

Clay County Schools

Montclair 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	20

Montclair Elementary School

2398 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://mce.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Bill Miller

Start Date for this Principal: 8/28/2020

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)	98%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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.

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	20

Montclair Elementary School

2398 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://mce.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	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

(*Title I Schoolwide Plan/SIP/PFEP can be 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Miller, William	Principal	Principal of school.
Pugh, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade Team Lead SAC participant
Weaver, Heather	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade Team Lead
Brown, Anita	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team Lead
Larson, Cheryl	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of school
Nebesnyk, Heidi	Teacher, K-12	Title One Lead Teacher, 3rd-6th Grade Reading Focus
Thompson, Lynda	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Team Lead
Hildebrandt, June	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Team Lead
Hartshorn, Brenda	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Team Lead
Fitzsimmons, Mary	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Team Lead
Goranson, Taylor	Other	PBS Behavioral Specialist
Williams, Robbin	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Lead

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/28/2020, Bill Miller

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.*

2

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

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)	98%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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	44	58	67	76	58	72	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	458
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	8	9	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	1	9	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/28/2020

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	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	

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	62	61	80	60	80	71	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	481
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	

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	
	(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	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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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

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	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				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	24	34	43	30	50	52	27				
ELL	42			42	50						
BLK	51	52		53	71	53	62				
HSP	41	38	50	51	67	67					
MUL	55	45		48	43						
WHT	61	53	39	66	64	37	68				
FRL	46	41	42	54	59	46	56				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	24	25	20	23	31	37					
BLK	28	28	15	23	29	40	30				
HSP	38	30	25	53	50	43					
MUL	42	56		40	47						
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.

ESSA Federal Index	
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
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%	1
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%	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	35
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	44
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	57
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	47
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	44
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.

Our SWD and Black/ African American subgroups performed the lowest. We have used LLI the previous 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 2019. The actions that contributed to the success was our small group initiative. We have provided training and time in the master schedule for teachers to analyze diagnostic assessments to tailor interventions to meet student needs. Data meetings will afford teachers regular opportunities to collaborate, analyze student data, and align tasks with standards. Our Title I 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?

Our instructional coach will make our PBS unit a priority this year to improve practice and impact performance of our students in the lower quartile. We will progress monitor with a focus on our sub group to ensure learning gains in ELA and Math. Continue Success Team meetings for attendance, behavior and academic concerns as this is a proactive measure to ensure students are not missing instructional minutes.

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

1. Focus on priority standards through PLCs and implement small group instruction tailored to student needs in ELA, Math, and Science. We will track mastery of prerequisite skills for each subgroup to ensure equity for all students..
2. Implement Conscious Discipline approach as a school wide initiative including a family connection. This will strengthen the school - home relationship in order to improve attendance, behavior as well as academics.
3. PLCs focused on District Vision Priorities - Strong Instruction, High Expectations, Student Engagement and Grade-Appropriate Tasks. We will continue data driven conversations to make learning gains in ELA, Math, and Science.
4. Utilize technology such as Google Classroom to provide instructional resources for students so that both B&M and OCO have equal access and opportunities to make learning gains.
5. Increase student literacy through a focus on writing in an effort to improve ELA learning gains.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Deepen standards based academic instruction through small groups tailored to students' needs in Reading, Math, and Science with an emphasis on priority standards. We will target our subgroups (Black/ SWD) to ensure that students' needs are addressed through small group instruction. We will meet monthly during PLC and Data Meetings to monitor that adequate progress is happening for our subgroup students.

Measurable Outcome: 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 Math with a focus on the lowest quartile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Group students accordingly based on academic needs and remediate through the use of LLI(primary only), i-Ready Toolbox, i-Ready Tools for Instruction, FCRR activities, SIPPS, Rewards, Achieve 3000, Eureka, HMH resources, instructional coaches, assistants and interventionist to support the small group instruction. Professional Development in Minding the Gap by Solution Tree and collaboratively planning for priority standards and prerequisite skills. Monthly data meetings and weekly PLC will focus on 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 engagement. District specialists and consultant (Dr. Johnson) will assist in professional development. We will purchase technology to assist teachers and students, such as; Chromebooks, Earbuds, Webcams, and Wireless Clickers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on FSA data these strategies will be implemented in order to increase learning gains and proficiency in Math, Reading, and Science.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Learning Community (PLC) sessions that focus on district priorities: Engagement, Strong Instruction, High Expectations, and Grade-Appropriate Assignments

Person Responsible Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

Monthly grade level meetings that focus on data-driven instruction

Person Responsible Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

Collaboration with district specialists and consultant (Dr. Johnson) to plan professional development and assist with coaching select teachers

Person Responsible Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

Title I staff and admin plan small grouping collaboratively with grade levels and monitor progress weekly

Person Responsible Heidi Nebesnyk (heidi.nebesnyk@myoneclay.net)

Extended Day planning based on i-Ready and Achieve 3000 data to ensure grouping tailored to need

Person Responsible Heidi Nebesnyk (heidi.nebesnyk@myoneclay.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase student engagement and investment in learning. 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. From 2017-18 discipline referrals increased from 107 to 176 in 2018-2019. There were 124 as of 3/17/2020. If teachers incorporate Conscious Discipline approach in SEL.

Measurable Outcome: Students will take ownerships 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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Foundations committee implement Conscious Discipline approach and train staff on trauma-informed strategies; behavior plan notebook for faculty with procedures and expectations, Class Dojo, shared team drive, guidance counselor, and attendance interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 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. From 2017-18 discipline referrals increased from 107 to 176 in 2018-2019.

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly attendance meetings
Success Team Meetings as needed

Person Responsible Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

Foundations team trains staff on Conscious Discipline approach 2 times a month.

Person Responsible Melissa Pugh (mapugh@oneclay.net)

Guidance counselor meets with students monthly to teach skills of Conscious Discipline.

Person Responsible Clarence Bilbray (clarence.bilbray@myoneclay.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Increase student literacy with a focus on writing across the curriculum. Based on ELA Writing Practice Assessments, 57% of 4-6th grade students were not proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase student proficiency by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heidi Nebesnyk (heidi.nebesnyk@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Expand the use of Ready Writing to 2nd-4th grade. District specialist will conduct lesson studies with teams as they implement the program. DBQs administered in 4-6th grade. Ongoing professional development based on teachers' instructional needs will continue, and we will use demonstration classrooms to strengthen our implementation of the lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Because Ready Writing complements our ELA (LAFS) curriculum, the instruction is cohesive. DBQs allow for cross curricular writing instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Use curriculum with fidelity.

Person**Responsible**

Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

Use specialists to support teachers in the implementation of the programs.

Person**Responsible**

Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

Use district writing assessments to monitor student progress.

Person**Responsible**

Heidi Nebesnyk (heidi.nebesnyk@myoneclay.net)

Monitor implementation through learning walks and assessment data.

Person**Responsible**

Cheryl Larson (cheryl.larson@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

n/a

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.

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 flagpole, have yearly BBQ's, and encourage parent and staff involvement in our morning, evening and summer activities. During our parent and staff involvement events, we ask for feedback from our parents to better meet the wants/needs of our families. We take our feedback forms and use these to plan for future events. Our SAC committee meets quarterly with parents, teachers, and community stakeholders to promote communication, involvement, and understanding within the school and the community. Close to the end of the school year, SAC meets to discuss the upcoming school years PFEP and SIP. Parents, staff, and community members give input into the budget, events, and barriers of the PFEP. At the beginning of the school year, the SAC committee meets to give input into the development of the SIP. Once again in December, SAC meets to discuss how the progress of the PFEP and SIP are going for that school year.

In addition to building these relationships, the Parent Portal, Class Dojo, showcase data events, and parent conference nights are all used to relay information to parents on current student academic progress and behaviors. Our school has transitional activities for our 6th grade students going to Lakeside Junior High and Orange Park Junior High. We also reach out to the upcoming Kindergarteners by taking flyers to the VPKs and apartments nearby.

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: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00