Otis A. Mason Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Otis A. Mason Elementary School

207 MASON MANATEE WAY, St Augustine, FL 32086

www-mes.stjohns.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Monique Keaton

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	60%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Dustin Sims](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 St. Johns County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org.](www.floridacims.org)

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

At 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 and dynamic learning environment, promoting high expectations for all students, nurturing determination, developing personal relationships, and involving our community.

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

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Keaton, Monique	Principal	Oversight of school management, instructional leadership, operational leadership, budget, staff, parent, and community communication, teacher and staff evaluations, student discipline support, data disaggregation, oversight of School Improvement Plan, MTSS & Core team member, Emergency Operations Plan (EOP), Safety team coordinator and drills, crisis team member, testing and master scheduling, and employee, student and parent issues and curriculum support.The Principal's primary function is to provide leadership and administration which will motivate instructional and support personnel to strive for superior performance so as to provide the best possible opportunities for student growth and development, both educationally and personally.
	Assistant Principal	The responsibilities of the assistant principal range from-enforcing attendance rules, meeting with parents to discuss student behavioral or learning problems, responding to disciplinary issues, coordinating use of school facilities for day-to-day activities and special events, working with teachers to develop curriculum standards, developing and maintaining school safety procedures, evaluating teachers and learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed, coordinating and planning class schedules, assessing data such as state standards and test scores, coordinating transportation for students, serving at the local education authority for ESE services, hiring and training staff, walking the hallways and checking in on teachers and classrooms and responding to emails from teachers, parents and community members.
Miller, Jenna	Other	Her job of "Behavior Interventionist" is done for the purpose/s of providing support, monitoring, and training using behavior management techniques, intervention strategies, coping skills, and problem solving for students with behavioral challenges.
Raynor, Annemarie	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Monique Keaton

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
69

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	60%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	117	120	107	97	99	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	637
Attendance below 90 percent	18	9	8	4	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	7	3	2	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/1/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	112	113	92	100	97	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	12	10	3	8	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	7	0	1	8	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	2	0	0	6	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	112	113	92	100	97	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	12	10	3	8	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	7	0	1	8	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	2	0	0	6	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	63%	75%	57%	64%	72%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	67%	58%	54%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	59%	53%	39%	50%	48%
Math Achievement	64%	77%	63%	70%	77%	62%
Math Learning Gains	59%	69%	62%	59%	67%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	59%	51%	39%	58%	47%
Science Achievement	60%	72%	53%	67%	68%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	78%	-20%	58%	0%
	2018	72%	78%	-6%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison	-14%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	77%	-2%	58%	17%
	2018	54%	74%	-20%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison	21%					
Cohort Comparison	3%					
05	2019	51%	76%	-25%	56%	-5%
	2018	63%	73%	-10%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison	-12%					
Cohort Comparison	-3%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	82%	-22%	62%	-2%
	2018	74%	80%	-6%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison	-14%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	82%	-5%	64%	13%
	2018	67%	83%	-16%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison	10%					
Cohort Comparison	3%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	80%	-29%	60%	-9%
	2018	67%	79%	-12%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	73%	-14%	53%	6%
	2018	67%	73%	-6%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	26	36	33	29	29	25	32				
BLK	28	35	29	28	30	13					
HSP	67	60		71	53						
MUL	73			64							
WHT	67	66	40	69	64	50	64				
FRL	45	50	42	46	45	36	40				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	28	40	34	38	43	29	45				
BLK	39	57	40	39	43	27	42				
HSP	62	60	50	84	71						
MUL	50			50							
WHT	69	54	38	73	60	38	76				
FRL	51	46	31	59	52	35	54				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	387
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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
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	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	69
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	60
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

Math Low Quartile: School 39%: SWD 25%: Black 13%
Contributing factors (what the school can control:) No intervention block built into the master schedule, i-Ready Instructional component usage (time and lessons passed) was low, and our school is still in the beginning stages of the PLC Process. Some students in the identified subgroups are being counted in all three categories - bottom quartile, SWD and Black. In addition, some of these students received behavioral referrals an out of school suspensions which leads to time out of class and missed instruction.
Trends: Math Lowest Quartile for the school in 2018 and 2019 was the same, 39%. A decline was evident in our SWDs. They went from 29% in 2018 to 25% in 2019. A decline was evident in our students who are Blas as well, 27% in 2018 and 13% in 2019.

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

School Grade Data Component: Science - 67% to 60% (-7%)
Grade Level Data: Grade 5 Math 2018 67% to 2019 51% (-16%)
Contributing factors for Science: Teacher knowledge and skills with teaching science concepts, lack of vertical discussion and alignment with science, not existing common formative assessments for teams to use to inform instruction.
Contributing factors for 5th grade Math: No intervention block built into the master schedule, students' skill gaps and lack of background knowledge, amount of content that must be taught and assessed in the grade level.

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

Grade 5 Math Proficiency 51% School compared to 80% District (-29%.)
Grade 5 ELA Proficiency 51% School compared to 76% District (-21%.)
Contributing factors: No intervention block built into the master schedule, iReady Instructional Component usage (time and lessons passed) was low, our school is still in the beginning stages of the PLC Process, low engagement in learning, students did not track their progress towards goals or receive timeline feedback on their learning. Also, content taught and assess in fifth grade is greater than any other grade level. When students come to the fifth grade without mastering essential standards in other grade levels,the teachers have to attempt to fill gaps while also teaching grade-level content.

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

School Grade Data Component: ELA Learning Gains - 54% to 62% (+8%)
Grade Level Data: Grade 4 ELA 2018 54% to 2019 75% (+21%)
Actions in this area: Utilizing the Teacher Toolbox on iReady, Professional Development focused on ELA instruction and assessment, more frequent progress monitoring of students' independent reading levels and writing abilities, data discussions and problem solving.

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

Level 1 on Statewide Assessment: 39 students
One or more Suspensions: 30
I am concerned that the 3rd grade students in this EWS data report are now sitting in 5th grade classrooms or are receiving some model of 5th grade instruction after having completed 3 quarters of the 2019 - 2020 school year in brick and mortar and one quarter through distance learning of some degree. These students will undergo a compromised first quarter of the school year and have their learning and growth measured by the state several weeks prior to completing the 4th quarter of their 5th grade year. The number of students in the 3rd grade that exhibit each early warning indicator is the greatest of all grade levels. See the indicators and the number of students in the third graded that exhibit the indicator.
Attendance below 90 percent - 8
One or more suspensions - 8
Course failure in ELA or Math 7
Level 1 on statewide assessment 4

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

1. African American Students learning Gains in Math and ELA
2. SWD learning Gains in Math and ELA
3. Science Proficiency
4. Number of Referrals
5. Student attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to the downward trend of scores for our students with disabilities in the area of ELA, our school has chosen to make this a critical area of focus. By doing so, our students with disabilities will begin to close the achievement gap and become more proficient in grade level standards.
Measureable Outcome:	For the 2020 - 2021 school year, at least 50% students in grades 4 and 5 will make a learning gain in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monique Keaton (monique.keaton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increased use of research-based programs such ans SIPPS and WILSON to target ELA skills. Increased use of the i-Ready ELA skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The programs match state, district, school, and clasroom needs while meeting the new ESSA evidence standards. The programs listed are effective.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Training and monitoring in the utilization of research based interventions and resources such as SIPPS,
i-Ready and WILSON.

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

ESE schedule that allows for spefic programs such as SIPSS and WILSON to be utilized with fidelity.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Ensuring students with IEP's are written to target specific skills and concepts in ELA that are critical to moving a student forward in his/her learning

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Training with district program specialist for ELA.

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

Monthly meetings including the LEA and ESE service providers for updates on scheduling, groups of students, fidelity of program usage, and proper use of paraprofessional assistance.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Intervention block built into the master schedule to give classroom teachers extra time to remediate/reteach key ELA skills.

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

Computer lab time built into the Resource wheel to allow for iReady ELA instruction and intervention.

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

Monthly meetings with grade-levels and the Leadership Team to discuss data, monitor student progress and determine next steps for instruction.

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

ESE schedule that allows for support facilitation

| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |

Training and support from district CAST and Interventionist

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Learning gains in the area of Math for our students with disabilities and students who are African American. Overall learning gains for African American Students has decreased from 43% (2018) to 30% (2019.)n the area of math. Overall learning gains for SWD has decreased from 43% (2018) 29% (2019) in the area of math. Due to the downward trend of scores for our students with disabilities in the area of Math, our school has chosen to make this a critical area of focus. By doing so, our students with disabilities and our African American students will begin to close the achievement gap and become more proficient in grade level standards.
Measureable Outcome:	For the 2020 - 2021 school year, at least 60% of students grades 4 and 5 will make a learning gain in Mathematics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monique Keaton (monique.keaton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increased use of research-based programs such as SIPPS, WILSON to target Math skills. Increased use of the i-Ready instrucitonal component (lessons passed, time on task) for Math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The programs match state, district, school and classroom needs while meeting the ESSA evidence standards. The programs listed are effective because they are research based.

Action Steps to Implement

Training and monitoring in the utilization of research based interventions and resources such as SIPPS, WILSON and i-Ready. The utilization of MDIS to diagnose specific mathematics deficits and intervene.

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

Intervention block built into the master schedule to give classroom teachers extra time to remediate/reteach key Math skills.

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

Computer Lab time built into the Resource wheel to allow for i-Ready Math instruction and intervention.

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

Ensuring RTI Plans are written, research based interventions are provided, and progress is monitored ofr students that do not have additional academic support through an IEP.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Ongoing Professional Development and follow-up with district program specialist in ELA, Math and Science.

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

Training and support from district level program interventionist and CAST specialist for Math.

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

Monthly meetings including the LEA and ESE service providers for updates on scheduling, groups of students, fidelity of program usage and proper use of paraprofessional assistance.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Decreased number of behavioral incidents, referrals and out of school suspensions. From August 10, 2018 - March 29, 2019, the number of behavior incidents in eSchoolPlus was 426 (an increase from 2017 - 2018 when 318 incidents were recorded. From August 10, 2018 to March 29, 2019, the number of Out of School Suspension (OSS) days in eSchoolPlus was 36 (an increase from 2017 - 2018 when 29 OSS days were recorded.)
Measureable Outcome:	Due to the implementation of PBIS and Conscious Discipline, the number of behavioral incidents, referrals and out of school suspensions will decrease by at least 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monique Keaton (monique.keaton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS and Conscious Discipline Behavior Interventionist on Staff
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Mason utilizes a PBIS framework and Conscious Discipline techniques and approaches to support students' behavior and development. Our approaches to discipline need to be more positive, proactive and preventative. Our approaches to discipline needs to be more positive, proactive and preventative. Our school-wide and classroom expectations are grounded in the acronym, L.E.A.D (Live Safely, Exhibit Kindness, Act Responsibly, Demonstrate Respect.) Our students will benefit from the Behavior Interventionist intervening with the staff first and helping them to understand how to make expectations clear, how to model expect ions, when to provide practice and feedback and how to reinforce positive behavior. The Behavior Interventionist will provide coaching/mentoring to teachers in the classroom in the areas of classroom management, social emotional learning, and positive behavior support. The Behavior Interventionist will meet with teachers monthly to review behavior data, problem solve, facilitate collaborative discussions on the grade-level so that teachers support each other.

Action Steps to Implement

PBIS/Conscious Discipline Training (June 2019, follow-up in January 2020) On-going

Person Responsible	Jenna Miller (jenna.miller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monthly meetings schedule with the grade-level, Behavior Interventionist and Administration.

Person Responsible	Jenna Miller (jenna.miller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Ongoing coaching and mentoring between Behavior Interventionist and selected classroom teachers.

Person Responsible	Jenna Miller (jenna.miller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Weekly problem-solving meetings with the MTSS Core Team (including a district mental health counselor and social worker.)

Person Responsible Jenna Miller (jenna.miller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Follow through with expectations of implementation and celebrating success (email reminders, weekly staff newsletters, keeping teachers and staff equipped with Manatee Money, managing students rewards in the Manatee Mall, recognition of students earning positive behavior referrals, LEADers with Character celebrations.)

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

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Overall learning gains for SWD has decreased from 43% (2018) 29% (2019) in the area of math. Due to the downward trend of scores for our students with disabilities in the area of Math, our school has chosen to make this a critical area of focus.
Measureable Outcome:	For the 2020 - 2021 school year, at least 50% of the Students with disabilities in grade 5 will make a learning gain in the area of ELA and Math
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monique Keaton (monique.keaton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increased use of research-based programs such ans SIPPS and WILSON to target ELA skills. The use of MDIS to specifically diagnose students gap standards and intervene accordingly. Increased use of the i-Ready ELA skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The programs match state, district, school, and classroom needs while meeting the new ESSA evidence standards. The programs listed are effective.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Training and monitoring in the utilization of research based interventions and resources such as SIPPS,
i-Ready and WILSON.

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

Intervention block built into the master schedule to give classroom teachers extra time to remediate/reteach key ELA and/or math skills.

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

Weekly/Monthly meetings with grade-levels and the Leadership Team to discuss data, monitor student progress and determine next steps for instruction.

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

ESE schedule that allows for specific programs such as SIPPS and WILSON to be utilized with fidelity,

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Ensuring students IEP's are written to target specific skills and concepts in ELA and Math that are critical to moving a student forward in his/her learning.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Monthly meetings including the LEA and ESE service providers for updates on scheduling, groups of students, fidelity of program usage and proper use of paraprofessional assistance.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Learning gains in the area of Math for our students with disabilities and students who are African American. Overall learning gains for African American Students has decreased from 43% (2018) to 30% (2019.)n the area of math.
Measureable Outcome:	For the 2020 - 2021 school year, at least 50% of African American Students will make learning gains in the area of Math and ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monique Keaton (monique.keaton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increased use of research-based programs such ans SIPPS and WILSON to target ELA skills. Increased use of the i-Ready ELA skills. The use of MDIS to specify student deficits and intervene accordingly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The programs match state, district, school and classroom needs while meeting the ESSA evidence standards. The programs listed are effective because they are research based.

Action Steps to Implement

Training and monitoring in the utilization of research based interventions and resources such as SIPPS,
i-Ready, MDIS and WILSON.

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

ESE schedule that allows for spefic programs such as SIPSS and WILSON to be utilized with fidelity.

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

Ensuring students with IEP's are written to target specific skills and concepts in ELA that are critical to moving a student forward in his/her learning

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Training with district program CAST specialist and interventionist for ELA and Math.

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

Ongoing Professional Development and follow-up with district program specialist in ELA, Math and Science.

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

Monthly meetings including the LEA and ESE service providers for updates on scheduling, groups of students, fidelity of program usage and proper use of paraprofessional assistance.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

At Otis A. Mason Elementary, there are several other areas that are priorities for school-wide improvement. This includes
a.) increasing rates of attendance
b.) increasing proficiency in Science
a.) The MTSS Core team and the Mason Admin. Team have "Attendance" as an agenda item of discussion each week. The school counselor, with the help of teachers, will be contracting families of students whole have frequent absences or tardies every Monday. The goal of the phone calls is to determine the reason for the absence, whether or not support is needed, (such as transportation to and from school, living arrangements, medical assistance,) offer support to the parent/guardian and encourage attendance at school. By being proactive, positive and making contact early in the year, we believe attendance rates will increase.
b.) Increasing proficiency in Science will be achieved through training and data discussion meetings with the district program specialist for science throughout the year, use of district curriculum maps, use of district formative assessments in science (5th Grade,) providing hands-on experiments and experiences for all students, and ensuring a science block is scheduled for every grade level. We will also have a school-wide STEM night to highlight science.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Parent and Family Engagement Plan
Parent/Teacher Conferences, Virtual
Manatee Memo, monthly newsletter
Positive School Culture through Manatee Memo : Monthly School Newsletter
At Mason Elementary we utilize our monthly newsletter, the Manatee Memo, to highlight and encourage our positive school culture. We use this platform to shine a spotlight on some of our outstanding student achievements for our parents and community to see. In the past they have included items such as our students winning Battle of the Books, our 4th grade class winning the Alligator Farm's Edu-Gator contest and our running club's participation and placement at a local 5K. During the Memo we also take the time to announce upcoming events and programs like our Trunk or Treat, Dad's and Donuts, Scholastic Bookfair Nights and

our chorus concerts. We like to showcase the St. Johns County Pillars of Character during each pillar's designated month. The Memo is also used to bring attention to different school procedures to help keep parents informed.

Curriculum Night, Virtual
Coordination with SNAP
Coordination with LFPBIS
Veteran's Day Celebration
Thanksgiving Celebration, if permitted
Food drives
Mason hosts a food and clothing pantry that receives donations from many individuals and organizations through the year and items are available at any time for a student or family in need. HUGS Across the County stocks our food pantry for families in need, individual snacks for students during the school day, and provides clothing within 24 hours for specific requests. Catholic Charities provides approximately 90 students with a Blessings in a Bag weekly food bag to take home for the weekend.
Community involvement for Thanksgiving and Christmas is quite extensive. In 2019 40 families received a Thanksgiving food basket and frozen turkey (provided by multiple churches, organizations, and school food drive) and 25 families received a pre-cooked family meal from Publix and United Way. Hugs Across the County also provided 90 "No Hungry Holidays" food bags for students over the winter break. At least 110 Mason students and siblings under the age of 18 received Christmas gifts and clothing based on specific wish list items. Those gifts were provided by Mason staff, families, civic organizations, businesses, and churches.

Clothing drives
STEM Fair Night
Night of the Arts
LEADers with Character Award Ceremonies (monthly)
PTO Events
Grade -Level events (Plays, Performances, Field Day)

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