Mcrae Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mcrae Elementary School

6770 COUNTY ROAD 315 C, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

http://mre.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Tammy Winkler

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2017

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

Mcrae Elementary School

6770 COUNTY ROAD 315 C, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

http://mre.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	88%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	11%

School Grades History

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

So that all children will know the joy of self-fulfillment, the importance of respect for others, and their responsibility to family, community, and country, McRae Elementary is dedicated to providing an educational atmosphere which will give each child the freedom to dream,the desire to achieve, the courage to act, the knowledge to assist, and the challenge to excel. "Together We Can."

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our major goal is to prepare students to become responsible citizens and to be the best they can be. We feel that education is a cooperative effort between school and community.

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
Winkler, Tamera	Principal	Tammy Winkler is the instructional leader of the school. In her role, she communicates goals and strategies for attaining school goals and provides a support system for improving the knowledge and skill set of every teacher and assistant at the school.
Burt, Tracy	Assistant Principal	Tracy Burt is an instructional leader of the school. In her role, she communicates goals and strategies for attaining school goals and provides a support system for improving the knowledge and skill set of every teacher and assistant at the school.
Brown, Mary	School Counselor	Mary Brown supports academic, behavioral, and social emotional needs of all students. She provides support to help teachers implement strategies to help students be successful learners. Mrs. Brown meets with parents and community members often to provide support and share resources.
Murrhee, Ashley	Instructional Coach	Ashley Murrhee is the instructional leader for our school. She serves as a liaison between teachers and administration to improve instructional practices and provides resources to help teachers support students to reach proficiency. She provides coaching opportunities to teachers to provide strong instruction and ensure mastery grade level standards.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 6/10/2017, Tammy Winkler

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.*

5

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.*

3

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)	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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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	64	80	57	76	67	60	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	482
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	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	6	5	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/2/2020

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	78	57	89	71	62	76	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	512
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	3	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	11	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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

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	78	57	89	71	62	76	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	512
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	3	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	11	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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

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	64%	65%	57%	58%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	62%	58%	49%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	54%	53%	38%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	70%	63%	52%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	73%	66%	62%	37%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	56%	51%	20%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	67%	65%	53%	37%	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	73%	68%	5%	58%	15%
	2018	62%	68%	-6%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	64%	0%	58%	6%
	2018	56%	62%	-6%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	59%	62%	-3%	56%	3%
	2018	48%	59%	-11%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	62%	64%	-2%	54%	8%
	2018	61%	63%	-2%	52%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	71%	-13%	62%	-4%
	2018	71%	70%	1%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	69%	4%	64%	9%
	2018	37%	66%	-29%	62%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		36%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	61%	64%	-3%	60%	1%
	2018	60%	65%	-5%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		24%				
06	2019	62%	70%	-8%	55%	7%
	2018	65%	68%	-3%	52%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	66%	63%	3%	53%	13%
	2018	47%	64%	-17%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
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	38	56	63	41	64	61	46				
WHT	64	66	64	64	73	62	68				
FRL	58	61	63	53	70	56	64				
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	38	47	46	35	53	56	18				
HSP	73			73							
WHT	57	57	44	60	69	70	50				
FRL	53	59	49	56	66	62	43				

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	30	40	35	22	19	12	18				
HSP	50			50							
WHT	58	47	33	52	36	18	34				
FRL	51	47	39	45	36	24	30				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	461
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	66
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was math achievement in the lowest 25th percentile. 4th grade math only made 44% gains and 6th only 41% gains in bottom quartile. This performance is not a trend.

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

The data component that had the greatest decline was overall learning gains for the lowest quartile in math. It slipped from 67 percent to 63 percent. There was a struggle to get 6th graders to put forth their best effort on not only iReady Diagnostic 1 which affected not only their learning path, but within the daily curriculum. This decline is not a trend.

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.

McRae outperformed all state percentages. Overall math achievement was up 1 percent from the State average, (64 percent compared to 63 percent). This will be our targeted area for our instructors. We utilized District and school instructional coaches, modeled lessons and had teachers attend professional development on strategies for solving word problems. Also, this was the 3rd year of the implementation of Eureka Math.

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

ELA Lower Quartile Learning gains and 5th grade Science Proficiency were both up 17 percent from the 2018 school year. To improve ELA Learning Gains, progress monitoring data was used to target students in need of support. 110 students were provided small group instruction using the Leveled Literacy Intervention program where students read a combination of fiction and nonfiction texts and answered comprehension questions and were required to provide text evidence. K-3 students participated in differentiated phonics instruction. All ELA teachers met weekly to ensure that lessons met the rigor of grade level standards. For science, teachers collaborated with our instructional coach and district support to create missions to complete in STEM labs that met the full level of rigor. Progress Monitoring data was used to target students in need of small group support. Spiral reviews were provided through Speed Bags and Moby Max. Teachers observed model lessons to improve instruction.

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

Students scoring Level 1s in ELA and Math will be targeted for support. Monthly Student Success Meetings will be held to support struggling students.

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

1. 6th Grade Proficiency and Lowest Quartile for Math
2. 3rd Grade Proficiency for Math
3. 5th Grade Proficiency for ELA and Math
4. 5th Grade Science Proficiency
5. Home/School Connection

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When all teachers implement differentiated, small group instruction with research-based interventions, we should see an increase in learning gains in math and reading, and struggling students will receive the necessary support to master skills.
Measurable Outcome:	Through the use of differentiated instruction, our students will see increased proficiency in math. McRae's target area will be sixth grade math or overall achievement and the lowest quartile. Our expectation will be that sixth grade students will see a 9 % decrease in students who are 2 or more grade levels below in math according to their iReady Diagnostic test 1. Currently, 19 % of students are 2 or more grade levels below and we expect to see this numbers at 10% by the end of the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashley Murrhee (ashley.murrhee@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through collecting and analyzing data, teachers will differentiate instruction based on students' areas of weakness. Teachers will utilize data form iReady, previous FSA, Achieve 300 formative teacher assessments, and BAS to aide their efforts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By using differentiated instruction, MRE will be able to meet the students at their level and help them grow towards proficiency. Researchers at the National Center on Accessing the General Curriculum define differentiated instruction as " a process to approach teaching and learning for students of differing abilities in the same class. The intent is to maximize each student's growth and individual success by meeting each student where he or she is … rather than expecting students to modify themselves for the curriculum" (Hall, 2002).

Action Steps to Implement

1.Use of math and reading coaches and Title 1 aides to help support small groups.
2. Use of technology to support work
3. Intervention and supplemental instructional materials to help support work, such as manipulatives
4. Provide a parent and family engagement room (multipurpose) to support not only students but families with instructional materials and opportunities to receive academic help.
5. Provide tutoring with transportation to provide additional opportunities for differentiated small groups.
6. Tech Needs for more hands on activities using large monitors for students to see and manipulate on screens.

Person Responsible	Tamera Winkler (tamera.winkler@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If we increase and reinforce student ownership of their learning, then we should see improvement in student engagement and mastery of standards.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome is that students will see an increase in learning gains and proficiency through students taking ownership of their learning. McRae's target will be first grade ELA. Our expectation will be that first grade students will see a 2% decrease in students who are 2 or more grade levels below in reading according to the iReady Diagnostic test. Currently, 12% of students are 2 or more grade levels below and we expect to see this number at 10% by the end of the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Brown (mary.brown@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	McRae will be incorporating the 7 mindsets with students to promote responsibility and student ownership in learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown that students who take ownership of their learning tend to make significant learning gains. Students who have ownership in their learning will be motivated to persevere and put forth their very best effort. They will set goals, plan for improvement and track progress. They will take responsibility for their learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Book Study
2. PLC work
3. Students will monitor their own data
4. Students will set individual goals and track their own progress
5. Students will be ale to utilize manipulatives to build conceptual understanding and master skills

Person Responsible	Tracy Burt (tracy.burt@myoneclay.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students are exposed to independent-level work through IDR, iReady, and Achieve 3000. McRae is setting the focus for teachers to create two weekly opportunities where students will read and respond to on-grade level texts.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome will be that students see an increase in Lexiles and reading proficiency. Our target area will be fifth grade reading. Our expectation will be that fifth grade students will see an 15% decrease in students who are 2 or more grade levels below in reading according to the iReady Diagnostic test. Currently, 41% of students are 2 or more grade levels below and we expect to see this number at 26% by the end of the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashley Murrhee (ashley.murrhee@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase rigor in the classroom and aide teachers in aligning work with state standards, teachers will provide students with two additional on-grade level texts each week. This evidenced-based strategy will help to improve student proficiency in reading.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A national study was conducted (Double Jeopardy: How Third-Grade Reading Skills and Poverty Influence High School Graduation) and it showed that students who do not read proficiently by third grade are four times more likely to leave high school without a diploma than proficient readers. Poverty compounds the problem: Students who have lived in poverty are three times more likely to drop out or fail to graduate on time than their more affluent peers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will collaborate during PLCs to focus on rigorous, complex text that will give students the opportunity to increase their reading proficiency 2. Use grade-level text resources and writing materials to support reading proficiency
3. Title I support will use BAS kits to help level students and place them in LLI groups
4. Pull out small groups: use of assistants, classroom teachers, Title I teacher, and instructional math coach
5. Use Florida Ready curriculum
6. Building classroom libraries and purchasing books for students to read at home
7. Book studies for professional development
8. Printing supplies will be needed to meet this goal, as copying will be required for resources to be distributed

Person Responsible	Tamera Winkler (tamera.winkler@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Science proficiency will also be a priority at McRae. We will strive to increase proficiency by 3 percent to bring us to 70 percent proficient. We will utilize the STEM lab and incorporate manipulatives, tools, materials into daily learning activities that align to Science standards. We will also continue to incorporate STEAM elements into all of our resource classes (including PE, media, technology, STEM, art, music.) Students will read on grade leveled text to ensure the mastery of concepts and academic vocabulary.
The School Leadership team, including administration, coach, teachers, and assistants will meet to discuss progress monitoring data in order to target students in need of extra support. Best practices will be incorporated in lessons. Current data, including classroom assignments and exit tickets, will be used to form small group support. Frequent Walk Throughs with Actionable Feedback will promote strong instruction with student engagement.

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.

A positive school culture and environment reflects a supportive environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people are who are active participants in relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to implement school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholders include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges, social services, and business partners. Stakeholders play a key role in the overall school performance and learning environment. Stakeholders are involved in school decisions through a variety of ways. We hold monthly McRae Moms meetings where parents are informed about activities happening at our school, and they are given the opportunity to provide input in ways we can improve services at out school. In addition, we hold quarterly SAC meetings. Parents provided input regarding family engagement events, school improvement plans, and budget. Kiwanis donated a Gaga Pit along with sand for our students at recess. They donated money for cleaning supplies as well. We receive feedback from our families at the end of each parent/family event by surveys we provide.
The following events have been added to our school calendar based on parent input:

Book Bingo
Data and Dads
Math with Moms
STEM NIght

Family Game Night
McRae Volunteer Training
Grade Level Specific Events to Support Learning at Home
Walk Your Child to School Day
Student Progress Banquet

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: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00