

Duval County Public Schools

Mayport Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

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 |
| 2021-22 Title I School | No |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 73% |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: B (61%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: A (62%) |
| 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

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

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) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | No | 73% |
| 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 | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B | | B | B |

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

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| 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. |
| Shells, Christine | 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 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.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

485

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

3

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

0

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 | 63 | 65 | 79 | 72 | 56 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 408 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 7 | 38 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |

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 | 7 | 27 | 32 | 5 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/23/2022

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 | 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 |

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 | 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 |

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 | 51% | 50% | 56% | | | | 58% | 50% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 60% | | | | | | 56% | 56% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 55% | | | | | | 38% | 50% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 63% | 48% | 50% | | | | 62% | 62% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 65% | | | | | | 60% | 63% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 66% | | | | | | 35% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 65% | 59% | 59% | | | | 68% | 48% | 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% | 51% | 7% | 58% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 52% | 6% | 58% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -58% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 48% | 50% | -2% | 56% | -8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -58% | | | | |

| 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 | 51% | 61% | -10% | 62% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 76% | 64% | 12% | 64% | 12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 57% | -4% | 60% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -76% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 49% | 14% | 53% | 10% |
| 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 | 19 | 38 | 35 | 30 | 59 | 60 | 44 | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 50 | 50 | 53 | 54 | 60 | 44 | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | 63 | | 66 | 74 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 41 | 67 | | 55 | 75 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | 61 | | 68 | 63 | | 72 | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 63 | 57 | 62 | 67 | 76 | 64 | | | | |
| 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 | 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 | | | | |
| 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 | 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 | | | | |

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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 61 |
| 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 | 425 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 41 |
| 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 | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 51 |
| 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 | 63 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 60 |
| 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 | 64 |
| 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 | 63 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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?

ELA proficiency is not improving across the school. Although we made great gains, we are not increasing the number of students who are on grade level.

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

Our greatest need for improvement is in the area of ELA proficiency.

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

Some factors that contribute to this need for improvement are high absence rates due to COVID-19, lack to data driven small group instruction targeted to individual student needs, and poor foundational skills. To address this need for improvement, training in targeted small group instruction needs to be implemented.

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

Our LPQ Math group showed the most improvement with a 30 point growth this year.

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

Strong small group instruction and intervention were contributing factors in this growth. Also, having all students in face-to-face instruction.

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

We will be implementing a new curriculum in both reading and math that includes small group instruction materials and lessons. We will be utilizing our coach to plan high quality core lessons and small group differentiation.

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.

Professional Development on the new BEST standards will be provided to all faculty. In addition, PD on the new curriculum and on small group differentiated learning.

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

Use of a reading interventionist to push into classrooms, Communities in Schools Reading Intervention using LLI, daytime tutoring.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Based on the 2021-2022 FSA Data, our ELA proficiency has dropped by 1 point. It is our lowest data point. In order to continue to improve all areas of our data, we need to increase our proficient readers.

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

Mayport Elementary School will increase our reading proficiency from 51% to 60% during the 2022-2023 school year.

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

The new state test will be used to monitor proficiency throughout the year. We will also be looking at students Achieve Data and STAR testing data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

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

If teachers provide high quality core instruction that is aligned to the BEST standards and provide daily small group instruction that is targeted to individual student needs, then we will see an improvement in reading proficiency.

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

Standards aligned core instruction will provide students an opportunity to work on grade level. Targeted intervention will close the gaps that exist in the students 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.

Send all teachers to BEST Training

Person Responsible

Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

Provide training to all teachers on Benchmark Advance

Person Responsible

Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

Utilize weekly common planning time to plan standards aligned lessons

Person Responsible

Christine Shells (shellsc@duvalschools.org)

Monitor instruction with weekly standards walks.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Collective Responsibility**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

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

Based on the 5Essentails Survey, collective responsibility was our weakest area, scoring just a 24. This area dropped by 18 points from the previous year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2022-2023 school year we will improve our rating on collective responsibility from a 24 to a 40, bringing it out of week and back to neutral.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through surveys given through the PBIS committee.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Shells (shellsc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

We will improve collective responsibility through Common Planning, where all teachers work together to build quality instruction. We will also use our PBIS committee to look at how the school as a whole can improve behavior and collective responsibility for student improvement. Finally, we will allow teachers to be leaders and train their colleagues in PD Days.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

By bringing teachers together for planning, we are collectively engaging in improving instruction. The PBIS committee is a virtual planning structure, which will help with building school wide collective responsibility. In addition, by allowing teachers to teach other teachers, we are raising the level of community.

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.

Provided dedicated common planning time

Person Responsible

Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

Have monthly vertical PBIS meetings

Person Responsible

Christine Shells (shellsc@duvalschools.org)

Have quarterly Master Dolphin Professional Development Days.

Person Responsible

Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

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

Based on the fall administration of the Waterford (grade K) or i-Ready (Grades 1 & 2) assessments, students in grades K-2 that are determined to be below grade level in reading will be put into Tier II interventions using the Benchmark Advance Intervention Kit. Students that show a substantial reading deficiency will be placed in a tier III Intervention using Seeing Stars and LLI.

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

Based on the fall administration of the Achieve 3000 assessments, students in grades 3-5 that are determined to be below grade level in reading will be put into Tier II interventions using the Benchmark Advance Intervention Kit. Students that show a substantial reading deficiency will be placed in a tier III Intervention using Seeing Stars and LLI.

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)

Students in grades K-2 will have at least a 51% proficiency on the Spring Administration of the STAR assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Students in grades 3-5 will have at least a 51% proficiency on the Spring Administration of the FAST test

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.

Students in Tier II and Tier III will be given a Progress Monitoring Plan. We will monitor their data during the 3 test administration windows. In addition, students in Tier II and Tier III will be monitored every 6 weeks during MTSS meetings with the classroom teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

O'Connell, Katie, speak@duvalschools.org

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?

Benchmark Advance Intervention Kit for Tier II- This is directly aligned to the BEST standards and is on the approved list and the districts Reading Plan.

Seeing Stars- Tier III Intervention- This is directly aligned to the BEST standards and is on the approved list and the districts Reading Plan.

Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI)- This is directly aligned to the BEST standards and is on the approved list and the districts Reading Plan.

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?

I selected the programs based on the districts reading plan recommendations and the availability for use in my school.

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 |
|---|---|
| Identify students that fall into Tier II and Tier III intervention based on the fall test administration. | O'Connell, Katie, speak@duvalschools.org |
| Schedule interventions into Master Schedule | O'Connell, Katie, speak@duvalschools.org |
| Monitor implementation on intervention through MTSS meetings every 6 weeks. | O'Connell, Katie, speak@duvalschools.org |

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.

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 leadership also plans initiatives that involve 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 school culture and environment.

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