

Escambia County School District

Myrtle Grove Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Myrtle Grove Elementary School

6115 LILLIAN HWY, Pensacola, FL 32506

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Robin Maloy G

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: D (32%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Myrtle Grove Elementary School

6115 LILLIAN HWY, Pensacola, FL 32506

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-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	56%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D		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 Myrtle Grove Elementary School is to provide students with an academic and social skills foundation which will effectively develop communication, cooperation, creativity, and critical thinking skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students to positively impact their community and become lifelong learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Maloy, Robin	Principal	
Hoyland, Gina	Assistant Principal	
Pierce, Ann	Other	
Quinlan, Susie	School Counselor	
Andersen, Michelle	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Lawson, Carrie	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Robin Maloy G

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

449

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

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	56	71	81	82	52	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	423
Attendance below 90 percent	9	29	24	28	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	1	6	3	4	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	3	5	13	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	12	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	7	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	9	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	11	11	22	7	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	4	4	11	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/16/2022

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	76	80	77	58	81	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	447
Attendance below 90 percent	13	37	36	25	40	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	13	12	4	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	0	5	6	3	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	20	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	29	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	4	4	12	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	10	12	4	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	11	17	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	76	80	77	58	81	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	447
Attendance below 90 percent	13	37	36	25	40	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	13	12	4	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	0	5	6	3	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	20	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	29	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	4	4	12	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	10	12	4	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	11	17	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	30%	51%	56%				41%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	41%						54%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						49%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	26%	46%	50%				35%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	35%						45%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%						48%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	52%	59%				61%	54%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	33%	56%	-23%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	37%	52%	-15%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	51%	51%	0%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	25%	55%	-30%	62%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	37%	58%	-21%	64%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	55%	-11%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	58%	55%	3%	53%	5%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	20	30	8	13	24	25	31				
BLK	12	31	40	16	23	29	8				
HSP	52	68		39	56						
MUL	27	41		15	28		36				
WHT	42	38		36	42		50				
FRL	22	37	32	22	31	36	17				

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	15	8		18	31		17				
BLK	21	20		9	20		7				
HSP	40			50							
MUL	36			20							
WHT	43	37		33	17		29				
FRL	26	24	24	19	25	40	15				

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	18	35	25	8	19	20	31				
BLK	22	47	36	20	42	52	29				
HSP	45	46		55	77						
MUL	63	60		38	40						
WHT	51	57	57	41	40	42	72				
FRL	37	52	40	29	42	46	57				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
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	226
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	23
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	29
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	42
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	28
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

3rd and 4th grade students have performed below the state proficiency guidelines for 3 or more years in ELA and Math. Economically Disadvantaged students, SWD, Black students, and Multiracial students have been below 32% proficient for one or two years in ELA and Math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

MGE's greatest need for improvement is in the subject area of Math for all subgroups. When looking at specific subgroups, the Black population has the greatest need in both areas of ELA and Math. SWD have the greatest need in Math.

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

Content areas and subgroups were impacted by teacher turnover and vacancies. We had many students and teachers absent due to COVID-19 or exposure to COVID-19, which caused a loss of instruction. ESE/Inclusion support was not consistent due to these teachers having to cover classes. We are not fully staffed, but are continuing to post available positions. All teachers have a plan for students who are absent due to Covid to continue the learning process while student is quarantined. I had a parent meeting with 3rd-5th grade parents to call the school if they had any questions about how to help their student with missed work. We are working with STO Instructional Coaches in ELA, Math, and 5th grade Science in order ensure the BEST standards are being taught to the rigor needed for academic improvement. We will work on recruiting subs to work for MGE.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

MGE showed the most improvement in the ELA Learning Gains from 2021 state assessment to the 2022 state assessment for all students. We also had significant learning gains in Math for same assessment periods.

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

Teachers had data chats after STAR progress monitoring assessment periods. Administration had whole class data chats. After iReady Diagnostics, we increased the level for students to have more challenging daily lessons on grade level content. Accelerated Reader continues to be a program our students enjoy

and helps to increase their love of reading. Faculty participated in a book study on how to create effective small group activities for students to complete when not working with the teacher.

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

Faculty will participate in a book study on the book, *Disrupting Poverty*. Our 3rd-5th grade teachers have a dedicated planning time at least two hours per week where they work with Instructional Coaches in core content areas. We have a Reading Remedial Teacher and a part time Math Remedial Teacher to work with non-SWD students. The Principal will meet with the STO Director for monthly meetings and Walkthroughs.

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.

Faculty will participate in a book study on the book, *Disrupting Poverty*. Faculty has been provided PD regarding the new B.E.S.T. standards. The planning with STO coaches will focus on understanding the B.E.S.T. standards, resource alignment, focused planning within the frameworks, and productive struggle for student understanding.

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

We are building capacity for our teachers to sustain the focused planning and strategies learned with the book studies we have provided. Admin will continue to have data meetings with teachers on a regular basis, and will implement focused CWT weekly. Data collected during PM will be used to determine small groups within the classrooms and for the Remedial Teachers.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

After reviewing the 2021-22 FSA Data (ELA - 30% proficiency, Math - 26% proficiency, Science - 31% proficiency) and conducting classroom walk throughs, a need was indicated for intentional grade level planning with support from STO coaches to ensure standards are being taught to the grade level rigor and the delivery of instruction is targeted for the success of all students.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students will reach 41% or above proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science by the end of the 2022-23 school year on summative district and state assessments: FAST, SSA Science, & Star 360. The SWD and Black/African American subgroups will close the achievement gap between overall students and raise all ESSA subgroups to 41% or above.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The data metrics utilized to monitor the goal will be STAR, district quarterly assessments, and school-based assessments. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation for small groups within the classroom and with remedial teachers. The leadership team will also review school wide data twice a month. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1. Students are given multiple opportunities to encounter and use academic vocabulary in natural contexts through listening, reading, speaking, and writing.
2. Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction in ELA and Science.
3. Provide opportunities for extended discussion of text meaning and interpretation.
4. Utilize writing for a variety of purposes.
5. Expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies (Math).
6. Teach students how to use visual representations (Math).
7. Connect and integrate abstract and concrete representations of concepts in Science and Math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

According to 10 Key Vocabulary Strategies For All Students from The University of Texas at Austin/The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, giving multiple opportunities to encounter and use academic vocabulary shows a positive impact on student achievement.

According to What Works Clearinghouse, Improving Reading Comprehension, teach students to identify and use the text's organizational structure to

comprehend, learn, and remember content (moderate evidence).

According to Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4 Through 8 found on What Works Clearinghouse found on What Works Clearinghouse, explicit mathematical representation proved to have a positive effect size on achievement.

According to Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4 Through 8 found on What Works Clearinghouse, explicit word problem instruction proved to have a positive effect size on achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss FSA and prior year data for overall population and specific subgroups. The leadership team will analyze data metrics from FAST, district progress monitoring and meet with teachers once a month and teachers will conduct data chats with students monthly. During these data chats, teachers will work with students to set goals and provide strategies to help them reach those goals. 5th grade teachers will also do data chats in Science using the most current data from Schoolnet.

Person Responsible Robin Maloy (rmaaloy@ecsdfi.us)

Professional development embedded in planning will include implementation of the new BEST standards in ELA and Math, comprehension strategies, vocabulary, writing, multiple problem solving strategies, use of visual representations, mathematical language, and abstract to concrete connections in science and math.

Person Responsible Robin Maloy (rmaaloy@ecsdfi.us)

Structured planning with STO coaches will occur twice a week during the school year (three times for 5th grade). STO and school-based leadership team will utilize a planning protocol to align Tier 1 instruction to the explicit intent of the standards.

Person Responsible Robin Maloy (rmaaloy@ecsdfi.us)

In-depth coaching will be provided as needed to teachers based on qualitative and quantitative data points. The coaching will be focused around content knowledge, SIP evidence-based strategies, and instructional practices. The coaching will be monitored by the School Leadership Team and STO to determine the on-going coaching cycle.

Person Responsible Robin Maloy (rmaaloy@ecsdfi.us)

The leadership team will conduct classroom walks on a weekly basis in the core content areas to monitor the implementation of the professional development and planning outcomes. The leadership team will provide feedback to teachers and determine coaching support based on the data metrics and classwalks. The team will determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities based on the qualitative and quantitative data.

Person Responsible Robin Maloy (rmaaloy@ecsdfi.us)

#2. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

School grade data and BSI walks indicated a need for explicit and intentional leadership support to implement feedback strategies that result in quality benchmark aligned instruction. The school will implement Get Better Faster (GBF) Observation and Feedback practices and action steps to improve benchmark aligned instruction.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

GBF Observation and feedback strategies will improve teacher practices that produce increased student performance in achievement with a goal of 41% or higher achieving on grade level performance (level 3) on the FAST assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The School Transformation Office (STO) will be supporting the school-based leadership team to monitor the implementation of the observation and feedback system through monthly Principal meetings, and monthly classroom walks. Feedback about implementation will be provided through STO on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The leadership team will utilize a systematic observation and feedback structure. Through this system the leaders are able to provide immediate support for teachers to have a positive effect size on student academic achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

This systematic approach to coaching teachers is a blend of directive and nondirective techniques. The focus is on small, specific, and focused moves and responses that have an immediate positive effect on student achievement. These are followed up by direct rehearsal and practice of the moves with the leader. The learning for the teachers is not rote or formulaic. It helps the teacher to anticipate and adjust to ensure learning is occurring. The objective is mindful behavior with management and rigor. Through the guidance of the BSI field team and the STO department, the school leadership team will be learning and implementing this system throughout the entire year receiving feedback from the STO and BSI teams.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Outline and monitor before-planning expectations (Identify understandings of the benchmark, review curriculum resources, solve assessment questions, review student learning data for prior learning)

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

Attend structured planning with STO/District coaches and school-based coaches utilizing a planning protocol to align Tier 1 instruction to the explicit intent of the standards. (Review benchmarks, identify practice, sequence the instructional strategies, determine tasks and item progression, and practice and solve benchmark aligned tasks and questions)

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

Schedule weekly classroom walks for identified teachers/ grade levels to monitor implementation of planning.

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

Conduct weekly classroom walk (when needed utilize coach/specialist to calibrate walk) and identify an action step from Get Better Faster (GBF) for teacher based on GBF waterfall and schedule feedback meeting with teacher. (Utilize GBF waterfall, plans, and video lesson)

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

Write feedback script (GBF script protocol- See it, Name it, Do it)- utilize coach/specialist to support script writing.

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

Meet with identified teacher for feedback meeting (follow GBF feedback meeting protocol) to discuss, practice, and stamp learning for teacher action step and schedule follow up classroom walk.

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

Conduct follow up classroom walks to identify implementation of action steps, provide feedback to teacher, and determine if action step will be continued or changed based on data.

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

Document teacher action steps, classroom observations, feedback meeting scripts, and notes on teacher tracker for stakeholder alignment. (School-based admin, coaches/ specialist, district, BSI)

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance and Behavior**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Office discipline referrals increased in the 21-22 school year. Based on this, teachers will receive refresher PD on our PBIS policies and procedures. Average daily attendance was 91% which indicates that students are missing out on instructional time. Our guidance counselor and Navigator will work with families to address barriers to attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The number of ODRs will decrease by 10% and average daily attendance will increase to 93% or higher. Economically Disadvantaged, SWD, ELL and Black student subgroups will also increase ADA to 93% and reduce percentage receiving office discipline referrals to match overall school average.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The PBIS Team will review discipline data (referrals) monthly. The PBIS team grade level representatives will meet with teachers monthly to discuss this data and impacts on student behavior and the quality of the action plan's implementation to determine next steps for the coming month.

Administration and guidance will monitor absences daily. Daily attendance information (tardies, absences, early check outs) will also be posted outside of main office and shared with families on class Dojo.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Maloy (rmaaloy@ecsdf.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1. Have a multitiered system in place that supports the behavioral practices—from the schoolwide to the individualized levels.
2. School staff supports are put in place through professional development to include data driven professional development for behavior interventions and classroom management.
3. Utilizing the Navigator and school Guidance Counselor to provide resources and support families to overcome barriers to student attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

According to 10 Key Policies and Practices for Schoolwide and Classroom-Based Behavioral Supports from The University of Texas Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, providing multitiered systems, implementation of student behavior strategies, and behavior professional development will lead to increased positive student behavior and decrease negative student behavior.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The PBIS team will analyze PMDR data and other behavior data. The team will meet with teachers at the beginning of the year to discuss student behavior and data directly tied to student disabilities pertaining to data. The team will then meet monthly with teachers to discuss data to inform next steps.

Person Responsible

Robin Maloy (rmaaloy@ecsdf.us)

The school will develop a school-wide positive behavior plan.

Person Responsible Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfi.us)

The school navigator will help support behaviors and attendance by removing barriers that impede positive behavior and attendance. The navigator will provide resources such as food, support for parents with utility bills, mental health counseling, coordination of travel for parents to get to medical appointments, school appointments, and family nights.

Person Responsible Robin Maloy (rmaloy@ecsdfi.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

Kindergarten ELA proficiency rate was 50% on the Spring 2022 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

First grade ELA proficiency rate was 45% on the Spring 2022 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

Second grade ELA proficiency rate was 51% on the Spring 2022 STAR Reading Assessment.

Students who score at the 53rd percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading are considered proficient. The number of students who were not considered proficient at the end of 2021-2022 indicates a need to 1) improve core instruction and 2) identify student deficiencies and provide interventions immediately in order to close achievement gaps.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

Third grade ELA proficiency rate was 26% on the 2022 FSA.

Fourth grade ELA proficiency rate was 34% on the 2022 FSA.

Fifth grade ELA proficiency rate was 28% on the 2022 FSA.

Achievement in ELA for grades 3rd - 5th has (not) reached 41% proficiency in all subgroups:
Economically Disadvantaged (22%)
ELL (N/A)
Students with Disabilities (20%)
African American (12%)
Multiracial (27%)

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

ELA proficiency as determined by those scoring at or above the 53rd percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading in 2022 will increase from 50% in K, 45% in 1st grade, and 51% in 2nd grade on STAR AP4 to 50% proficiency or higher on FAST-STAR PM3.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

ELA proficiency will increase from 26% in 3rd grade, 34% in 4th grade, and 28% in 5th grade on the 2022 FSA to 50% or higher in each grade on the 2023 FAST.

The ELA Proficiency for all identified ESSA subgroups will increase to 50% or higher on new 2023 FAST Progress Monitoring assessments by 23-24.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

1. To monitor for desired outcomes, we will collect data, analyze, and track the percent of students scoring satisfactorily each quarter. We will identify students in need of intervention according to the intervention decision tree.
 - a. Kindergarten: STAR Early Literacy results and percent of students earning satisfactory performance on the standards-based grading rubric.
 - b. First grade: STAR Early Literacy/Reading results and track the percent of students meeting benchmark on the first grade quarterly decoding probe per classroom.
 - c. Second grade: STAR Reading results and track the percent of students whose fluency rate is average per the time of year on the Hasbrouck and Tindal fluency norms chart.
 - d. Grades 3-5: analyze results by classroom of district module assessments.
2. Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to observe delivery of Pre-K to Grade 5 literacy instruction and suggest improvements through the use of the Literacy Practice Profile tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Maloy, Robin, rmaloy@ecsdf.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Myrtle Grove uses HMH Into Reading 2022 for its Comprehensive Core Reading/Language Arts Program (CCRP)

The district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan outlines in detail how the various components Into Reading meets Florida's definition of evidence-based. The district ELA Department mapped B.E.S.T. and created curriculum frameworks to ensure that Tier I instruction is standards-aligned.

In order to ensure the measurable outcomes are reached in K-5, our school will 1) focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 CERP and 2) provide intensive, systematic instruction on foundational reading skills according to the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees.

Tier 1 instruction is monitored by the school's administration team through weekly classroom walkthroughs and by being present during collaborative lesson planning. Teachers and Rtl teams monitor the effectiveness of interventions with individual students by collecting data and tracking student progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The use of Houghton Mifflin Into Reading 2022 as a Comprehensive Core Language Arts/Reading Program is supported by recommended practices in the The Institute of Education Sciences Practice Guides as described in the K-12 CERP. The core curriculum includes accommodations for students with a disability, and students who are English language learners; provides print-rich explicit and systematic, scaffolded, and differentiated instruction; builds background and content knowledge; incorporates writing in response to reading; and incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning.

A focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) with this comprehensive curriculum will increase the proficiency of our students in

K-5.

Furthermore, following the Institute of Education Sciences recommendations (strong evidence) for interventions, teachers follow the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees to provide interventions in decoding and building fluency, matched to student need during a dedicated intervention period daily.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

Action Step 1: Literacy Leadership-

- Develop a schoolwide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth.
- Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.
- Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve.

Maloy, Robin,
rmaloy@ecsdfi.us

Action Step 2: Literacy Coaching-

- District coaches and/or school mentor teachers will facilitate common lesson planning using the district adopted curriculum and pacing guides, including how to effectively deliver instruction of B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, engagement strategies, etc.).
- Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support.

Maloy, Robin,
rmaloy@ecsdfi.us

Action Step 3: Assessment

- Our school utilizes the MTSS 4-step problem solving process to analyze data and determine need for differentiated instruction/ intervention.
- Grade level teams will meet to discuss the use of formative assessment to guide differentiation in the classroom; analyze core reading material assessment results, and use STAR for screening, diagnostics, and progress monitoring.

Maloy, Robin,
rmaloy@ecsdfi.us

Action Step 4: Professional Learning -

We will provide training to teachers at our school on the following:

- Use of STAR360 reports, core reading program data, and the intervention decision trees
- Differentiation during the 90 minute block, and use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the language arts intervention period.
- Five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan
- The B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the science of reading

Maloy, Robin,
rmaloy@ecsdfi.us

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Myrtle Grove Elementary School plans to have an ELA Data night, as well as a Math and Science night. Teachers and school leaders post information on the school website, Class Dojo, and our school Facebook page. We will have monthly SAC meetings and PTA meetings. We will have an Annual Title I meeting to elicit parent thoughts for school activities. Families will be encouraged to participate in PBIS celebrations. A monthly newsletter is sent home with each student, as well as posted on our school website.

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

The School Leadership Team will plan and organize family activities, such as Literacy night, ELA Data, Math Data night, etc. and families are encouraged to participate in these events. The Assistant Principal posts Tiger of the Week and pictures of positive events happening at school on class DOJO and the Myrtle Grove Facebook page. Myrtle Grove Baptist church promotes a positive school culture and environment by allowing us to use their facilities when needed. They have also provided our students with needed school supplies. Landmark Baptist Church also provides Christmas gifts (shoe boxes) for our students. Families are invited to collaborate with school leaders on the School Improvement Plan and the School/Family Compact as well as serve on the School Advisory Committee. Administration also encourages parents to reach out via phone, email, or in person with any suggestions or concerns.