Escambia County School District

L. D. Mcarthur Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

L. D. Mcarthur Elementary School

330 E TEN MILE RD, Pensacola, FL 32534

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Holly Magee S

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

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

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

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

L. D. Mcarthur Elementary School

330 E TEN MILE RD, Pensacola, FL 32534

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Magee, Holly	Principal	
Arnold, Kristin	Assistant Principal	
Ball, Evelyn	Teacher, K-12	
Simmons, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Higgins, Carmen	Teacher, K-12	
Keslar, Deborah	Teacher, K-12	
Greene, Kara	Teacher, K-12	Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Holly Magee S

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

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

651

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	116	87	127	97	104	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	629
Attendance below 90 percent	19	27	31	20	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	6	11	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	8	6	3	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	9	9	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	30	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	10	9	3	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 7/25/2021

2020-21 - 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	52	111	112	118	92	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574
Attendance below 90 percent	8	23	12	16	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	1	5	4	4	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	5	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	4	6	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	5	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	12	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

2020-21 - 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	52	111	112	118	92	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574
Attendance below 90 percent	8	23	12	16	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	1	5	4	4	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	5	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	4	6	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	4	5	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	12	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				45%	53%	57%	48%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				43%	55%	58%	46%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	52%	53%	38%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	57%	63%	57%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	60%	62%	57%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	52%	51%	38%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				45%	54%	53%	57%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	58%	56%	2%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	52%	-13%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	51%	-10%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	53%	55%	-2%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

				MATH		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	59%	58%	1%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

				SCIENCE		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	48%	55%	-7%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

STAR Early literacy, STAR reading and STAR math

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	43	47	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	58	59
	Students With Disabilities	23	32	36
	English Language Learners	na	na	na
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	46	59	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	33	34
	Students With Disabilities	2	4	2
	English Language Learners	na	na	na

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29	42	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	27	28
	Students With Disabilities	3	5	4
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22	35	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	23	24
	Students With Disabilities	4	5	6
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30	40	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	21	20
	Students With Disabilities	1	3	2
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27	41	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	22	24
	Students With Disabilities	2	3	3
	English Language Learners	0	0	1

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	34	38	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	20	15
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	1
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	30	43	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	22	19
	Students With Disabilities	2	3	2
	English Language Learners	1	2	1

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	29	36	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	15	19
	Students With Disabilities	1	2	2
	English Language Learners	1	1	0
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	29	38	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	18	17
	Students With Disabilities	1	0	2
	English Language Learners	1	2	1
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Science	All Students	56	47	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	28	21
	Students With Disabilities	5	3	3
	English Language Learners	2	3	2

Subgroup Data Review

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	19	29		16	21		14				
BLK	32	30	50	32	40	50	26				
HSP	38			38							
MUL	46	50		30	30						
WHT	55	38		56	54		51				
FRL	40	39	55	39	45	50	36				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	23	23	22	28	44	30	20				
BLK	32	37	25	41	55	28	41				
HSP	65	50		70	69						
MUL	63	58		67	83						
WHT	49	44	43	67	76	71	49				
FRL	38	37	30	48	61	44	36				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	27	39	32	33	40	30	42				
BLK	30	33	35	41	55	38	31				
HSP	60	52		60	52						
MUL	45	38		60	46						
WHT	58	53	43	66	61	35	71				
FRL	39	38	26	50	54	41	49				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	307
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	51
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

There are a few trends that emerge across grade levels, subgroups, and core content with McArthurs data. There is more growth made between the fall and winter assessment period. The growth at almost every level and every grade and subject greatly slows between the winter and spring. Also our student with disabilities are also grossly underperforming at the school. When looking at past years data, Mcarthur seems to be "stuck" for lack of a better word at the 40 to 45 percentage in proficiency. There is also a trend for a great drop in data from K and 1 percentage proficient and 2-5.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our students with disabilities is a great concern. They are grossly underperforming the rest of the school. The primary grade data is higher than the intermediate grades. I have not been at the school long enough to understand why it drops so much but this something to pay close attention to as wel..

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

There has to be a restructuring of the services our students with disabilities receive in general education classroom. In the past, the teachers made their own schedules of support, pulled students out during grade level academic times (whole group etc) to get interventions and assisted greatly with testing. We have restructured this time to use more of a push in model where the ese students are getting the on grade leve material with the rest of the class and only receive intervention during intervention time. The ese teachers are more present and active in the general education setting.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Comparing the data between FSA 2018 and FSA 2019.there were two areas that saw an upward trend. This is in the areas of math proficiency and math learning gains.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

There was nothing new that the school said they did differently. This was the second year of the new curriculum, so possibly familiarity with that helped. I was also not at the school

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Mcarthur needs to increase the rigor and pace of the on grade level educational time. The focus this year is correct utilization of the district provided curriculum and only using supplementary materials that have been approved when needed. There is also an intervention hour that breaks students into groups with research based interventions in small group that happens daily.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will be ongoing in the areas of ELA as far as the what the 90 minute block should look like. This is also the same for the math block. This will include correct use of materials and manipulatives. We will do a book study on Notes and notice which is embedded in the new ELA curriculum and will help turn learning over to students. There will also be a focus on intervention time and what that time should look like while using research based interventions.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We will utilize walk throughs to continue to monitor the PD needed, reach out to district level specialist for assistance as needed and use funding to pay teachers to plan and collaborate more effectively and efficiently.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Achievement in ELA has not reached 50% in all sub groups and grade levels: 3rd grade. 4th grade, 5th grade Economically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, Black, and White
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency for grades 3rd -5th will increase to 50% or higher per the 2022 FSA exam. At the end of the 2020-2021 school year, 3rd grade at 43% proficient, 4th grade at 47% proficient and 5th grade at 40% proficient. In order to reach 50% proficient 3rd grade will need 53/96 student proficient, 4th grade will need 74/127 proficient, and 5th grade will need 48/88 students proficient. This will also include our sub groups of Economically disadvantaged, Students with disabilities and black students proficiency the same.
Monitoring:	Data from Star 360 and core language arts instructional materials will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed by teacher groups as well as ESSA groups. The final determination will be the spring FSA assessment in ELA School administrators will conduct weekly walkthroughs and will review school wide data twice a month. They will monitor the progress of students receiving intervention and share findings with teachers. Administration will seek district coaching support to recommend adjustments to interventions and or to provide professional development needs to help improve the effectiveness of intervention. The RTI/MTss team will meet monthly to analyze data and determine effectiveness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using the HMH curriculum purchased by the district, and following the district reading block template, teachers will utilize these materials to teach during their 90 minute ELA block to all students. Any additional supplemental materials needed during this block will be approved ahead of time by an administrator. Teachers will have a 60 minute block where students are grouped by data and need for intervention. During this intervention time, teachers, based on students in group, will select from approved research interventions to work with students. These interventions will be monitored and tracked.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In past, there was not a designated 150 minutes for ELA that was followed. Teachers were using many non researched based programs without training and bringing materials from non recommended sites to teach during their 90- minute block. There was no structure or follow up with either block of time for ELA. Students with disabilities were being pulled out of grade level whole group time for interventions and never receiving on grade level materials and instructions.

Action Steps to Implement

Walkthroughs by administration will happen to make sure that the 90 minute ELA block is being taught to fidelity. This will include the appropriate use of HMH as the core curriculum, the small group time in the 90 minute block being on grade level small group and there are little to few materials that are not vetted and approved ahead of time being utilized in the classroom.

Person Responsible	Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdfl.us)

Collaborative grade level meetings will occur 1 time a week where grade level chairs will complete a checklist that includes that each teacher on the team is keeping up with the pacing guide suggested by the

district. These will be turned into administration. Administration will also be in attendance to as many collaborative planning sessions as possible.

Person Responsible Kristin Arnold (karnold@ecsdfl.us)

During the intervention hour, student will be grouped using a walk and read model by thier data. Appropriate interventions will be utilized and monitored with the students. Students at or above grade level will participate in enrichment activities, book studies and research projects during this time.

Person Responsible Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdfl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This was identified as a critical need when looking at the data for our students with disabilities which is significantly below all other students in the school and the district. After talking with teachers, looking at past schedules and practices, this became a primary focus.
Measurable Outcome:	The learning gains of students with disabilities will increase by 15 % based on the 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Data will be tracked through school wide data spreadsheets. ESE Teacher schedules will be provided to teachers to ensure that students with disabilities are receiving services at appropriate times during the day and interventions during the intervention time are appropriate based on student need. The interventions will also be tracked in the data spreadsheet
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy being used for this areas of focus includes research based interventions chosen from the approved intervention list. These students will still be receiving the core instruction for on grade level learning based on the approved curriuclum by the district which is HMH.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies were chosen because of lack of structure and rigor beings used during learning time with students with disabilities. The students were missing on grade level instruction in order to get their interventions. The interventions used were not interventions that were chosen based ont he need of the student.
Action Steps to Implement	

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Walkthroughs	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Walk throughs are not a common practice at Mcarthur in previous years. Teachers have shared that administrators only came to their room for evaluations and/or a behavior call. Therefore, expectations were expected but not inspected and did not happen in most cases.
Measurable Outcome:	Walkthroughs by administration will happen on a weekly basis including two walk throughs per class with feedback being left at least one time during the first semester. Feedback will be left more frequently during the second semester. I was hoping to start even faster with feedback but have seen the resistance and negativity due to lack of understanding and frequency that this has been done in the past.
Monitoring:	By walking through on a daily basis into the classrooms, administrators and support people will be able to inspect that the learning happening and the expectations are not just talked about but are happening. Then feedback will help grow teachers, get them thinking and also help lead us to the appropriate and needed PD offerings at the school . Look fors have been developed to help teachers know what is being looked for during walk throughs. Ongoing training will happen with the look fors and walk throuhgs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Walk throughs are an evidence based strategy when done correctly. These will happen on a daily basis.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Look for/walk through forms will be left and one copy kept so admin can reflect on support needed.

Action Steps to Implement

Walk throughs utilizing the look for's determined will take place on a weekly basis leaving feedback for teachers. This will also help determine professional development offered for teachers and staff.

Person Responsible	Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdfl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This was identified as a critical need when looking at the data for our students in the sub group of black/african american students. which is significantly below all other students in the school and the district. After talking with teachers, looking at past schedules and practices, this became a primary focus.
Measurable Outcome:	The proficiency and learning gains of black/african american student will increase by 15 % based on the 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Datawill be tracked through school wide data spreadsheets. Teacher schedules will be provided to teachers to ensure that all students are receiving rigourous appropriate instruction on grade level during the 90 minute block and then appropriate intervention during the intervention time that matches the need of the student as well as using research based approved interventions. The interventions will also be tracked in the data spreadsheet
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy being used for this areas of focus includes research based interventions chosen from the approved intervention list for intervention time and then students will still be receiving the core instruction for on grade level learning based on the approved curriuclum by the district which is HMH instead of teacher selected material from non approved sites.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies were chosen because of lack of structure and rigor beings used during learning time with students and students with disabilties which includes a disproportinate number of black students. The students were missing on grade level instruction in order to get their interventions. The interventions used were not interventions that were chosen based on the need of the student.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Mcarthur has not had a positive behavior intervention plan that was implemented with fidelity in several years. School wide expectations were not created and a plan for when misbehavior happens did not include a thorough, research based plan to change behavior.
Measurable Outcome:	Mcarthur will transform into a trauma informed school with full implementation by year 5. Year 1 will be the 2021-2022 school year and will include a positive behavior plan in place that includes school wide expectations created, posted and followed by the school, students, and staff at Mcarthur. Ongoing training and strategies on trauma informed care and positive behavior strategies will be shared with staff on an ongoing basis throughout the year with support for those who choose implementation. training of trauma informed strategies will be offered for all staff over the summer months with hopes of pay. Year 2 will include ongoing training and an expectation of at least two trauma informed strategies being an expectation in everyone with ongoing training and support through the behavior team of these strategies. Trauma informed training.conference will be offered over the summer between year 2 and 3 again with a plan created at this point to include parents in the process. Year three will include trauma informed walk throughs, the big shift in language to become trauma informed and including parents in the process/
Monitoring:	Year 1 will include that the behavior intervention plan and school wide expectations are taught, expected and retaught as needed by the entire school. Minor referrals will be utilized within focus to document interventions tried by the teacher. Monitoring of discipline data and minor referrals will drive PD and support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive behavior plan and supports based on PBIS system and trauma informed training.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Mcarthur has not had a tier 1 plan for behavior in place that was implemented with fidelity and included a process for misbehvior.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Achievement in ELA has not reached 50% higher in in all sub groups and grade levels: 2nd grade (below 50%) Economically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, Black, and White
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency for grades Kindergarten through 2nd grade will increase to 50% or higher per the 2022 spring STAR ELA assessment. At the end of the 2020-2021 school year, 2nd grade was at44% proficient, In order for 2nd grade to reach 50 % proficient , 59/106 student proficient. This will also include our sub groups of Economically disadvantaged, Students with disabilities and black students proficiency the same.
Monitoring:	We will monitor the progress through ELA STAR asseessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using the HMH curriculum purchased by the district, and following the district reading block template, teachers will utilize these materials to teach during their 90 minute ELA block to all students. Any additional supplemental materials needed during this block will be approved ahead of time by an administrator. Teachers will have a 60 minute block where students are grouped by data and need for intervention. During this intervention time, teachers, based on students in group, will select from approved research interventions to work with students. These interventions will be monitored and tracked.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In past, there was not a designated 150 minutes for ELA that was followed. Teachers were using many non researched based programs without training and bringing materials from non recommended sites to teach during their 90- minute block. There was no structure or follow up with either block of time for ELA. Students with disabilities were being pulled out of grade level whole group time for interventions and never receiving on grade level materials and instructions.

Action Steps to Implement

During the intervention hour, student will be grouped using a walk and read model by thier data. Appropriate interventions will be utilized and monitored with the students. Students at or above grade level will participate in enrichment activities, book studies and research projects during this time.

Person Responsible	Kristin Arnold (karnold@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Our biggest priority at McArthur as far as discipline is to make sure that we are utilizing all supports for students before we send a student home for an out of school suspension. This includes practices that support both the student and family.

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.

For the 2021-2022 School year, there was a Behavior leadership team created that meets each month. The team began by creating school wide expectations that did not exist within the school. The team also created a positive behavior system that includes a token economy system and school store that students can purchase things using their 'eagle bucks' to encourage positive behavior. Signs with school wide expectations were placed throughout the school and these expectations are emphasized during every opportunity including morning announcements and teacher and student interactions. The grounds of the school were made more appealing after a preschool survey showed that teacher morale was low and comments about the grounds not being maintained as they had in the past. A new teachers lounge was formed with spaces for teachers to relax with positive opportunities embedded in the room such as "shout out" boards, articles about self care etc. The school is not trauma informed and during pre-school and during the year, strategies are being introduced to the school to use in their rooms such as community meetings, zones of regulations, and other strategies. A sub group of teachers will be introducing zones and going through the training.
Teachers are greeted by administration each day and asked if they need anything trying to build trust and support while maintaining high expectations.
Ensuring classrooms are cleaned as need and things broken are repaired and the building is decluttered will continue to be a focus as well.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

All stakeholders are involved in the positive culture shift at Mcarhtur.
PTA and parents help with the school store, furniture for the new teachers lounge, and tracking PBS points at home.
Teachers opened the year with reading the story about Being a marigold and are reminded about staying in the positive zones. Trauma informed strategies will be grown throughout the year as well.
Modeling of positive strategies will be used with teachers to encourage use with students.
Over the summer, administration hopes to do training on trauma informed practices with entire staff in an effort to moved towards a fully implemented trauma informed school within 5 years.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Walkthroughs	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00