Mayport Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mayport Elementary School

2753 SHANGRI LA DR, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

http://www.duvalschools.org/mayport

Demographics

Principal: Katie Oconnell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (70%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.](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 Elementary School

2753 SHANGRI LA DR, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

http://www.duvalschools.org/mayport

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	78%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

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.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in middle school and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Engage, encourage and educate our students and families by creating hands-on opportunities to explore the world around us.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
O'Connell, Katie	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing curriculum, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support school and district goals, and communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities, and leads the instructional leadership team.
Thomas, Dione	Assistant Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing curriculum, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support school and district goals, and communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities, and leads the instructional leadership team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Katie Oconnell

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.*
24

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

461

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

12

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

12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	87	79	90	96	88	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	519
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	1	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/6/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	84	99	90	79	74	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
Attendance below 90 percent	16	17	7	12	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	27	52	42	22	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	33	68	52	40	19	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224

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	28	50	35	21	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	84	99	90	79	74	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
Attendance below 90 percent	16	17	7	12	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	27	52	42	22	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	33	68	52	40	19	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224

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	28	50	35	21	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	1	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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				58%	50%	57%	63%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	56%	58%	57%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	50%	53%	52%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				62%	62%	63%	79%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	63%	62%	62%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	52%	51%	35%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				68%	48%	53%	87%	55%	55%

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	58%	51%	7%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	52%	6%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	50%	-2%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	61%	-10%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	76%	64%	12%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	63%	49%	14%	53%	10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The data was provided via performance matters and given to principal via district personnel.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17/22%	25/36%	40/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/27%	12/39%	17/57%
	Students With Disabilities	1/6%	3/19%	4/27%
	English Language Learners	1/33%	0/0%	1/33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11/14%	25/36%	35/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/18%	13/42%	13/45%
	Students With Disabilities	1/6%	2/13%	3/20%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/33%

Grade 2			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27/29%	37/43%	40/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/23%	12/32%	10/31%
	Students With Disabilities	3/13%	4/17%	7/35%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/13%	21/24%	38/46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/13%	6/16%	15/45%
	Students With Disabilities	2/8%	2/9%	4/20%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 3			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42/48%	43/49%	44/56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/45%	18/44%	20/53%
	Students With Disabilities	4/20%	5/24%	6/32%
	English Language Learners	1/33%	0/0%	1/33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52/60%	40/45%	46/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/55%	20/48%	20/53%
	Students With Disabilities	9/45%	3/14%	5/26%
	English Language Learners	1/33%	1/33%	2/67%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33/45%	47/64%	48/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/41%	20/65%	19/58%
	Students With Disabilities	6/35%	8/47%	8/47%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/100%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52/72%	50/68%	50/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/84%	19/61%	22/69%
	Students With Disabilities	8/45%	9/14%	5/26%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36/55%	37/54%	38/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/53%	18/49%	19/54%
	Students With Disabilities	6/38%	6/32%	5/28%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24/37%	30/45%	30/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/35%	15/42%	16/46%
	Students With Disabilities	5/31%	7/39%	4/22%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	37/58%	28/44%	24/39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/50%	12/35%	12/36%
	Students With Disabilities	5/31%	4/24%	4/24%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Subgroup Data Review

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	21	11	20	35	42		15				
BLK	42	53		59	73		56				
HSP	50			61			30				
MUL	43			29							
WHT	58	42		71	67		40				
FRL	54	40	23	58	58		34				

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	42	59	40	42	62	40	54				
BLK	56	50		54	50		67				
HSP	36	25		59	33						
MUL	56	50		63	70						
WHT	62	62	43	66	66	27	66				
FRL	55	66	44	60	58	27	64				

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	45	57	54	62	59	30	88				
BLK	53	53		70	63						
HSP	56	64		78	73						
MUL	67			81							
WHT	65	58	53	81	63	38	90				
FRL	63	56	53	80	65	39	88				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	329
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

In grades 1 through 4, the overall data is trending up for overall students proficient and also for subgroups of students proficient (from fall to spring which shows growth). 5th grade has gaps in a few areas based on 2019 data and PMA assessment data 20-21. Science has decreased based on comparison to 2019 data and it is trending down throughout the school year. 5th grade math has also decreased.

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

The greatest need for improvement based on progress monitoring data and 2019 assessments are both 5th grade math and science. Science possesses the greatest need due to the low amount of students that were proficient by spring and the decline in number of students proficient from fall to spring. 5th grade math also had the lowest level of proficiency (which did not improve from winter to spring) by spring according to the district PMA assessment data. According to that data, we were also not on target to surpass the 2019 level of proficiency and gains.

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

The contributing factors to this need for improvement may be contributed to the lack of time spent teaching science, the lack of lab utilization due to Covid-19 restrictions, and the dynamic of having a virtual class that struggled to obtain solid content due to teacher error. The new actions that would need to be taken are based on looking at master scheduling of science, ensuring the instructor is well aware of the standards and content, and implementation of labs to help students better understand the scientific processes. In mathematics, the contributing factors would be lack of clarity for the students in the virtual class, and the need for more fluency prior to standards based content.

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

Based on progress monitoring and 2019 state assessment data, the area that showed the most improvement is
5th grade ELA.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement was the use of learning arc standards based protocol to ensure the students were consistently working on content relevant to what is being assessed and how it is being assessed, skilled planning, and having students complete activities that are directly aligned to the standard. Teacher leadership played a role in successful planning.

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

The strategies that will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning is to consistently give standards aligned assessment in the classroom. Based on the standards walkthrough tool, as a school, the use of standards aligned assessments is an area of growth. Through this process and accurately planning instructional minutes, the areas of growth should see significant improvement in a short amount of time.

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.

The professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders will involve consistent weekly PLC with teachers, placing a focus on the type of assessments given to students and when those assessments will be given to students. For acceleration of learning in science, there will be more opportunities for teachers at all grade levels to teach science content with fidelity and incorporate labs aligned to standards goals (specifically in 5th grade). Leadership will find ways to incorporate more time for strategic planning and collaborate with teachers to identify areas of need. Leadership will also use outside resources, teacher leaders, and technology to host more time effective professional learning opportunities for school faculty and staff.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement this year and beyond will be conducting periodic needs assessments in the areas of focus. There will also be data chats conducted to examine student success data which will better define our goals and expose any gaps that may need attention.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Hispanic subgroup had a federal index of 38% in 2019 which falls below the 41% threshold.
Measurable Outcome:	Mayport Elementary will increase federal index for the Hispanic subgroup by 4% bringing it to 42%
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored with the use of performance matter to review district assessment data and teacher formative assessments. Reading mastery and LLI assessments will also be monitored.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students in grades K-2 will be receiving direct instruction in reading using the SRA reading mastery program. Students will receive 45 minutes of intervention in reading daily. Students in grades 3-5 will receive 30 minutes of intervention in reading daily using LLI.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The programs are data based intervention programs that assist struggling readers.

Action Steps to Implement	
Identify all students in the subgroup and assess their current reading level	
Person Responsible	Dione Thomas (thomasd11@duvalschools.org)
Enroll students into intervention program	
Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)
Monitor student assessments monthly	
Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	33% of the time teachers are determining mastery at the close of the lesson and 61% of the time students are seeing FSA aligned questions, according to the 2020-2021 Standards Walkthrough Dasboard.
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers will engage in standards aligned common planning focused on standards aligned tasks and assessments. As a result of the learning, students will engaged in an aligned assessments at least 65% of the time.
Monitoring:	This area will be monitored by conducting standards walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional delivery ensures that students are exposed to standards aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments. Based on standards walkthrough tool, our team can measure classrooms that have aligned standards and experiences in core classes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	It is expressed in the Opportunity Myth, schools need to ensure students are getting standards aligned and grade appropriate instruction so they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state, along with the following year's progression of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Calibrate administration on standards walkthroughs. We need to ensure instruction is the same.

Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

Create common planning agendas and tasks that allow for the teacher to plan standards focused tasks and assessments that meet the level of rigor of the standard.

Person Responsible	Dione Thomas (thomasd11@duvalschools.org)

Continue monitoring alignment of standards and assessments through Standards Focused Walkthroughs using the Standard Walkthrough tool and analyze the data weekly with the admin team.

Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

Conduct focus walks with grade level teams quarterly to ensure grade level alignment to the standards is seen.

Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 5 Essentials Survey, teachers rated collaborative practices as week (32%). Teachers do not feel that they have many opportunities to observe each other or work together to create common assessments or instructional strategies. This negatively impacts alignment across grade levels.
Measurable Outcome:	Core content teachers will engage in instructional rounds to observe other classrooms quarterly and provide each other with feedback on standards aligned instruction. As a result of Instructional Rounding, teachers will rate collaborative practices at least neutral on the 5 Essentials Survey.
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional Rounds gives teachers the opportunity to visit each others classrooms and gain ideas and inspiration from each others teaching. It will also allow for rich discussion about effective instructional practices and standards alignment. Providing feedback to your peers will build a collaborative environment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional Rounds are research based and help teachers gain a common understanding of what effective instruction looks like. They are a valuable tool for building a culture of collaboration.

Action Steps to Implement	
Train teachers on Instructional Rounding and set guidelines. Have protocol for debrief and feedback.	
Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)
Create a schedule to conduct instructional rounds at least quarterly with all grade levels	
Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)
Conduct instructional rounds and debrief with teachers in a structured way. Allow teachers to provide feedback to each other.	
Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)
Conduct a book study on grade level teams on The 5 language of Appreciation in the Workplace. This would allow teams to build a culture of appreciation and respect.	
Person Responsible	Dione Thomas (thomasd11@duvalschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on school PMA assessment data, science was identified as an area of need.
Measurable Outcome:	If we increase the support for teachers and students by having a fulltime Science Lab Teacher/Coordinator to support students and provide regular field experiences, Science scores will increase.
Monitoring:	Periodic checks to ensure teachers are teaching science for the correct length of time. Science Lab Teacher/Coordinator will work with students consistently. 2) STEAM Field Experiences (Gr5) 3) Coastal Science Field Experiences (GrK-5) A Science Lead Teacher/Coordinator will be used to provide weekly lessons to students that support the science curriculum in the classroom and to coordinate field experiences for students
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dione Thomas (thomasd11@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Planning a standards aligned focus calendar will ensure activities implemented are timely and accurate.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The chosen strategy will help to ensure students are receiving the correct standards aligned experiences when appropriate. This will also help to ensure the activities are engaging.

Action Steps to Implement	
Science Lead Teacher/Coordinator will plan with 5th grade science teachers to provide additional assistance with teaching science standards.	
Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)
Science Lead Teacher/Coordinator will coordinate field experiences for students in all grade levels throughout the school year. A schedule will be created to include a weekly Coastal Science Lab Resource for hands-on science lessons.	
Person Responsible	Dione Thomas (thomasd11@duvalschools.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 2021-22 data, ELA was identified as a critical need. Students at our school need support with learning the foundational skills of how to read and also understanding the content they are reading. As an Area of Focus, student success in ELA progress will also increase student achievement in other subject areas. o The percentage of students in grades 3-5, below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment are as follows: 3rd grade is 46%, 4th grade is 46%, and 5th grade is 53%. o The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2020-2021 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment is as follows: 1st - 80% and 2nd - 73%
Measurable Outcome:	K-5 data: *Increase percentage of K-2 students scoring "At Grade Level" or above by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points. *Increase percentage of 3 -5 grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.
Monitoring:	Our school leadership team, district content specialist support, and Supplemental Instructional APs will review ELA data from district assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data Driven Lesson Planning: Understanding where students are with mastery of standards, using data from informal and formal assessments, planning clear objectives, implementation, and checking for understanding when lesson planning. Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Not all students are on the same level, but all standards must be mastered. Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet students at their level to support their needs. Progress Monitoring: Ensuring whole group lessons, interventions, and assessments are done with fidelity. Checking effectiveness from student data.

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: Collecting data from classrooms in real time and providing immediate
and clear feedback for teachers and school leadership teams to work together to ensure effectiveness.

Data-driven Lesson Planning: Effective lesson planning requires teachers to determine three essential
components such as the objective, the implementation, and a reflection. https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/howto-
plan-effective-lessons

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Small group instruction is the key to data-driven results and is the
gateway to meeting the needs of all learners. https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/turn-small-reading-groups-intobig-
wins

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Progress Monitoring: Student progress monitoring helps teachers evaluate how effective their instruction is,
either for individual students or for the entire class. https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/how-student-progressmonitoring-
improves-instruction

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: The implementation review is a plan designed to 1) recognize
accomplishments, 2) track actions, 3) measure implementation impact, 4) evaluate the plan, 5) determine next
steps. It may be used by the school alone or with the assistance of the support lead. https://institutionalresearch.syr.edu/what-we-do/student-ratings/creating-an-action-plan/action-plan-teachingstrategies/

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with all four strategies listed above. Professional Development
during Early Release Days and Common Planning will be essential for Leadership to support teachers. Based
on observational data and teacher feedback, PD topics will be set before each Early Release and Common
Planning.

Person Responsible   Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

During Common Planning and individual teacher data chats, specific data pertaining to ELA reading and student success will be discussed and analyzed to ensure we are monitoring progress.

Person Responsible   Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

Give immediate feedback on any observations/walkthroughs conducted by state support, school leadership,
district content specialists, and district leadership.

Person Responsible   Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

At this time, there are secondary areas of concern. One primary area of concern is level 3 referrals which are presently due to the discipline issues of one student. During this upcoming school year, we will monitor the consistency of school mental health professionals and track the amount of time spent with students in need. The school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior, attending to the social, emotional, and other needs of students and staff. In compliance with our district expectations we will conduct wellness Wednesdays and work closely with the school counselor to implement activities that positively influence school culture as it relates to trauma, student needs, and dealing with the pandemic.

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.

The school has a sunshine committee that engages all faculty and staff members in improving culture and climate. This committee plans events and gatherings to engage all faculty and staff members on team building, trust building, and friendship. School leaderships also plans initiatives that involves monthly calendars allowing teachers to engage in fun activities on a daily basis and collaborate with one another in order to build collegial relationships. In addition, the school utilizes class dojo with all students and parents. This program allows parents and teachers to communicate easily and often. In addition, it allows teachers to celebrate student success and notify parents when a student is struggling with behavior. The school as a whole utilized Dojo to celebrate students with monthly dojo awards and prize carts. The school involves parents and community members in the month SAC meetings to gain support from all stakeholders. Stakeholders are fully informed of events and initiatives that will be taking place at the school so that they can participate and or allow us as a school to participate in community activities.

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

Blessings in a backpack- Provide resources to students that may be in need
Beaches Resource- Contribute resources and marine life to our magnet initiatives and house our marine life when when we are in need.
Bragan Foundation- Support of student population with resources
United Way-Support of student population with resources

Oceanside Rotary Club- Provides resources for literacy and volunteers to work with the students
Morgan Stanley
Lowe's
One Church- Faith based partner. Provides meals for faculty and staff events. Also supplies resources for students in need.
Fort Caroline Baptist- Faith based partner
BEAM
Project HEAL
Jax Whole Furnitre
Berkshire and Hathoway
Oak Harbor Church

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning**	$0.00
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**	$0.00
5	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**