

Escambia County School District

# L. D. Mcarthur Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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: 8/22/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (43%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (49%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

---

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

## L. D. McArthur Elementary School

330 E TEN MILE RD, Pensacola, FL 32534

[www.escambiaschools.org](http://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 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	56%

### School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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

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
Magee, Holly	Principal	
Harris, Angie	Assistant Principal	
Higgins, Carmen	Teacher, K-12	
Mcmillan, Emily	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Penton, Becky	Teacher, K-12	
Stephenson, Megan	Teacher, K-12	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 8/22/2022, Holly Magee S

**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.*

3

**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.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

35

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

576

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

5

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

18

### 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	73	112	87	111	84	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	6	39	17	27	11	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	6	1	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	2	6	4	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	1	4	6	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	5	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	10	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	1	9	6	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	2	4	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/26/2022



**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	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

**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	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

**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	49%	51%	56%				45%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	45%						43%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						34%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	47%	46%	50%				59%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	48%						68%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						44%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	33%	52%	59%				45%	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	58%	56%	2%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	52%	-13%	58%	-19%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					
	2019	41%	51%	-10%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

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	53%	55%	-2%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	58%	1%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	48%	55%	-7%	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	37	37	31	41	29	7				
BLK	38	49	55	38	46	50	26				
HSP	21	25		21	25						
MUL	45	29		48	40						
WHT	61	48	33	57	55	50	44				
FRL	46	43	40	44	41	36	25				

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	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				
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	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				

### 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	301
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	23
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	41
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## 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?

Trends include that our students with disabilities sub group continued to perform well below average. The subgroup increase from the previous in ELA minimally and doubled in math learning gains and proficiency. But is still below expectations. 5th grade data in all areas was well below average. Learning gains, overall and lowest quartile trended low.

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

The subgroup of students with disabilities is a group that shows the greatest need for improvement along with learning gains of all students. Math data and science data also needs great improvement.

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

A restructuring of ESE services at the school along with professional development for those teachers. There is a new staff of inclusion ese teachers for the 2022 school year as well. Overall data analysis with teachers will help improve the low learning gains of students. A structured math block that includes daily small group instruction will assist in raising the math scores. Science scores from last year were very low. Staffing in 5th grade was a problem with only 1 teacher that stayed consistent for the entire year. All others had long term subs or rotating subs. Therefore, a more stable staff in 5th grade will also help with improvement. A dedicated focus on science in all grade levels will help build the science knowledge of students before they enter fifth grade as well.

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

ELA proficiency showed the most improvement.

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

McArthur had a walk and read time in each grade level where students were instructed on their grade level with either intervention or enrichment. These groups remained fluid through out the year as students grew academically. There was also a focus on appropriate and approved interventions that were used for intervention and fidelity checks on the use of those interventions. Structured schedules for ESE teachers allowing SWD's to be in class for tier 1 instruction.

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

Continued structured scheduling for support services including ESE supports. More structured, specific tier 1 block for ELA and math, adding specific times for small group in math. Learning targets for both teachers and students to utilize. Collaborative learning groups in classrooms with the use of summary mats for student participation and engagement. Daily walkthroughs from administration with feedback.

**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.**

Summary mat and learning target training to take place in September  
Small group instruction PD (Math and ELA)  
Walk through data

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

Monthly data meetings with grade levels. Bi-monthly data meetings for teachers whose data warrants further conversations. Modeling for struggling teachers in the area of small groups. Grade level planning that is supported by administration or district supports.

### **Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

McArthur's Hispanic, Student with Disabilities, and economically disadvantaged subgroups are below the 41 percent federal index.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The subgroups of hispanic, student with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged will grow above 41 percent federal index.

**Monitoring:**

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

Data spreadsheets that track not only iready and fast data, but ela module tests. These spreadsheets will be utilized to provide specific support and resources for both tier 1 instruction for teachers and specific interventions during ELA intervention hour.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Emily Mcmillan (emcmillan@ecsdf.us)

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

Tier 1 instruction utilizing HMH core material for tier 1 block that includes all students exposed to on grade level academic curriculum. Students will be placed strategically into intervention groups focusing on specific skills that need intervention based on data, using research based interventions off the district intervention tree

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

All students, even students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students must have exposure to tier 1 on grade level academics in order to bridge the gap. The intervention time must be spent utilizing research based interventions that have been proven effective.

**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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***



**#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.**

Specific teacher feedback and walkthrough information was chosen due to a lack of common understanding of what ela block, both tier 1 curriculum and intervention hour practices should look like in the classroom.

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

Walk throughs in classrooms on specified look fors will receive an average score of 4-5 on a scale of 1-5 (5 being the highest) in at least 75% of the monthly walk throughs per grade level .

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

Copies of data (walkthrough forms) left for teacher feedback for each teacher will be collected and charted in the computer

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Holly Magee (hmagee@ecsdfl.us)

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

Ongoing consistent teacher feedback

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

Teachers having ongoing feedback can help with making sure that instruction remains at the high expectation needed and that all components are being covered as needed. It helps bridge a culture of learning.

**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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The new module and topic assessments for both ELA and math are written to the rigor of our best standards, and students are consistently scoring below average. The instructional practices and instruction in the classroom must meet the rigor and level of difficulty assessed through the new best standards.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Outcomes will be measured through the ELA module and Math topic assessment scores.

**Monitoring:**

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

Data obtained from the ELA Module assessments as well as the Math Topic assessments will be used to monitor progress.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Holly Magee (himagee@ecsdfl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Based on the BEST Standards, all students will receive Tier I, on grade level instruction. Students will also receive small group instruction in both Math and ELA for intervention.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

All students receiving appropriate tier I, on grade level instruction taught appropriately at the rigor and level of difficulty through the new BEST standards will perform better on module assessments and standardized tests.

**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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**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 45% on the Spring 2022 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.  
First grade ELA proficiency rate was 64% on the Spring 2022 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.  
Second grade ELA proficiency rate was 66% 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 66% on the 2022 FSA.

Fourth grade ELA proficiency rate was 43% on the 2022 FSA.

Fifth grade ELA proficiency rate was 40% on the 2022 FSA.

Achievement in ELA for grades 3rd - 5th has (not) reached 41% proficiency in all subgroups:

Econ Dis (46%)

SWD (17%)

Hispanic (21%)

Multiracial (45%)

**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 45% in K, 64% in 1st grade, and 66% 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 66% in 3rd grade, 43% in 4th grade, and 40% 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.

**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?

McArthur Elementary 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 RtI 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
<p>Action Step 1: Literacy Leadership-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop a schoolwide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth.</li> <li>- Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.</li> <li>- Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve.</li> </ul>	<p>Mcmillan, Emily, emcmillan@ecsdfi.us</p>
<p>Action Step 2: Literacy Coaching-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.).</li> <li>- Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support.</li> </ul>	<p>Harris, Angie, aharris@ecsdfi.us</p>
<p>Action Step 3: Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Our school utilizes the MTSS 4-step problem solving process to analyze data and determine need for differentiated instruction/ intervention.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>	<p>Magee, Holly, hmagee@ecsdfi.us</p>
<p>Action Step 4: Professional Learning - We will provide training to teachers at our school on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of STAR360 reports, core reading program data, and the intervention decision trees</li> <li>- Differentiation during the 90 minute block, and use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the language arts intervention period.</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>- The B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the science of reading</li> </ul>	<p>Magee, Holly, hmagee@ecsdfi.us</p>

## 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.

For the 2022-2023 School year, there was a Behavior leadership team meets each month. During this time, problem solving takes place with any issue with students, procedures teachers that exist and a plan to assist is created. Schoolwide, starting in the summer of 2022, we began implementation of trauma responsive practices school wide at McArthur. We began by implementing tier 1 strategies that include zones of regulation in every classroom as well as the book study, help for billy. There continues to be a focus on the school grounds and making the building and area more appealing and "comfortable".

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.

Every faculty meeting, administration shares " McArthur moments" which are great and specific things we have seen others do at the school. We encourage others to share their McArthur Moments. We also share many of these with families via our social media sites.

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 school culture and environment.

Administration, school staff, community members, and district staff

All stakeholders are involved in the positive culture shift at Mcarhtur.

Parents and community help with the school store, , and tracking PBS points at home, supporting zones of regulation and communication with school staff..

Modeling of positive strategies will be used with teachers to encourage use with students.

Over the summer, administration began the implementation of trauma informed practices with entire staff in an effort to moved towards a fully implemented trauma informed school within 5 years.