

Clay County Schools

Tynes Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Tynes Elementary School

1550 TYNES BLVD, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://tes.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Brennan

Start Date for this Principal: 12/1/2011

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	46%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Tynes Elementary School

1550 TYNES BLVD, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://tes.oneclay.net>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">47%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">31%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Tynes Elementary School in partnership with its children, families, and community will provide a superior education by providing quality instruction in a safe and orderly environment. Through their education at school, students will gain the skills, strategies, and desire necessary for continued learning. They will also develop a strong sense of responsibility for themselves, their community, and each other. Our hope is to foster life-long learners and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Tynes Elementary School wants to maintain its A school status while developing the whole student in areas of academics and social, emotional learning.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fogarty, Laura	Principal	Engages all stakeholders, and collaborates in all school decision making processes.
Bright, Steven	Assistant Principal	
Crosby, Cassie	Teacher, K-12	
Donaghy, Leanne	Administrative Support	
Hall, Julie	SAC Member	SAC Chair
Hendricks, Lindsay	SAC Member	SAC Co-Chair
Mayfield, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Stewart, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	
Stokes, Lori	Teacher, K-12	
Ziegler, Sabre	Teacher, K-12	
Powers, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	
MacPherson, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	
Race, Pamela	Teacher, K-12	
Parenteau, Megan	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Darin	Teacher, K-12	
Warren, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Cambron, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	

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	158	124	138	146	129	166	151	0	0	0	0	0	0	1012
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	9	26	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

56

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/13/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
Attendance below 90 percent															
One or more suspensions															
Course failure in ELA or Math															
Level 1 on statewide assessment															

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
Students with two or more indicators															

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	10	18	11	19	14	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	4	6	0	1	5	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	69%	65%	57%	65%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	62%	58%	57%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	54%	53%	43%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	76%	70%	63%	63%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	66%	62%	56%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	56%	51%	46%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	65%	53%	50%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	158 (0)	124 (0)	138 (0)	146 (0)	129 (0)	166 (0)	151 (0)	1012 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)	26 (0)	38 (0)	73 (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.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	75%	68%	7%	58%	17%
	2018	80%	68%	12%	57%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	64%	7%	58%	13%
	2018	67%	62%	5%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	63%	62%	1%	56%	7%
	2018	56%	59%	-3%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2019	59%	64%	-5%	54%	5%
	2018	70%	63%	7%	52%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	71%	11%	62%	20%
	2018	81%	70%	11%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	69%	4%	64%	9%
	2018	72%	66%	6%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	62%	64%	-2%	60%	2%
	2018	61%	65%	-4%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
06	2019	81%	70%	11%	55%	26%
	2018	51%	68%	-17%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		30%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	73%	63%	10%	53%	20%
	2018	69%	64%	5%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	39	32	33	54	46	41	48				
ELL	67	83		75	75						
ASN	100			100							
BLK	57	50	36	69	57	41	52				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	65	71	57	73	62	56	87				
MUL	79	67		91	79						
WHT	70	61	50	76	64	52	77				
FRL	59	60	50	70	63	52	68				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	45	48	40	50	56	46	58				
ELL	60			67							
ASN	91			100							
BLK	58	45	28	53	40	32	50				
HSP	60	59	56	52	67	56	53				
MUL	74	63		78	76						
WHT	72	63	49	71	55	50	76				
FRL	65	61	48	61	54	44	68				
2017 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	32	40	38	34	44	37	25				
BLK	51	49	37	55	61	60	29				
HSP	59	57	36	50	46	37	37				
MUL	73	50		55	53						
WHT	68	58	45	67	55	44	56				
FRL	58	51	39	57	55	39	41				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	75
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	100
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	79
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The lowest performance factor at Tynes Elementary is our lower quartile for ELA and Math. While each section showed an increase of 5 and 4 points, both sections continue to be our lowest performers. The increase in scores are direct results to a focus on small group instruction.

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

The only data point that showed a decline was overall ELA proficiency 70% to 69%. The one point decrease can be contributed to influx of students new to Tynes. Approximately, 33% of students were new to Tynes Elementary within the last year.

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.

The biggest gap between the state and Tynes Elementary is in the area of Science. The state proficiency rate is 53% and Tynes proficiency rate is 75%. This gap is attributed to Tynes having a Science teacher on our resource wheel and a heightened focus on standards in third and fourth grade.

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

Math showed the greatest gains with a 9 point increase. Tynes focussed on increasing student math skills through small group instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Potential area of concerns would be proficiency in classroom grades for ELA.

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

1. ELA
2. Reading
3. SEL
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Social Emotional Learning (SEL)
Rationale	By increasing student awareness of social and emotional learning, we hope to improve student mental health, including overall increased happiness in the learning environment.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If students engage in SEL, then the whole student will be healthy and we will see less indicators on the Clay BUS, and there will be positive improvements on student feedback survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	Using the 7-Mindsets Program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Implementing the 7-Mindsets Program
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SEL Resource Class- Students will go to an SEL class twice during a resource rotation, where the 7-Mindsets will be taught with fidelity. 2. OneClay Portal- All teachers have access to the 7-Mindsets Curriculum for use in the classroom. 3. Tiger Club 4. Buddy bench 5. Military counselor 6. Parent and stakeholder community involvement.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2	
Title	ELA
Rationale	On the 2018-2019 Florida Standards Assessment our students were at 69% proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we focus on increasing our students understanding in the area of ELA using data driven instruction, then we will raise student achievement for all, including our LQ students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laura Fogarty (laura.fogarty@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence of grade appropriate assignments will be reflected in an increase in iReady scores in K-3, and an increase in Achieve Level Sets in grades 3-6.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase student vocabulary in all content areas. 2. Use i-Ready Reading online diagnostics to drive small group instruction. 3. Use Achieve diagnostics and articles to drive instruction to increase reading comprehension and vocabulary. 4. Use LAFS to drive instruction. 5.
Person Responsible	Laura Fogarty (laura.fogarty@myoneclay.net)

#3	
Title	Math
Rationale	On the 2018-2019 Florida Standards Assessment 76% of our students were proficient.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we focus on increasing our students understanding in the area of mathematics using data driven instruction, then we will raise student achievement for all, including our LQ students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laura Fogarty (laura.fogarty@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence of grade appropriate assignments will be reflected in an increase in iReady scores.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use data to drive small group instruction. 2. Teams will collaborate to plan engaging lessons specific to struggling students. 3. i-Ready Instruction, Go-Math, and Eureka curriculum will be utilized with fidelity. 4. Tutoring will be available at times throughout the school year. 5. Use MAFS to drive instruction.
Person Responsible	Laura Fogarty (laura.fogarty@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).