
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Otis A. Mason Elementary School

207 MASON MANATEE WAY, St Augustine, FL 32086

www-mes.stjohns.k12.fl.us

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.

At Otis A. Mason Elementary, we believe student success is fostered by a continuous commitment to improvement, which ensures well-rounded and motivated learners. We do this by maintaining a safe, orderly and dynamic learning environment, promoting high expectations for all students, implementing the PLC model, and adopting the Character Counts! approach to relationships and community conduct. We believe in the importance of togetherness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The “Mason Way” is one that nurtures a passion in every child for personal success, good character, and a desire to learn, explore, and better themselves as they grow to be responsible members of our community.

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
Keaton, Monique	Principal	Implements and oversees operations of the school.
Antoine, Marie	Assistant Principal	Assist Principal
Hudson, Julie	Assistant Principal	Assists Principal
Ford, Torrey	Math Coach	Oversees math instruction
Hunting, Kathleen	Instructional Coach	
Jaffa, Danielle	Instructional Coach	Support teaching and learning at Otis A. Mason Elementary

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.

Otis A. Mason Elementary has an active Parent Teacher Organization and School Advisory Council. Members of both are made up of parents, grandparents, guardians, teachers, staff, administrators, district support, and community members. Their input is received and written in the Otis A. Mason school improvement plan. The input is received via monthly meetings with both SAC and PT, school-based

surveys, ongoing communications with the School Advisory Council and the Parent Teacher Organization, and school leader feedback community response to school.

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 school improvement plan is directly aligned with school goals, district goals, and school focus. The school's goals and focus are reviewed weekly via planning, monthly via professional learning, and after each progress monitoring assessment. Otis A. Mason's 23 - 24 plan for continuous improvement will be revised as needed.

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	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	48%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	15	31	18	8	12	10	18	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	1	7	1	3	2	0	11	0	0	25
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	6	0	0	2	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	12	10	0	0	26
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	3	1	0	8	5	9	0	0	26

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	16	41	20	17	26	28	52	0	0	200

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	9	8	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	26
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	19	19	17	9	24	12	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	2	4	4	1	8	5	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	8	9	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	8	7	0	0	0	16
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	

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	3	7	11	14	12	0	0	0	47

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	13	9	6	3	1	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	19	19	17	9	24	12	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	2	4	4	1	8	5	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	8	9	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	8	7	0	0	0	16
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	

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	3	7	11	14	12	0	0	0	47

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	13	9	6	3	1	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	64	70	53	67	74	56	60		
ELA Learning Gains				62			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57			63		
Math Achievement*	66	73	59	77	50	50	77		
Math Learning Gains				68			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			65		
Science Achievement*	56	69	54	63	77	59	66		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					69	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		66	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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	256
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	453
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	47			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	63			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	57			

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	50			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	68			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	56			

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	64			66			56					
SWD	44			45			42				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37			53							2	
HSP	56			58							3	
MUL	72			72							2	
PAC												
WHT	69			68			64				4	
FRL	58			59			51				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	67	62	57	77	68	59	63					
SWD	38	48	45	56	63	63	37					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46	56		58	56	40						
HSP	55	50		76	90							
MUL	63	64		63	36							
PAC												
WHT	72	63	59	79	69	67	67					
FRL	53	59	50	68	59	54	46					

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	60	55	63	77	66	65	66					
SWD	26	39	53	53	55	61	15					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	36		27	50		14					
HSP	52			83			50					
MUL	64			71								
PAC												
WHT	66	61	86	82	71	73	83					
FRL	47	50	42	61	50	45	47					

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	62%	71%	-9%	54%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	76%	2%	58%	20%
03	2023 - Spring	68%	72%	-4%	50%	18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	73%	78%	-5%	59%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	79%	-1%	61%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	56%	74%	-18%	55%	1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	58%	70%	-12%	51%	7%

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.

- Data Components 2022
- SWD ELA Achievement 38
- SWD Science 37
- SWD Math 56
- Data Components 2021
- SWD ELA Achievement 26
- SWD Science 15
- SWD Math 53

One contributing factor is students' gaps in learning and standards mastery.
 Another contributing factor is an inconsistency in stable staffing.

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

The greatest decline is reflected in the subgroup, white in the area of ELA Learning Gains L25%. There was a difference of 27.

One contributing factor is an inconsistency in the stability of staff.
Another contributing factor is the possibility of a lack of detail to the needs in this subgroup.

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.

Our 3rd and 4th grade started the year higher than the state but were still able to increase the gap and had more positive change from PM1?PM3 than the state averages.

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

The most improvement was shown in the area of math achievement.
2021 - 2022 27% of black students scored in the achievement range
2022 - 2023 58% of black students scored in the achievement range

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

Absenteeism
Suspension

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

Safety for all students and staff
Continuous improvement of Professional Learning Community Implementation
Continuous Student Achievement for all students
Continue to build the school's climate and culture including teacher recruitment and retention
Professional Development for teachers and staff to include student engagement

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 Other

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.

Otis A. Mason Elementary School understands the value of the Professional Learning Community. We understand Professional Learning Communities build strong relationships between team members. They provide the opportunity for many participants to make contributions and share their experiences with the goal of finding ways to improve educational practices. At Otis A. Mason Elementary, we invest in people. Those investments are manifested via community events, individual parent-teacher conferences several times per year, parent invitations to each student meeting, and ongoing home-school communication. The communications include classroom-to-home, school-to-home, and social media.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school plans to strengthen its implementation of the Professional Learning Community. Its growth towards this plan will be measured via school and staff surveys, and community feedback.

Monitoring:

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

This area will be monitored via SAC, PTO, staff and community involvement, needs assessments, and feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monique Keaton (monique.keaton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

St. Johns County school district is a Professional Learning Community District. Otis A. Mason Elementary is a Professional Learning Community School We believe in the power of a school community acting collaborative on behalf of all stakeholders. We invest in these principles, concepts, and characteristics.

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.

This area of focus is a school goal and focus at Otis A. Mason this school year. We will continue to implement the PLC process into the fibers of our school as suggested in the Cognia feedback for our district and as appropriate for our school.

Person Responsible: Monique Keaton (monique.keaton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: During School year 23 - 24

#2. 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.

Otis A. Mason Elementary School is identifying ESSA SWD Subgroup as an area of focus because it is the area that received the lowest percentage of total points during the school year 2022.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Specifically, we hope to continuously improve the percentage of SWD that score in the ELA achievement range. We want to improve the percentage of students with disabilities that score in the Science achievement range.

48% of SWD scored in the ELA achievement range in 2022. We hope to increase this percentage by percentage points.

37% of SWD scored in the Science achievement range. We hope to increase this percentage by 5 percentage points.

Monitoring:

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

Otis A. Mason will focus more specifically on science content this year.

Staff has been hired to monitor the desired outcome.

Specifics for the desired outcome are in place. The Professional Learning Community will monitor using those specifics. Performance Matters, CSA's and formatives are the monitoring tools we will use.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monique Keaton (monique.keaton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Teaching, re-teaching, small group learning, formative assessments, data discussions, data review, tactile learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These are evidence-based interventions and strategies used not only traditionally by educators but they are also reinforced via our school district's evaluation model.

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.

A continuous study of students' needs based on data. Data results will drive small-group instruction and intervention.

Person Responsible: Monique Keaton (monique.keaton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Throughout the 2023 - 2024 school year.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

The rationale that explains how this area of focus was identified is because at Otis A. Mason Elementary School this past school year, 58% of the fifth-grade students were within the science achievement range. During the 2021 - 2022 school year, 63% of the students scored within the science achievement range. This is the reason it is a crucial need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school plans to increase the percentage of students scoring in the science achievement category to match or exceed the percentage scoring within this range on the 2022 assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Otis A. Mason will focus more specifically on science content this year. Specific Staff has been hired to assist with monitoring the desired outcome. The school will participate in the district approach to the curriculum summative assessments. Instructional supports are in place. Departmentalization is permitted for staff as requested, based on teacher and student needs. Professional learning Teams will monitor for this desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monique Keaton (monique.keaton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Teaching, re-teaching, small group learning, formative assessments, data discussions, data review, tactile learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale that explains how this area of focus was identified is because at Otis A. Mason Elementary School this past school year, 58% of the fifth-grade students were within the science achievement range.

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.

Hire staff that can support science, learning, and achievement.

Define and design the role.

Ascertain baseline data.

Focus on Science instruction during the science block and incorporate Science instruction into ELA.

Person Responsible: Julie Hudson (julie.hudson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: During school year 2023 - 2024.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement plan will be presented in a fall School Advisory Council meeting. The school advisory council consists of families, school staff, building leaders, and district staff. The school improvement plan will also be posted on the Otis A. Mason website.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress by building strong partnerships with families and communities. At School Advisory Council meetings, we ask families about their expectations for their child's education. In addition, we honor the cultural backgrounds of families through community gatherings, whole school celebrations, and by providing opportunities for families to share their stories about their own educational experiences with teachers, students, and the whole school community. Our schools welcome community organizations to these events and invite them to participate and share their knowledge and resources about things like after-school programs, community services, arts and athletic events, and volunteering opportunities.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Otis A. Mason Elementary plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum by setting school goals this school year to build continuously on strengthening our school culture and climate, increasing student achievement and practicing essentials for an effective professional learning community. One of our areas of focus is the importance of a positive school culture.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A