.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

McArthur Elementary has a strong Parent Group who serve in the PTA and School Advisory Council. Both groups work closely with the faculty and staff to ensure a positive and accessible school atmosphere. This support helps to build a positive school culture that is safe, supportive, encouraging, inviting, and a challenging environment for students and staff, which in turn allows students' academic achievement to evolve. Our school's culture values honesty, hard work and kindness. The Eagle Behavior Plan acknowledges these values through our Eagle of the Week and Student of the Month recognition. Throughout the year, programs build on the core values. Red Ribbon Week, DOT Day, HERO Day, Book Characters Day are a few examples as well as a Buddy Bench on the playground to encourage positive support for struggling students. Parents are encouraged to participate in our Family Night and annual Carnival as well as eating lunch with their child.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00