Middleburg Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Middleburg Elementary School

3958 MAIN ST, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://mbe.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Becky Wilkerson

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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.](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

Middleburg Elementary School

3958 MAIN ST, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://mbe.oneclay.net

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-6	Yes	83%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	14%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	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.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wilkerson, Becky	Principal	Responsible for the safety and well-being of students, teachers, and staff.
Grant, Yolanda	School Counselor	Counsel students and member of the Student Success team.
Perry, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	First grade teacher and team leader
Beason, Linda	Teacher, K-12	Third grade teacher and team leader
Brown, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	Fourth grade teacher and team leader
Strickland, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Discipline, professional development, and any other needs of the students, teachers, and staff.
Weitnauer, Susan	Instructional Coach	Math and science instructional coach and Title 1 team lead
Gooding, Terri	Instructional Coach	ELA instructional coach
Filligane, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten grade teacher and team leader
Wright, Robin	Teacher, K-12	Second grade teacher and team leader
Sullivan, Angela	Teacher, K-12	Fifth grade teacher and team leader
Launikitis, Morgan	Teacher, K-12	Sixth grade teacher and team leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/31/2020, Becky Wilkerson

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.*
10

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.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
43

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	72	73	71	71	78	79	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	532
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

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	82	75	75	69	79	84	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	538
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	12	13	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	10	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	82	75	75	69	79	84	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	538
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	12	13	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	10	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	63%	65%	57%	58%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	62%	58%	54%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	54%	53%	39%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	70%	63%	65%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	66%	62%	60%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	56%	51%	43%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	67%	65%	53%	60%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(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	62%	68%	-6%	58%	4%
	2018	70%	68%	2%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison	-8%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	64%	4%	58%	10%
	2018	51%	62%	-11%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison	17%					
Cohort Comparison	-2%					
05	2019	53%	62%	-9%	56%	-3%
	2018	60%	59%	1%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison	-7%					
Cohort Comparison	2%					
06	2019	64%	64%	0%	54%	10%
	2018	48%	63%	-15%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison	16%					
Cohort Comparison	4%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	71%	-10%	62%	-1%
	2018	62%	70%	-8%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	69%	7%	64%	12%
	2018	79%	66%	13%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison	-3%					
Cohort Comparison	14%					
05	2019	59%	64%	-5%	60%	-1%
	2018	66%	65%	1%	61%	5%
Same Grade Comparison	-7%					
Cohort Comparison	-20%					
06	2019	76%	70%	6%	55%	21%
	2018	75%	68%	7%	52%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	66%	63%	3%	53%	13%
	2018	64%	64%	0%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	24	42	41	32	54	55	25				
HSP	47	50		73	82						
MUL	80										
WHT	63	65	58	69	71	58	64				
FRL	55	63	59	58	70	63	58				
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	48	55	46	68	54	38				
HSP	25			62							
WHT	60	56	57	72	73	59	71				
FRL	55	55	59	68	70	55	66				
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	33	50	32	40	50	50	53				
BLK	70			80							
HSP	40	23		47	44						
WHT	58	55	42	65	62	46	62				
FRL	54	52	37	60	60	48	62				

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	457
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63

Hispanic Students	
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	80
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	64
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	61
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.

MBE's lowest performance was in ELA lower quartile learning gains with only 59% proficiency. This is not a trend for us based on recent years' data. We increased ELA lower quartile learning gains from 39% in 2017-2018 to 60% in 2018-2019. We experienced ELA teacher turnover and/or new teachers in every grade level 3rd through 6th grade. We also had an ELA curriculum change mid-year.

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

The largest decline is seen in our Math achievement with a 4 point decline moving from 73% to 69%. This is not a trend for our school; producing an 8% increase in this component in the 2017-2018 school year. In the 2018-2019 school year, we had three new math teachers in the 3rd-6th grade

teams. The 3rd grade students transitioned to a new curriculum from what they had experienced in K-2nd.

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.

We were above the state average in every component. The area containing the smallest gap above the state average is in Math achievement with 3% above the state average. New Math teachers and students' first year with new Math curriculum may have contributed to a smaller gap. Exceeding the state average in Math achievement is a trend for our school, we are consistently above the state average in this category.

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

ELA Learning Gains improved from 58% in 2017-2018 to 66% in 2018-2019. We led small groups using Leveled Literacy Interventions with students identified to be below grade level in comprehension and phonics. We emphasized using close reading strategies in small groups with on grade level and above grade level Achieve 3000 articles. Teachers used the RACE strategy with students in writing in all content areas. Small groups with
differentiated instruction (I-ready toolbox lessons, Achieve 3000 lessons, LLI lessons, LAFS lessons) were implemented and supported in all classrooms and content areas. Additional classroom assistants were hired with Title I dollars. All were trained in the SIPPS and LLI, these assistants helped us to truly keep our small groups small.

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

The amount of current 6th grade students with a Level 1 on at least one statewide assessment is a concern. 22 out of 74 students fit in this category equalling roughly 30% of the grade level.

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

1. SWD growth in proficiency in ELA, Math and Science
2. Increase Math proficiency and learning gains
3. Increase ELA lower quartile learning gains
4. Decrease the number of students who report they are unable to self-regulate their emotions on the Panorama survey
5. Increase 5th grade Science proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

If all teachers use high leverage instructional practices to set high expectations for every student, then students will increase learning gains for lower quartile reading students.

If all teachers plan for deep engagement of their students and expose students to relevant assignments that match the learning objectives, where students are provided opportunities to practice, discuss and demonstrate mastery of on grade level and above reading activities, through small group differentiated instruction, then our most struggling students will rise to those expectations and show learning gains. This will help to close the achievement gap and prepare students for college and careers.

Measurable Outcome:

Middleburg Elementary will focus to improve ELA lowest quartile students by improving their learning gains from 59 percent to 62 percent. On our local iReady diagnostic, 46 percent of our 5th grade students read two years below grade level. To meet our FSA goal, we would like to decrease percentage of students who are 2 or more grade levels below in 5th Grade ELA based on iReady D1. Currently 46 % of our students fall into this group. We would like this percentage to drop to 36%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Becky Wilkerson (becky.wilkerson@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

LAFS curriculum, I-ready toolbox and prescribed diagnostic materials to identify learning needs, small group differentiated instruction using LLI (Leveled Literacy Intervention Program), progress monitoring tools. District adopted and mandated curriculum resources with support from Instructional Coach, professional development, and PLC's.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Reading comprehension is the ability to understand written text. It is a complex process that involves all the other components of reading, as well as a reader's background knowledge. Explicitly teaching reading comprehension strategies helps students recognize and apply ways of thinking that strong readers use to understand text (Shanahan et al., 2010). These strategies help students become more purposeful and active when they read and can be used before, during, and after reading. Reading comprehension strategies include activating prior knowledge and making predictions, self-monitoring for understanding, asking and answering questions, making inferences, and summarizing or retelling.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Deeply analyze student data to determine areas of focus within the standards for each and every Lower 25% ELA student.
2) Provide PD around high impact teaching strategies for Reading Instruction using LAFS and RazKids.
3) Progress monitor and adjust small groups and instructional plans based on the evidence gathered.
4) Utilize all human resources available (teachers, Title I teachers and assistants, guidance counselor and district specialists) for small group differentiated instruction and tutoring.
5) Analyze work samples provided to students to ensure they match the intended learning outcome and rigor of the standards being assessed on FSA.
6) Utilize technology, such as chromebooks, to maximize online tools available through iReady, Achieve, RazKids, and Smore Communication .

Person Responsible

Terri Gooding (terri.gooding@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If all teachers use high leverage instructional practices to set high expectations for EVERY student, Then we will see increases in student learning gains of our Lower Quartile Math Students. If all teachers plan for deep engagement of their students and expose students to relevant assignments that match the learning objectives, where students are provided opportunities to practice, discuss and demonstrate mastery of on grade level and above math activities, through small group differentiated instruction, then our most struggling students will rise to those expectations and show learning gains. This will help to close the achievement gap and prepare students for college and careers.
Measurable Outcome:	MBE will improve our Math Lowest 25th Percentile students from 61% in 2018-2019 to 63% in 2020-2021. On our iReady diagnostic, 30% of 5th graders and 26% of 6th graders are 2 or more grade levels below in 5th and 6th grade math based on iReady D1 data. We would like to decrease these percentages to 20% and 16%; respectively.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susan Weitnauer (susan.weitnauer@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Eureka curriculum, I-ready toolbox and prescribed diagnostic materials to identify learning needs, small group differentiated instruction, progress monitoring tools. District adopted and mandated curriculum resources with support from Instructional Coach, professional development, and PLC's.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The National Mathematics Advisory Panel and the research in the Response to Intervention in Math shows the use of concrete models, explicit instruction, small groups, strategy instruction for problem solving are proven strategies to increase mathematical understanding. The district adopted and mandated curriculum provides additional resources teachers can use to differentiate and implement these strategies, thus delivering what research shows as best practices for struggling students in mathematics. The resources coupled with targeted instructional coaching, progress monitoring, and continued professional development will help us fill the gaps in our lower quartile students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Deeply analyze student data to determine areas of focus within the standards for each and every Lower 25% Math student.
2. Provide PD around high impact teaching strategies for Math Instruction using MAFS and Affirm.
3. Progress monitor and adjust small groups and instructional plans based on the evidence gathered.
4. Utilize all human resources available (teachers, Title I teachers and assistants, guidance counselor and district specialists) for small group differentiated instruction and tutoring.
5. Analyze work samples provided to students to ensure they match the intended learning outcome and rigor of the standards being assessed on FSA.
6) 6) Utilize technology, such as chromebooks, to maximize online tools available through iReady, Affirm, and Smore Communication .

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If ALL teachers provide SEL through the implementation of 7 Mindsets curriculum, Then we will see an increase in student positive attitude about the learning environment and their ability to self-regulate their emotions. On last year's student surveys, students indicated an inability to regulate their emotions. More specifically, only 31% of our students stated that when they were in a bad mood, they were able to pull themselves out of it.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase from 31% to 35% of our students responding favorably to the question, "How often are you able to pull yourself out of a bad mood?".
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yolanda Grant (yolanda.grant@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of the 7 Mindsets SEL curriculum and PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions & Support).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	7 Mindsets is one of the well-known research based curriculum programs available to schools for SEL. According to independent research, when implemented with fidelity 30 minutes a week for 20 weeks, the 7 Mindsets program was able to increase student perceptions of self and school resulting in an increase of standardized test scores by 250%. The program also decreased the emotional reactiveness of students. We believe this will benefit our students to decrease negative thoughts and feelings associated with a bad mood and increase their ability to persevere with grit.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Implement 7 mindsets daily lessons in each homeroom and biweekly during media for school-wide implementation.
2) Implement PBIS Pirate 100 club to support student and faculty positive behavior systems.
3) Facilitate monthly professional development on monthly mindset for faculty and staff.
4) Utilize Smore Communications to create school-wide weekly newsletter for faculty and staff and virtual Tuesday folder for online students.

Person Responsible	Yolanda Grant (yolanda.grant@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will increase student proficiency in reading and math by supporting our lowest 25 percent. Small group differentiated instruction and data analysis will improve our quality of instruction and student achievement. Fifth grade science proficiency will also improve through small group differentiated instruction, progress monitoring, and the use of inquiry throughout the school year.

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.

Many events we hold throughout the year contribute to this area. Title I events, such as Breakfast with Champions, Preparing for the Test, Family Reading Night, and Beat the Summer Slide focus on involving parents in literacy education. STEAM Night, Eureka Math Night, and Science Lock-In engage parents with Math and Science strategies and resources. Other grade level specific events held throughout the year also aim to bring parents into the learning environment and foster positive academic communication. Social emotional learning is also promoted with family activities such as virtual Open House, Chorus Concerts, Volunteer Orientation, Volunteer Appreciation Breakfast, Field Trips, SAC Meetings, Awards Assemblies, 6th Grade Promotion, Kindergarten Promotion, Agendas, Tuesday Communication Folders, school website and Facebook page will be used to communicate with parents regarding academics, behavior, and upcoming events. Our stakeholders include our Student Advisory Committee along with parents, community organizations, such as First Baptist Church of Middleburg and Ron Shoals attorney. Our SAC committee meets four times per year to give input on the budget and parent family events. During our SAC meetings, the community provides feedback and plans are revived based on the feedback. The Title 1 team, along with SAC committee, documents and revives plans and seeks solutions with barriers. In the Spring, the Title 1 team reaches out to local daycares for tours and screenings of potential kindergarten students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.