Mayport Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mayport Middle School

2600 MAYPORT RD, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

http://www.duvalschools.org/mayportmiddle

Demographics

Principal: Chris Koek

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	59%
2019-20 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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

Mayport Middle School

2600 MAYPORT RD, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

http://www.duvalschools.org/mayportmiddle

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	58%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

Our mission is to teach through an interdisciplinary focus on rigorous, interrelated core academic subjects and electives, which prepare learners for the stringent requirements of high school Advanced Placement courses. Our methodology will be inquiry-based, differentiated, and aligned with preparing our students to enter any high school acceleration program. Our students will become self-directed researchers, analytical thinkers, problem-solvers, prolific readers and writers, and lifelong stewards of the coastal environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Mayport Coastal Sciences Middle School is to enable all students to reach their full potential as creative, inquiring learners who respect our Florida Marine Ecosystems.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Koek, Chris	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities - Instructional Lead for Math/Science -Athletics -Grants - Band Booster Liaison - SAC Liaison
Carson, Christi	Assistant Principal	Principal designee, and MTSS/RTI Lead: Grade retention, curriculum, and standards-based administrator. Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. - Threat Assessment Team - Attendance Intervention Team - Builds Master Schedule - Instruction Lead for EESS/Guidance/ELA/Reading - 6th and 7th grade House Administrator - Curriculum Administrator
Hitzeman, Brooke	Assistant Principal	Grade 8 House Administrator. Safe and Civil Schools and Attendance administrator. Monitors and provides interventions based on attendance and behavior referrals data. Responsible for community engagement and building partnership with local business. - 8th Grade House Administrator - Instructional Lead for Social Studies/Journalism/Band/PE/Health/CTE/Foreign Language - AVID Coordinator - Safety and Operations Manager - TEAM UP Liaison - PTSA Liaison
Garvey, Donyale	Teacher, K-12	Department Head for ELA
Howell, Loravie	Teacher, K-12	Math Dept Head
Duncan, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	Athletic Director & PE/Health Dept Head

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Romano, Miranda	Teacher, K-12	Gifted and Academically Talented Lead Teacher and Social Studies Dept Head
Rose, Jeff	Teacher, K-12	AVID Lead Teacher
Sullivan, Jill	Teacher, K-12	Science Dept Head
Taylor, Kimberly	School Counselor	Guidance Dept Head-Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
Wakefield, Heather	School Counselor	Social Emotional Learning Lead
Orr, Soraya	Teacher, ESE	Monitors, develops, and interprets fidelity of Individual Education Plans. Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for IEP program.
Smith, Latrise	Dean	Develops and implements discipline protocols for classroom managed and office managed behaviors; investigates and processes discipline incidents and referrals; assigns and monitors discipline consequences based on the DCPS Code of Student Conduct; collects, analyzes, and presents discipline data to faculty and staff; participates in design and delivery of professional development; provides support for PBIS.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Chris Koek

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.*
15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
41

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	59%
2019-20 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/6/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	241	258	289	0	0	0	0	788
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	14	27	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	37	33	0	0	0	0	84
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	13	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	45	133	0	0	0	0	239

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	33	0	0	0	0	66

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	241	258	289	0	0	0	0	788
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	14	27	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	37	33	0	0	0	0	84
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	13	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	45	133	0	0	0	0	239

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	33	0	0	0	0	66

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	56%	43%	54%	46%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	49%	54%	46%	48%	54%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	45%	47%	36%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	62%	49%	58%	46%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	55%	50%	57%	42%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	47%	51%	34%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	69%	44%	51%	57%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	68%	72%	60%	65%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	55%	47%	8%	54%	1%
	2018	50%	44%	6%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	49%	44%	5%	52%	-3%
	2018	44%	41%	3%	51%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	63%	49%	14%	56%	7%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	58%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	43%	51%	-8%	55%	-12%
	2018	40%	42%	-2%	52%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	38%	47%	-9%	54%	-16%
	2018	42%	50%	-8%	54%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	70%	32%	38%	46%	24%
	2018	58%	31%	27%	45%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		28%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	56%	40%	16%	48%	8%
	2018	34%	44%	-10%	50%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	67%	32%	67%	32%
2018	99%	63%	36%	65%	34%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	80%	69%	11%	71%	9%
2018	92%	84%	8%	71%	21%
Compare		-12%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	57%	37%	61%	33%
2018	98%	61%	37%	62%	36%
Compare		-4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	61%	35%	57%	39%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	31	41	34	40	47	33	42	69	77		
ELL	27	57		40	57						
ASN	58	58		83	83						
BLK	42	48	38	42	46	40	52	69	77		
HSP	48	56	52	65	54	44	55	72	85		
MUL	53	52	29	57	54	43	56	76			
WHT	64	59	56	70	59	55	77	86	91		
FRL	47	53	38	52	51	46	57	71	88		
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	27	39	27	28	36	27	33	85			
ELL	18	36		27	45						
ASN	50	53		71	60						
BLK	32	40	31	32	43	38	38	94	75		
HSP	35	49	50	52	56	62	52	91	92		
MUL	49	56	56	48	57	50	41		70		
WHT	60	54	45	65	56	48	71	95	93		
FRL	40	45	37	42	46	39	44	85	75		
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	15	26	27	20	38	35	32	23			
ELL	27	42			20						
ASN	47	47		80	60						
BLK	29	40	35	27	38	36	34	37	65		
HSP	38	45	33	40	29	27	27	58	80		
MUL	46	33	7	42	35	31	60	46			
WHT	56	51	42	54	48	35	72	74	84		
FRL	33	40	29	34	36	29	47	42	73		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	560
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	71
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
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	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
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	69
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The Bottom Quartile in math and reading was our lowest performing group of students. We grew in both areas; however, we need to improve the support and performance to increase the growth even more.

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

Our biggest decline was in Civics, due to the level of students that were taking the assessment. The previous year, only advanced level students took the EOC and this year, all levels took the assessment.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The difference in achievement between our Bottom Quartile and the rest of the student body is our biggest gap. We need to increase support for these students by reducing class sizes and getting additional push-in support from ESE teachers, tutors, and administrators to provide small-group instruction.

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

Our science data increased the most. We were strategic with scheduling and intentional with support for these students, specifically by utilizing reading strategies in science classes to enhance student ability to comprehend questions.

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

We made significant reductions in all areas of EWS; however, a trend that is concerning is our 8th graders seem to be significantly higher in all areas each year then the other grade levels. We need to develop additional support for students in this grade to help reduce all EWS areas for 8th grade.

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

1. Additional support for students with an IEP
2. Corrective Reading, push-in/small group instruction, and tutoring for levels 1 and 2
3. Math 180 for Level 2 and Level 3 students placed in Algebra 1
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our goal is to strengthen standards-based planning to enhance instruction and assessment, ultimately leading to student growth across all subject areas. After reviewing the 5 Essentials survey results, our students indicated rigor and academic support are not adequate. As a result of assessment data and student feedback, we will ensure that student work is aligned to the appropriate achievement level for the standard as well as the teachers' lesson plans and instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers will participate in standards-based instructional planning to align lesson plans to the appropriate achievement level of the standard, as measured through student work. The outcome will allow students to increase their Lexile level in reading and quantile score in math by one year expected growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chris Koek (koekc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Common planning will focus heavily on student work and lesson plan analysis measured by standards-based "walk-throughs." Teachers and school leaders will collaborate to continuously improve standards-based alignment, thus strengthening instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If planning and instruction is aligned on the Learning Arc with appropriate ALD level for the standard, then student work will provide evidence of standard mastery.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development on aligning instruction and student work to standards; i.e., addressing all standard components/ALD/learning arc.

Person Responsible	Chris Koek (koekc@duvalschools.org)

Common plan to design student activities and assessments that mirror the ALD of the standard.

Person Responsible	Chris Koek (koekc@duvalschools.org)

Calibrate standards-based walk-throughs among administrators and teacher leaders to complete cross-curricular peer observations.

Person Responsible	Chris Koek (koekc@duvalschools.org)

Administrators use SWT to determine continuous improvement of standard-alignment among student work and instruction.

Person Responsible	Chris Koek (koekc@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School Culture and Social Emotional Learning is a focus for the school. MCSMS launches our Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS) program at the start of the school year. Interactive PBIS behavior expectation lesson plans are taught by each teacher during the first week of school to ensure that all students are aware of expected behaviors throughout the school. The PBIS lessons focus on relationships throughout the school and include student and teacher feedback. The school-wide expectations for MCSMS are Self-control, Wise choices, Independent, Make a positive difference (SWIM). With students being out of school since March, it is important to ensure we have support in place to assist students with learning gain deficiencies and social emotional challenges.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Provide teachers the opportunity to review 5 Essentials results and collaborate on methods for improving their survey areas of concerns. Provide teachers an opportunity to complete an Needs Assessment Survey to provide teachers with meaningful professional development Instructional Coaches will provide professional development.Ensure that the professional development opportunities teachers experience have a direct impact on their classroom instruction, which will result in an improvement of student achievement. Provide more opportunities for teacher-leaders to lead professional development sessions for their teams, and for the school, based on their areas of interest/expertise. Teachers will
complete exit tickets after professional development sessions including the question "Today's session provided me with strategies I will use in my classroom this week." Exit Tickets will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of professional development. Instructional rounding will be conducted by teacher teams to provide feedback on best
practices.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.