Mayport Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Mayport Elementary School

2753 SHANGRI LA DR, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

http://www.duvalschools.org/mayport

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation 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.
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.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The SIP goals are developed with the School Advisory Counsels input as well as the Shared Decision Making Team. The Shared Decision Making Team is comprised of 1 employee from every grade level and bargaining unit. We look at the data from the prior school year and develop priority goals.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be reviewed for effectiveness during quarterly LEAD meetings and monthly SAC Meetings. We will analyze data through the use of the 4-Step Plan and revise our plan with each new data set.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	73%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	29	30	31	31	23	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	6	22	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	10	13	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	38	35	0	0	0	0	0	80

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	7	27	32	5	18	0	0	0	89

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	29	30	31	31	23	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	6	22	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	10	13	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	38	35	0	0	0	0	0	80

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	7	27	32	5	18	0	0	0	89

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	39	48	53	51	50	56	52		
ELA Learning Gains				60			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			27		
Math Achievement*	54	58	59	63	48	50	63		
Math Learning Gains				65			64		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66			36		
Science Achievement*	52	52	54	65	59	59	43		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	182
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	24	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	43			
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	41			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	63			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	63			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	39			54			52					
SWD	16			33			35				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			35			50				3	
HSP	38			50			40				3	
MUL	28			56							2	
PAC												
WHT	48			59			65				4	
FRL	37			49			45				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	51	60	55	63	65	66	65					
SWD	19	38	35	30	59	60	44					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	43	50	50	53	54	60	44					
HSP	48	63		66	74							
MUL	41	67		55	75							
PAC												
WHT	58	61		68	63		72					
FRL	52	63	57	62	67	76	64					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	52	44	27	63	64	36	43					
SWD	21	11	20	35	42		15					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	53		59	73		56					
HSP	50			61			30					
MUL	43			29								
PAC												
WHT	58	42		71	67		40					
FRL	54	40	23	58	58		34					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	47%	9%	54%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	50%	-10%	58%	-18%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	46%	-4%	50%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	59%	59%	0%	59%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	58%	-3%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	52%	11%	55%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	54%	48%	6%	51%	3%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

ELA Proficiency- Last year we had self-contained classes on 3rd and 4th grade for the first time. With all new curriculum in both reading and math, I think those teachers were burned out and unable to focus on priorities. The 2 self-contained classrooms scored the lowest on the test.

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

Science. These are the same teachers from the prior year. I think the low reading scores attributed to the low science scores.

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.

4th Grade ELA had the greatest gap when compared to state data. In past years, we had 4 teachers on the grade level and it was 2 departmentalized teams. Last year, we dropped to 3 teachers on the grade level. One teacher became self-contained. She was learning 2 brand new curriculums and 2 new sets of standards and was overwhelmed. The 4th grade ELA team will be needing additional training on the new standards and implementation of the core curriculum.

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

5th Grade Reading and Math had the highest level of achievement. New curriculum and focus on the standards alignment.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

We have 25% of students missing 20 days of school or more. Although we reduced this significantly over the last year, it is still far too many students missing nearly a month of instruction.

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

1. 3rd Grade ELA
2. 4th Grade ELA
3. 5th Grade Science

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Reduce the number of students with 20 or more days absent

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

Reduce the number of students with chronic absenteeism from 25% of students to 20%

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

Area of focus will be monitored though monthly Attendance Admin Team Meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Shells (shellsc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students with chronic absences will be heavily monitored and motivated to attend school through incentives and team meetings

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This will give students a motivator to be at school each day. It will also build rapport with the parents, which will help them understand the importance of school.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

All City Year Corps members will have a focus list of 10 students with chronic absences that they will do a check in-check out, phone calls home, and provide incentives for.

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

By When: daily throughout the school year

Monthly Attendance Meetings with Leadership Team, including School Counselor, Assistant Principal, and Social Worker to ensure Focus Lists are accurate and that meetings are being scheduled with the correct families

Person Responsible: Christine Shells (shellsc@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Monthly Attendance Intervention Team Meetings with parents of chronically absent students to discuss mitigation efforts and find solutions.

Person Responsible: Christine Shells (shellsc@duvalschools.org)
By When: Monthly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase Reading Proficiency in 3rd and 4th Grade ELA

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

Proficiency in ELA will increase from 42% to 48% in 3rd grade and from 40% to 48% in 4th grade.

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

PM1 and PM2 of the FAST Test, Data Chats

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Small Group intervention will be implemented daily to ensure that we are closing gaps and bringing students up to grade level reading abilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It allows for differentiated instruction to meet individual student needs

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Add 30 minutes per day of WIN time in Master Schedules to provide students with targeted intervention based on individual reading deficiencies.

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

By When: Daily

Send all 3rd and 4th grade teachers to UFLI intervention training

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

By When: Pre-Planning

Weekly Common Planning Focused on embedding the 4 Principles of Learning into all Core Lessons

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

By When: Weekly during common planning

City Year Partnership- Each 3rd and 4th grade classroom will have a full time AmeriCorps member that will be running intervention groups during WIN time and Center Rotations

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

By When: Ongoing- Daily

Data Chats with teachers after each new data set it received

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

By When: As needed

Quarterly Instructional Rounding looking at effective small group instruction

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

By When: Quarterly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase Science Proficiency in 5th Grade

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

Science proficiency will increase from 52% to 65%

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

Area of Focus will be monitored through DMA Science Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students will be provided more minutes in science, allowing for small group instruction to occur daily

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Allows for students to get individualized instruction in their area of difficulty

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Restructured the 5th grade team to a 3-way split, allowing for 65 uninterrupted minutes of science daily.

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

By When: Daily

Small Group Rotations will be implemented daily, allowing the teacher an opportunity to implement remediation lessons.

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

By When: Daily

Implement a problem of the daily so students have continuous exposure to a wider set of standards and test practice questions.

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

By When: Daily

Send 5th Grade science teacher to monthly science professional development

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

By When: Monthly

Utilize the new STEM lab though Project Intersect

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

By When: Ongoing

Hold Data Chats with teacher after each new data set

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

By When: As needed

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

NA

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

3rd and 4th grade reading proficiency is our area of focus. It was identified as the 2 lowest performing grade levels in literacy. In order to increase proficiency, we have added 30 minutes per day of WIN (What I Need) time to the master schedule to allow for 3rd-4th grade ELA teachers to have core phonics instruction using UFLI for students that need the intervention. We will send all 3rd and 4th grade teachers to UFLI training. In addition, we will have data chats and instructional rounding.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

NA

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

3rd grade ELA proficiency will increase from 42% to 50% and 4th grade ELA proficiency will increase from 40% to 50% by PM3.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Monitoring will be done through weekly Benchmark Walkthroughs with targeted feedback. We will also conduct data chats.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

O'Connell, Katie, speark@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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. §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?

The UFLI Phonics Program will be implemented with all students that fall into the phonics intervention category, based on STAR and the Core Phonics Screener.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

If we fix students phonics errors, they will become more fluent readers, and will be able to work on their comprehension.

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
Send all teachers to UFLI Training	O'Connell, Katie, speark@duvalschools.org
Screen all students using STAR and the Core Phonics Screener	O'Connell, Katie, speark@duvalschools.org
Implement WIN time in Master Schedules	O'Connell, Katie, speark@duvalschools.org