

Clay County Schools

Montclair Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	0

Montclair Elementary School

2398 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://mce.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Bill Miller

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Montclair Elementary School

2398 MOODY AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://mce.oneclay.net>

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-6	Yes	84%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

(*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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Miller, William	Principal	Principal of school
Williams, Robbin	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Lead
Hartshorn, Brenda	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Team Lead
Fitzsimmons, Mary	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Team Lead
Hildebrandt, June	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Team Lead
Weaver, Heather	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade Team Lead
Nebesnyk, Heidi	Teacher, K-12	Title One Lead Teacher, 5th-6th Grade Reading Focus
Brown, Anita	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team Lead
Tison, Melissa	Instructional Media	Resource Team Lead

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/24/2021, 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

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

439

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

2

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

2

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	50	56	54	58	69	59	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	428
Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	6	13	14	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	15	21	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	22	23	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	15	21	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	1	0	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	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	0
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

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	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	0
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in Math	0	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	0
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	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	

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				46%	65%	57%	56%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	62%	58%	50%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	54%	53%	42%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				51%	70%	63%	60%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				51%	66%	62%	65%	68%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	56%	51%	47%	56%	47%
Science Achievement				44%	65%	53%	65%	66%	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	48%	68%	-20%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	64%	-20%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	37%	62%	-25%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
06	2021					
	2019	52%	64%	-12%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	71%	-22%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	69%	-18%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	64%	-25%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
06	2021					
	2019	57%	70%	-13%	55%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	41%	63%	-22%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We used iReady for Reading and iReady for Math to monitor progress toward our goal.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9	25	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	25	50
	Students With Disabilities	0	50	22
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2	20	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	20	56
	Students With Disabilities	0	50	56
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8	21	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	21	41
	Students With Disabilities	0	18	40
	English Language Learners	0	0	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2	17	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	17	38
	Students With Disabilities	0	27	54
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17	35	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	35	40
	Students With Disabilities	13	10	21
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5	21	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	21	36
	Students With Disabilities	6	10	17
	English Language Learners	0	0	11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19	33	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	33	40
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	18
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3	23	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	23	45
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	22
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14	18	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	18	28
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6	20	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	20	43
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	9
	English Language Learners	20	0	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	11	56	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	56	52
	Students With Disabilities	0	30	0
	English Language Learners	0	20	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16	23	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	23	26
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	13
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5	12	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	12	27
	Students With Disabilities	6	8	8
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26	40	25	24	37	36					
ELL	29	64		42	91						
BLK	40	50		31	50		50				
HSP	51	57		49	61		60				
MUL	61	71		56	57						
WHT	65	66	33	60	56	38	60				
FRL	39	53	47	38	45	59	48				
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				

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	438

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
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	47
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?

Our progress monitoring data and state assessment data indicate an upward trend in proficiency in all content areas. Although we have seen gains, our SWD and Black/ African American subgroups continue to perform the lowest proficiency scores. We have also noted that our ELL subgroup needs improvement.

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

Based on our progress monitoring data and state assessment Reading and Math proficiency need improvement. Reading proficiency has impacted Science performance.

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

We have been working for the past few years to strengthen our core instruction in all subject areas, especially ELA. We implemented evidenced based programs in the area of phonemic awareness and phonics in K-1. We continue to make small group instruction a priority. High expectations and grade appropriate instruction continue to be our focus to raise the rigor for scholars. We are working to increase student engagement and investment in learning through data tracking with scholars that includes a school wide positive behavior system. We will continue to support the paraprofessionals in our PBS unit as well as our ESOL assistants with professional development in order to strengthen the

small group instruction in the multi-grade classrooms to increase proficiency in our SWD and ELL subgroups.

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

Based on progress monitoring and state assessment data, our most improved area is ELA Learning Gains. We had improved in 2019 from 50% to 54% ELA Learning Gains. In 2021 we gained another 7 points in ELA Learning Gains. Our Lower Quartile Learning Gains also improved from 40% in 2019 to 47% in 2021.

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

We focused on essential standards and the prerequisite skills needed to master these standards in our small group instruction. This work enabled us to close some of the learning gaps that incurred due to lost instruction from the Covid epidemic. Small groups continue to be a priority in all content areas in order to individualize instruction. PLCs are structured to analyze student learning and reflect on instructional practice. 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 afford teachers regular opportunities to collaborate, analyze student data, and align tasks with standards.

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

Strategies needed to accelerate learning -

- Focus on essential 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.
- Continue the implementation of trauma-informed approach to strengthen the school-home relationship, which will improve attendance, behavior and academics.
- Monthly grade level data meetings that support data driven instruction and collaborative practices.
- Support PLC work by posing reflective questions to explore various approaches to intervention and enrichment. Provide professional development based on needs of scholars and teachers.
- PBIS Rewards program to increase the positive interactions with scholars and peers, which will strengthen the Montclair Family.

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.

Our IAP will provide training as needed with Synergy and PBIS Rewards through an Open Lab each week.

Training will be scheduled to develop skills with our new ELA programs (Lexia, SAVVAS, etc) as well as collaborative planning to align curriculum with BEST Standards.

Teachers will have the opportunity to conduct peer coaching sessions or observe in classrooms as part of lesson and case studies throughout the year.

Professional development will be conducted throughout the year based on a quarterly survey of teachers' needs.

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

An outline of professional learning for the year is posted for teachers and PLC facilitators meet monthly to refine the plan. Grade level data meetings, PLCs and other meetings are listed on a matrix

and on the school calendar as well as reminders in the weekly newsletter. Lead teachers developed a set of expectations for PLC work and created collective commitments with their teams to ensure purpose for the meetings. Progress will be celebrated monthly with scholars and teachers to encourage continued growth. Agendas for PLCs and grade level data meetings are shared with administration in order to continue to support this work.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Deepen standards based academic instruction to increase ELA proficiency. Small group instruction will be tailored to students' needs with an emphasis on priority standards. We will target our subgroups (African American, SWD, ELL) and meet monthly to monitor that adequate progress is happening for all students. Increased ELA proficiency will positively impact Science performance. We will utilize technology such as chromebooks and interactive monitors, Title I Personnel, Model Classrooms, Monthly data meetings to support our ELA instruction. We plan to purchase Raz-Kids and Flocabulary with federal funds. Based on 2021 FSA scores 57% of our third through sixth grade scholars demonstrated proficiency; 21% of scholars scored below grade level; and 22% scored well below grade level. 65% of our lower quartile made learning gains, and 49% of all scholars made learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: By May 2022, the percentage of third through sixth graders scoring at or above grade level on the FSA ELA will increase from 57% to 77%; the remaining 23% will demonstrate an average growth of 20 % on the FSA ELA.

Monitoring: Progress will be monitored through weekly PLCs as well as monthly grade level data meetings. Our Mid Year benchmark of expected growth is as follows: 67% at or above grade level; 17% approaching grade level; and 16% far below grade level using Achieve and Lexia data.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Demonstration classes, Peer coaching, Monitoring comprehension, Graphic and semantic organizers, Summarizing, Generating questions all will be used throughout the year to strengthen our instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on progress monitoring and FSA data these strategies will be implemented to increase learning gains and proficiency in ELA.

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 William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)

Teachers will align ELA curriculum with BEST standards through collaborative planning for tier 1 instruction.

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

The district decision tree will be used to determine intervention resources for tier 2 and tier 3 instruction based on individual needs of students. iReady diagnostics will be used for k-3 students and Lexia will be implemented k-6 for individualized practice to close learning gaps. K-3 teachers will implement Heggerty, From Phonics to Reading to supplement SAVVAS instruction. 3-6 will also use Achieve 3000 as a supplemental resource.

Person Responsible Melissa Pugh (mapugh@oneclay.net)

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

Person Responsible Melissa Pugh (mapugh@oneclay.net)

PLC will focus on data-driven instruction and planning for priority standards and prerequisite skills.

Person Responsible William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: If we increase student engagement and investment in learning through the use of a school-wide positive behavior system then we will reduce our suspensions. Our school has purchased an the PBIS Rewards Intervention System. Our IAF will provide Professional development for teachers with the PBIS Rewards system. Title I personnel will support the use of PBIS Rewards by supporting teachers with positive rewards and behavioral interventions. The most frequent reason for discipline referral is disrespect and inappropriate behavior, which demonstrates the need for coaching and consistent expectations. We also have 20% of our scholars with less than 90% attendance rate.

Measurable Outcome: Based on 19-20 safeschool data, we ranked very high in our rate of suspensions. By May 2022, we will reduce our suspensions per 100 students from 9.1 to 3.9. Our violent acts ranked in the moderate range - 16 out 22 in our county. By May 2022, we will reduce our violent incidents per 100 students from .42 to 0.

Monitoring: Our Conscious Discipline Implementation Team will meet monthly to analyze and respond to discipline data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robbin Williams (robbin.williams@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Set achievable goals, integrate SEL strategies, introduce positive actions for body and mind, breathing techniques, calming corners, positive behavior points to help ensure consistency across all grade levels to achieve the greatest results from teaching Social Emotional Learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our PBIS plan addresses the 5 Social Emotional Learning competencies as outlined by CASEL.

Action Steps to Implement

We will deepen understanding of learning and human development to create a safe and respectful learning environment.

Person Responsible Robbin Williams (robbin.williams@myoneclay.net)

Monthly attendance and success team meetings as needed.

Person Responsible William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)

Foundations team trains staff on Conscious Discipline Approach once a month.

Person Responsible Melissa Pugh (mapugh@oneclay.net)

Family training will take place through a Google Classroom and in person every few months.

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

Utilizing our BSC and counselors will help strengthen the intervention team.

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

IAF will train staff on PBIS Rewards System.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: If we deepen standard based academic instruction in Math with an emphasis on priority standards and target subgroups to ensure that students' needs are addressed through small group instruction we will increase overall proficiency. We are utilizing Title I personnel and manipulatives to assist in small group instruction based on academic need.

Measurable Outcome: By May 2022, the percentage of third through sixth graders scoring at or above grade level on the FSA Math will increase from 52% to 72%; the remaining 28% will demonstrate an average growth of 20% on the FSA Math.

Monitoring: Progress will be monitored through weekly PLCs as well as monthly grade level data meetings. Our mid year benchmark of expected growth is as follows: 66% at or above grade level; 21% approaching grade level; and 14% far below grade level using iReady diagnostic data.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Explicit instruction, scaffolding, questioning and observe student responses, assist students as they practice material, begin lessons with short reviews of previous learning

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

Action Steps to Implement

Continue building on strategies using Eureka program and GoMath for our 6th grade advanced students.

Person Responsible William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)

iReady diagnostic and practice will be used to supplement the Core program. We will utilize the district decision tree to provide resources for tier 2 and tier 3 instruction.

Person Responsible William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)

Monthly PLC and Data Meetings to collaborate and build capacity

Person Responsible William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)

Strategically target scholars based on data with a focus on priority standards

Person Responsible William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)

Intentionally plan and implement small group instruction on a daily basis

Person Responsible William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)

Use Hands on Equations to increase proficiency in Algebraic Thinking for 6th Grade Scholars

Person Responsible William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)

Plan Professional Development specifically for Math Instruction

Person Responsible William Miller (william.miller@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

We were ranked overall in the moderate range (#598 out of 1395). Our violent incidents were middle range while the property and drug/ public order incidents fell in very low range. Our suspensions for 19-20 ranked very high at 9.1 out of 100 students. The data shows our scholars have difficulty regulating emotions and resolving conflict.

We plan to increase opportunities to provide meaningful relationships between teachers and students. Teachers will intentionally plan immediate positive and fair feedback to encourage authentic growth while capitalizing on strengths and supporting areas of growth. We will plan professional development to provide stimulating activities and strategies that encourage and motivate students to achieve at higher levels and participate as active learners. We will view challenging behavior as a skill deficit just as math and reading and problem solve behavior interventions as a team through the MTSS process. Utilizing our BSC and counselors will help strengthen the intervention team. There is a correlation between problem behavior patterns and academic deficits, and as students progress in school, the gap becomes even more extreme. Teaching prevention and intervention strategies and positive replacement behaviors in the same way that a missing academic skill is taught may provide new strategies for scholars to manage their behavior. By not expecting scholars to have these skills will enable us to coach scholars up rather than punishing them for skills they do not possess. Peer coaching will be utilized to model data chats, questioning strategies, and reflective conversations to improve scholars' self view. We plan to use the PBIS Rewards program to promote positive, respectful behaviors between personnel and scholars. This management system will enable us to recognize scholars throughout the school who are meeting behavior expectations and communicate this to all stakeholders in an effort to encourage scholars to achieve at higher levels. We plan to continue rolling out the implementation of the Conscious Discipline approach to all stakeholders through monthly professional development as well as family training in an effort to strengthen the home family and school family. During pre-planning we will provide guidelines for establishing the school family to create consistency. We will use the Powers and Skills of Conscious Discipline to help us connect with others, manage our feelings, set and reach goals, and resolve conflicts. Adults will model positive peer interactions and provide anchor charts to teach scholars what it means to have respectful interactions. Use conflict as an opportunity to coach scholars to problem solve. Our guidance counselor, mental health counselor and ISS assistant will be utilized as a resource for this work. We will refine our reflection sheet to teach scholars how to move from survival state or emotional state to a problem solver. A teacher of the month will be showcased to model effective strategies that improve the learning environment.

Monitored through monthly data meetings focused on discipline, monthly grade level meetings to problem solve, learning walks through classrooms.

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.

Montclair has a rich history of parent involvement. It is fostered by activities that are part of our school culture. Such activities include quarterly flagpole meetings with community, yearly BBQs, family engagement activities and monthly PFA meetings. We ask for feedback and use this to plan for future events. The implementation of the Conscious Discipline approach continues to be communicated to all stakeholders through monthly professional development as well as family training in an effort to strengthen the home family and school family. Rituals such as MCE101 indoctrinates new members into the Montclair Family and new rituals such as the "Well Wishes" board for scholars/ staff who are absent will strengthen the school culture. We will work to create a learning environment where adults understand that empathy helps children reach a higher brain state to better manage their own emotions and problem solve. Our SAC committee meets quarterly to promote communication, involvement and understanding within the school and community. In addition to building these relationships, Synergy, PBIS Rewards, 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 and Orange Park Junior High Schools. We also reach out to the upcoming kindergarteners by taking flyers to the VPKS and apartments nearby as well as school events to meet the teachers. Our school has partnered with nearby churches to provide backpacks and weekend meals to support many of our families.

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

Administration - accountable for promoting a positive culture and environment and oversees all teams in this effort

Conscious Discipline Team - analyze and respond to data, conduct training for staff and parents

Title I Team - family engagement

PFA - promotes partnerships between school and community

Staff - promote PBIS Rewards, models positive interactions

SRO - responsible for maintaining safe campus

Community Partners- Celebration Church, First Baptist Church, Shannon Murray - Realtor