Tynes Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Tynes Elementary School

1550 TYNES BLVD, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://tes.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Brennan   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-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	46%
2019-20 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%)
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

Tynes Elementary School

1550 TYNES BLVD, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://tes.oneclay.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	39%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	32%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	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, all 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brennan, Sarah	Principal	Engages all stakeholders, and collaborates in all school decision making processes.
Bright, Steven	Assistant Principal	
Crosby, Cassie	Teacher, K-12	
Donaghy, Leeanne	Administrative Support	
Hall, Julie	Teacher, K-12	
Hendricks, Lindsay	Teacher, K-12	
Mayfield, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Ziegler, Sabre	Teacher, K-12	
Race, Pamela	Teacher, K-12	
Brown, Darin	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Sarah Brennan

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	46%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	139	154	115	128	137	119	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	942
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	1	3	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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

Sunday 9/27/2020

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	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	

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	

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	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	

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	

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	
	(0)	(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	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%				
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				
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							

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
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	75
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	100
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
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.

Lower quartile learning gains in ELA and math continue to be the lowest areas of performance. Although those data showed increases of 5 and 4 points respectively, those continue to be the lowest performers. Despite monitoring of BQ students in reading and math, there is a need for more granular data analysis and small group instruction to address learning gaps.

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

Only overall ELA proficiency showed a decline from 70% to 69%. The one point decrease may be attributed to a large influx of new students to the school. Approximately 33% of the students at Tynes are new within the last school year. Tynes has a large (20-25%) percentage of military students which affects the mobility rate.

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 Tynes and the state average is in science. The state proficiency rate in science is 53%, while Tynes' proficiency is 75%. This positive gap is likely due to increased focus on science standards in 3rd and 4th grades, as well as the curriculum support by our STEM/science resource teacher.

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

The most improvement was in mathematics, with a 9 point increase in learning gains. Tynes has continued to roll out the implementation of Eureka math as core curriculum, adding one grade level each year. Focus for 18-19 was on small group instruction in math.

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

Level 1 performance on state assessments in reading and math
Attendance

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. Bottom quartile learning gains in ELA
3. SEL

4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Overall proficiency in ELA will positively impact students' performance across the content area. From 2017-18 overall ELA proficiency increase from 65%-70%, but then declined in 2019 to 69%, which is just above the district average of 65%.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020-21 school year, 71% of students at Tynes Elementary will make gains in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Brennan (sarah.brennan@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers in grades 2-6 will implement the LAFS curriculum as their core curriculum for daily instruction. In addition, teachers in those grade levels will use diagnostic data and ongoing progress monitoring to form flexible small groups to target standards showing the need for remediation using i-Ready Toolbox.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	LAFS is an adopted and aligned grade level appropriate curriculum that exposes students to rigorous texts and tasks. It also provides scaffolded instruction to students across the week using modeling, guided instruction, and independent practice. Ready-LAFS will also be used in small group to ensure alignment with grade level standards while providing remediation and/or enrichment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers new to LAFS will receive professional development and all teachers will receive ongoing support for implementation.
2. Through their weekly PLC work teachers will use district curriculum maps and resources to guide their instructional planning.
3. Teachers will independently and collaboratively analyze weekly independent practice to identify and standards which need remediation.
4. Teachers will use the independent practice data, along with diagnostic data and progress monitoring, to identify any students who need to receive MTSS in reading.

Person Responsible Sarah Brennan (sarah.brennan@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students at Tynes Elementary in the Bottom Quartile have made gains in reading, but there is still a gap between learning gains of the BQ at Tynes versus the district and state averages. In 2019 51% of students in the BQ at Tynes made ELA gains as compared to the district 54% and the state 53%.
Measurable Outcome:	This year 55% of students in the Bottom Quartile will make gains in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Brennan (sarah.brennan@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize standards, based differentiated small group instruction using research based strategies and materials for remediation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers use research based strategies in a small group setting to address areas of need, students will receive additional targeted instruction in reading to help them make learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Leadership team will identify the students in the lowest 25% in ELA.
2. Teachers will identify the gains needed to show an increase in proficiency on FSA.
3. Teachers will participate in professional development on targeted, small group instruction to address standards needing remediation.
4. Teachers will meet weekly in grade level PLC groups to analyze data and plan next steps for the students in the BQ in reading.
5. Administrators will monitor the progress of the students in the BQ and support students through data chats and teachers through quarterly data meetings to discuss the students' progress.

Person Responsible Sarah Brennan (sarah.brennan@myoneclay.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students' social and emotional health is essential to their ability to learn. According to 2018-19 data on the Clay Bus, students at TES demonstrated difficulty with self-regulation. If students are better able to identify and control their emotions, this will positively impact their readiness in the classroom.
Measurable Outcome:	During 2020-21 the percentage of students who can positively regulate their emotions as measured by the Clay Bus and survey will increase by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Steven Bright (steven.bright@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will enter year two of implementation of the 7 Mindsets curriculum. 7 Mindsets is a research based SEL program that has been designed to promote self-awareness and responsible decision making in students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	School wide implementation of the 7 Mindsets will provide a common language and schoolwide norms for social emotional learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PBIS team will meet monthly to help integrate the 7 Mindsets material across all grade levels.
2. All students grades K-6 will attend SEL resource twice per rotation, where the 7 Mindsets lessons will be taught with fidelity.
3. Administrators and guidance counselors will support students who receive office referrals by using 7 Mindsets language and strategies.
4. Our Military Family Life Counselor will support implementation of 7 Mindsets through this year's Anchored for Life project in which the student members will create videos for their peers around the 7 Mindsets.
5. Administrators will use informal walk-throughs to gather evidence of implementation of the 7 Mindsets.

Person Responsible	Steven Bright (steven.bright@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Bottom Quartile Math Gains
Teachers will identify the lowest 25% as measured by FSA testing. Teachers will provide daily standards-based instruction and form differentiated small groups based on ongoing formative assessment data. Teachers will analyze data and plan remediation in PLCs with support of administrators and district math specialists. MAFS which is a research based curriculum will be used for small group instruction.

Attendance
Tynes will continue to have an attendance intervention team which will be comprised of Principal, AP, Guidance, and School Social Worker. Monthly meetings will be held to review attendance data and address any students whose attendance is below 85%. The goal of the meetings is to both monitor trends and partner with families who need support ensuring that their student(s) attend(s) school regularly.

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.

Tynes Elementary values a positive school culture and environment. The faculty and staff at Tynes work to build positive relationships with families by communicating mission and vision and keeping families updated on school initiatives via weekly newsletter and social media. Teachers communicate with families to keep them informed of their progress - both academic and social emotional. FOCUS parent portal registration is encouraged for all families so that parents and guardians can monitor their students' completion and mastery of assignments. Schoolwide implementation of PBIS initiatives is communicated with all stakeholders. These include positive behavior referrals for students showing Tynes Tiger P.R.I.D.E. (positivity, respect, integrity, determination, and effort); Positive Paws incentives in the cafeteria for classroom behavior; implementation of 7 Mindsets curriculum schoolwide K-6. SAC focuses on school improvement and includes parent representation.

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**