

Walton County School District

Paxton School



2021-22 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 | 25 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 35 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 36 |

Paxton School

21893 US HIGHWAY 331 N, Paxton, FL 32538

<http://pax.walton.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Brent Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School PK-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 61% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (65%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Rachel Heide |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Walton County School Board on 10/5/2021.

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 | 25 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 36 |

Paxton School

21893 US HIGHWAY 331 N, Paxton, FL 32538

<http://pax.walton.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-12</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>52%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>11%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| Grade | B | B | B | B |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Walton County School Board on 10/5/2021.

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.

Paxton School enables student achievement with a dynamic faculty devoted to high academic standards and commitment to continuous improvement and success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Paxton Faculty and Staff will bring our BEST effort, attitude, and skillset to inspire, motivate, and educate every student to bring their best everyday to become life long learners and productive citizens in our society.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Cook, Jessica | Teacher, K-12 | SIT chair/ SAC chair |
| Jones, Brent | Principal | |
| Jackson, Mitch | Assistant Principal | |
| Thomas, Sasha | Paraprofessional | |
| Geoghagan, Jeff/Joy | SAC Member | |
| Brinson , Ligaya | SAC Member | |
| Taylor, Greg | SAC Member | |
| Taylor, Kim | SAC Member | |
| Daughtry , Donna | SAC Member | |
| Miller, Scott | SAC Member | |
| Cook, Addison | SAC Member | |
| Varnum, Cassie | SAC Member | |
| Thomas, John | SAC Member | |
| Sansom, Tillie | SAC Member | |
| Bradley, Jordyn | SAC Member | |
| Leddon , Faye | SAC Member | |
| McQuaiq, Liz | SAC Member | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Brent Jones

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.*

1

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

803

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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 | 59 | 53 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 53 | 65 | 60 | 66 | 49 | 51 | 76 | 47 | 780 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 15 | 13 | 24 | 141 |
| One or more suspensions | 13 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 11 | 14 | 9 | 10 | 33 | 16 | 2 | 4 | 129 |
| Course failure in ELA | 2 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 2 | 1 | 10 | 11 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 11 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 11 | 82 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 50 |

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 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 34 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/6/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 62 | 59 | 65 | 51 | 66 | 56 | 66 | 61 | 56 | 84 | 54 | 51 | 49 | 780 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 61 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 17 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 58 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 14 | 19 | 18 | 10 | 13 | 15 | 2 | 111 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 13 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 71 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 57 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

2020-21 - 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 | 62 | 59 | 65 | 51 | 66 | 56 | 66 | 61 | 56 | 84 | 54 | 51 | 49 | 780 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 61 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 17 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 58 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 14 | 19 | 18 | 10 | 13 | 15 | 2 | 111 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 13 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 71 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 57 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 56% | 70% | 61% | 57% | 70% | 60% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 50% | 60% | 59% | 46% | 59% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 41% | 53% | 54% | 36% | 51% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 68% | 74% | 62% | 65% | 74% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 57% | 65% | 59% | 47% | 63% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 45% | 59% | 52% | 48% | 59% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 66% | 70% | 56% | 66% | 73% | 57% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 74% | 85% | 78% | 72% | 83% | 77% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 66% | 7% | 58% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 64% | -10% | 58% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 65% | 64% | 1% | 56% | 9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 42% | 55% | -13% | 54% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -65% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 64% | -7% | 52% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -42% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 60% | -8% | 56% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -57% | | | | |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 64% | -10% | 55% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 59% | -15% | 53% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 90% | 65% | 25% | 62% | 28% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 65% | -10% | 64% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -90% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 55% | 9% | 60% | 4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -55% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 60% | -5% | 55% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -64% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 62% | -26% | 54% | -18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -55% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 63% | 6% | 46% | 23% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | -36% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 61% | -1% | 53% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 58% | -2% | 48% | 8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -60% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 79% | 79% | 0% | 67% | 12% |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 76% | 82% | -6% | 71% | 5% |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 70% | 77% | -7% | 70% | 0% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 86% | 72% | 14% | 61% | 25% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 62% | 72% | -10% | 57% | 5% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Grade 1st -11th - STAR reading assessment

Grade 1st - 8th - STAR math assessment

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 21% | 60% | 63% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16% | 59% | 61% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 50% | 50% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 38% | 72% | 65% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 31% | 71% | 67% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33% | 100% | 83% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 29% | 63% | 65% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 23% | 62% | 69% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33% | 100% | 83% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 50% | 50% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 34% | 55% | 49% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 22% | 44% | 39% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33% | 36% | 33% |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 43% | 61% | 57% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 33% | 52% | 50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11% | 36% | 33% |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 27% | 68% | 64% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 23% | 61% | 57% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25% | 50% | 63% |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 53% | 71% | 58% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 48% | 59% | 43% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 40% | 40% | 20% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 37% | 65% | 56% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 36% | 66% | 47% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20% | 60% | 40% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 47% | 62% | 54% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 48% | 59% | 43% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 22% | 22% | 22% |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 34% | 43% | 58% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 30% | 35% | 47% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 11% | 33% |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 47% | 55% | 55% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 39% | 46% | 47% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25% | 13% | 17% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 27% | 59% | 53% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 14% | 47% | 45% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25% | 42% | 8% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 63% | 52% | 53% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 56% | 44% | 50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13% | 0% | 9% |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 14% | 25% | 39% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16% | 25% | 40% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Civics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 43% | 37% | 43% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 36% | 19% | 26% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20% | 25% | 23% |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 28% | 39% | 47% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 29% | 43% | 45% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25% | 20% | 27% |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 50% | | 48% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 48% | | 48% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 47% | | 37% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43% | | 35% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33% | | 33% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | | 0% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0% | | 0% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0% | | 0% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | | 0% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 12 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 27 | 45 | 37 | 35 | 41 | 42 | 35 | 29 | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 40 | | 23 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 60 | | | 55 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 58 | 43 | 70 | 47 | 50 | 70 | 70 | 53 | 94 | 57 |

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| FRL | 56 | 53 | 46 | 63 | 45 | 51 | 61 | 67 | 36 | 92 | 50 |
| 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 | 26 | 35 | 30 | 39 | 48 | 45 | 35 | 36 | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 32 | 30 | 41 | 53 | 30 | 33 | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | 40 | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | 51 | 42 | 70 | 57 | 49 | 69 | 74 | 77 | 98 | 41 |
| FRL | 54 | 49 | 39 | 63 | 55 | 42 | 63 | 75 | 65 | 100 | 32 |
| 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 | 31 | 45 | 35 | 51 | 59 | 45 | 50 | 38 | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 50 | 50 | 25 | 41 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 18 | | 55 | 50 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 64 | 55 | | 38 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | 47 | 36 | 68 | 47 | 51 | 66 | 75 | 70 | 81 | 52 |
| FRL | 51 | 45 | 34 | 59 | 42 | 41 | 61 | 64 | 67 | 79 | 27 |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 61 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| 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 | 668 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 36 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |

| 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% | |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 29 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 58 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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 | 61 |
| 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 | 56 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Some trends we noticed when analyzing data, was that across grade levels and in core content areas students were reaching grade-level proficiency, but not making growth from the previous year. Subgroups were making improvements but still have not reached the 41% mark.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

According to data components and 2019 state assessments, our overall school ELA scores and growth percentiles are lower than district averages.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Some contributing factors could be the increased number of SWD grade levels, the increased rigor of ELA standards, and higher-level questioning on state assessments. As a school, we need to focus on asking higher-level questions to increase the rigor of classroom instruction and on assessments.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math Learning Gains showed the most improvement going from 47% in 2018 to 57% in 2019. The new actions the school took were: 4th/5th grade participated in Walk-to-Math lessons, daily spiral reviews, various computer programs, 6th -12th utilized interactive notebooks, math boot camps, and computer-aided instruction.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The new actions the school took were: 4th/5th grade participated in Walk-to-Math lessons, daily spiral reviews, various computer programs, 6th -12th utilized interactive notebooks, math boot camps, and computer-aided instruction.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We plan to continue the above actions along with increasing the rigor of higher-level questions in classroom instruction and assessments. We also plan to add achieve-level descriptors in daily lessons.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We will be providing professional development on the implementation of achieving level descriptors in daily classroom lessons. Also, we will provide professional development for writing to increase the level of rigor of higher-order thinking questions across content.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Teachers will participate in PLCs in content areas or grade levels that will focus on the implementations of achieving level descriptors in daily classroom lessons. These ALDs will allow students to take control of their learning and ensure they have met the learning target for the lessons.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>Math is a critical aspect of a student's education and is used in multiple everyday life settings. To be career and college ready by the time of graduation students need specific mathematical skills taught throughout different grades levels and courses.</p> <p>Currently, the following combined grade level sections have an average STAR Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for grades 1-3, grades 4-8, and Algebra 1/Geometry students. FSA achievement scores for ESSA-identified subgroup from the 2019 administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Grades 1-3 average SGP of 62% on STAR Math on AP3 2020-2021 school year. * Grades 4-8 average SGP of 61% on STAR Math on AP3 2020-2021 school year. * Grades 3-8, 41% of the ESSA-identified subgroup of Black students and 39% SWD scored proficiency on FSA. |
| Measurable Outcome: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Students in Math for grades 1-3 will increase overall STAR Assessment Student Growth Percentile average to 65%. * Students in Math for grades 4-8 will increase overall STAR Assessment Student Growth Percentile average to 65%. * Students in Math class Algebra and Geometry will increase overall STAR Assessment Student Growth Percentile average to 62%. * The achievement of the ESSA-identified subgroup of black students and SWD in grades 3-8 will increase to 41%. |
| Monitoring: | STAR math will be used to monitor student growth. STAR will be administered at least 3 times a year. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Math manipulatives daily</p> <p>Exit tickets to extend math instruction whole group</p> <p>Daily spiral reviews</p> <p>Computer programs</p> <p>Interactive Notebooks</p> <p>ALDs</p> <p>Afterschool Tutoring</p> <p>Formative Assessments during units of study</p> <p>Learning Targets</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Differentiating student instruction will increase mastery of standards-based math skills. Math manipulatives are physical objects that are designed to represent explicitly and concretely mathematical ideas that are abstract (Moyer, 2001). Bruner(1960) explained how this was possible through the concept of the spiral curriculum. This involved information being structured so those complex ideas can be taught at a simplified level first, and then revisited at more complex levels later. Learning targets and performance scales can help teachers develop more student-centered lessons, and students take ownership and learn how to monitor their progress toward a learning target (Creating Learning Targets & Performance Scales, 2018)</p> |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Through differentiating instruction, students in grades kindergarten through second grade will increase mastery of standards-based math skills.

- * Kindergarten teachers will incorporate math manipulatives daily during math lessons. (T1)
- * 1st-grade teachers will utilize exit tickets to extend math instruction whole group. (T1)
- * 1st & 2nd-grade students will complete daily spiral reviews. (T1)
- * 2nd-grade teachers will use various district-approved computer programs for instruction and remediation on specific skills. (T2, T3)

Person Responsible Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

2. Third - Sixth Grade teachers will increase the understanding of Florida Math Standards through critical thinking, problem-solving skills, and visual representations that are scaffolded throughout instruction.

- * 3rd-6th grade teachers will introduce, review, and reinforce standards with the use of interactive notebooks and learning targets. (T1)
- * 3rd-6th grade teachers will review grade-level standards by using utilizing spiral reviews that require higher-order thinking questioning and answering applications. (T1)
- * 3rd-6th grade teachers will use various district-approved computer programs for instruction and remediation on specific skills. (T2, T3)
- * 4th-6th grade students will participate in flexible tiered grouping. (T1, T2)

Person Responsible Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

3. Solving real-life mathematical problems will be a focus of 6th through twelfth grades through the use of district-provided resource materials and modeling with mathematics.

- * 6th-8th grade students will use interactive notebooks to reinforce state standards. (T1)
- * Computer-aided instruction will be utilized to reinforce math concepts in grades 9-12. (T2, T3)
- * 9-12th grade students will use exit tickets to demonstrate mastery of learning targets/standards.

Person Responsible Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

4. Formative assessment will be used during units of study to address gaps in students' educational backgrounds. Also, implementation of achievement level descriptors to allow students to take ownership and monitor their learning.

- * Kindergarten through 12th-grade teachers will implement the use of formative assessments to identify areas of weakness and strengths in students' educational backgrounds.
- * Kindergarten through 12th-grade teachers will implement the use of ALDs in lessons.

Person Responsible Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>Reading and writing is a critical aspect of a student's education and used in multiple everyday life settings. To be career and college ready by the time of graduation students need specific reading and writing skills taught throughout different grades levels and courses. Currently, the following combined grade level sections have an average STAR Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for grades K-3 and grades 4-8. FSA achievement scores for ESSA-identified subgroup from 2019 administration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Grades K-3 average SGP of 61% on STAR Reading and STAR Early Literacy on AP3 2020-2021 school year. * Grades 4-8 average SGP of 58% on STAR Reading on AP3 2020-2021 school year. * Grades 3-8, 30% of the ESSA-identified subgroup of Black students and 26% SWD scored proficiency FSA |
| Measurable Outcome: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Students in Reading for grades K-3 will increase overall STAR Assessment Student Growth Percentile average to 65%. * Students in Reading for grades 4-8 will increase overall STAR Assessment Student Growth Percentile average to 65%. * The achievement of the ESSA-identified subgroup of black students and SWD in grades 3-8 will increase to 41%. |
| Monitoring: | STAR reading will be used for progress monitoring in all grade levels. STAR Reading will be administered at least 3 times a year. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Complex text(s) Read alouds AVID strategies Intentional Questioning and answering Vertical plan from grade level to grade level for writing instruction Formative Assessments Learning Targets ALDs</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | The underachieving students seem to be growing rapidly and with the number of students per elective class limited, the only way to effectively help all students is to utilize the AVID strategies throughout the school (Watt, Yanez, & Cossio, 2002). Reading standards require that teachers teach close reading of the complex text with intentional questioning. Learning targets and performance scales can help teachers develop more student-centered lessons, and students take ownership and learn how to monitor their progress toward a learning target (Creating Learning Targets & Performance Scales, 2018) |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Paxton School will take specific action to ensure the implementation of literacy skills school-wide in all tiers through research-based strategies that are in alignment with the Florida Standards in 6-12 and BEST standards in K-5 to increase reading comprehension.

* To increase literacy skills across all grade levels, the teacher will (daily) use grade level, complex text(s) through read-aloud, close and careful reading, choral reading, incorporating intentional questioning and answering. Students will read complex text daily across all disciplines. (T1)

* Strategies will be differentiated to guide students through increasingly complex levels of text(s). (T2, T3)

* Students will use computer-based programs, including but not limited to Common Lit, to increase complex text reading level (T1, T2))

Person Responsible Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

2. Student responses in the form of writing will be facilitated through a formalized approach to vertical planning across all grade levels.

* Grade level cohorts (grade K-10) will create a standards-based vertical plan to writing that includes strategies with examples, implementation ideas, and a progress monitoring system from grade level to grade level. (T1)

* Monthly/ Weekly school-wide writing initiative will focus on key writing/grammar aspects. Students will participate in all subjects K-12 to ensure that writing is cross-curricular.

Person Responsible Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

3. Formative assessment will be used during units of study to address gaps in students' educational backgrounds. Also, implementation of achievement level descriptors to allow students to take ownership and monitor their learning.

* Kindergarten through 12th-grade teachers will implement the use of formative assessments to identify areas of weakness and strengths in students' educational backgrounds.

* Kindergarten through 12th-grade teachers will implement the use of ALDs in lessons.

Person Responsible Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Science is a critical aspect of a student's education and is used in multiple everyday life settings. To be career and college ready by the time of graduation students need specific science skills taught throughout different grades levels and courses. Currently, the following combined grade level sections have an average proficiency achievement score for grades 5, 8, and Biology from the 2021 administration state science assessment. State science assessment achievement scores for ESSA-identified subgroup from 2019 administration.

* Grades 5, 8, and Biology average 65% proficiency on state science assessment on 2021 administration.

* Grades 5, 8, and Biology, 33% of the ESSA-identified subgroup of Black students and 35% SWD scored proficiency 2019 state science assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

*Grade 5, 8, and Biology students taking the state science assessment will increase to 69% proficiency.

* Grades 5, 8, and Biology students identified in black subgroup will increase to 41% proficiency and SWD will increase to 41% proficiency.

Monitoring:

District assessments will be used to progress monitor students in 5th, 8th and Biology.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Interactive Notebooks
Scholastic Magazines
Pacing Guides
Data Analysis practice
Small group and one-on-one instruction
Learning Targets
ALDs

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Interactive notebooks are one tool for students to keep their information and produced work organized (Walden & Crippen, 2009) It would also allow them to refer back to the contents and engage with new information, and process it more thoroughly(Rheingold et al., 2013) Student will also need to read complex scientific texts through close and careful reading. Learning targets and performance scales can help teachers develop more student-centered lessons, and students take ownership and learn how to monitor their progress toward a learning target (Creating Learning Targets & Performance Scales, 2018)

Action Steps to Implement

1.Students will improve reading and writing skills in science content areas through exposure to a variety of informational sources and utilization of differentiated strategies.

* Kindergarten and 1st-grade students will utilize an interactive notebook/journal with science-related topics to demonstrate understanding of non-fiction texts by using Science Spin/ Scholastic News and other science non-fiction text.

* 2nd and 3rd-grade students will use INB/journals to write in response to science-related texts.

* Kindergarten through 12th-grade teachers will implement the use of formative assessments to identify areas of weakness and strengths in students' educational backgrounds.

*K-12th grade teachers will use ALDs in science lessons.

Person Responsible Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

2. Students will improve science content knowledge and understanding through a variety of educational techniques.

- * 4th and 5th-grade students may participate in grade-level science fairs.
- * 5th-grade students will utilize high-interest nonfiction science texts to remediate specific cross-curricular reading skills.
- * 6th -12th-grade students will utilize INB to organize notes and record new learning gained from various sources (such as experimentation, lecture, video, written text)
- * 6th -12th-grade students will be provided additional support in maintaining their interactive notebooks.
- * 9th -10th-grade students will participate in data analysis practice related to each unit of study throughout their science course. Students will receive peer and teacher support during the practice of data analysis through small group and one-on-one instruction.

Person Responsible Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Teachers need to stay up to date with new strategies, reinforce best teaching practices, and continue content area learning. Students will always learn better from highly qualified and enthusiastic teachers. As a result of these principals, one area of focus will be professional learning communities. |
| Measurable Outcome: | During the 2021-2022 school year, 60% of teachers will participate in PLC at Paxton School, enroll in a component on ePDC, and complete the follow-up required to earn professional development points. |
| Monitoring: | PLC participate through out the year will be used to monitor. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Professional Learning Community participation |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Participation in professional learning communities is an evidence-based strategy that has been shown to improve student performance through continuous teacher collaboration. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. All teachers will participate in a PLC that is connected to the school improvement plan. K-1 teachers will participate in SONDAY system PLC. 2-12 ELA teachers will participate in Writing Revolution.
2. PLC facilitators will request a written component for their specific PLC.
3. Professional Learning facilitators will write a component for each requested PLC.

Person Responsible Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement**Area of****Focus**

Parent Involvement in their child's education is a vital part of the success of our students and school. Students' learning is increased when parents are involved. We had 62% parental involvement during the 2020-2021 school year.

Description and**Rationale:****Measurable****Outcome:**

Parental involvement will increase by 13% to make our goal for Paxton School parental involvement 75% for the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring:

We will use different parent involvement opportunities throughout the year to monitor parent involvement. Opportunities like orientation, open house, parent conference, etc...

Person**responsible****for****monitoring****outcome:**

Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-**based****Strategy:**

Paxton School believes parent involvement is a vital link to our student's success. We wish to involve parents in the academic and non-academic aspects of the learning process. Sign-in sheets for parent involvement activities for grades K-12 as well as parent participation in the school climate surveys will be used in determining the level of parental involvement.

Rationale**for****Evidence-****based****Strategy:**

Regardless of family income or background, students whose parents are involved in their schooling are more likely to have higher grades and test scores, attend school regularly, have better social skills, show improved behavior, and adapt well to school. (Henderson, A.T., and K.L Mapp)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Parents, students, and teachers will incorporate communication folders, student planners, or apps for teacher-parent communication.

* Pre-Kindergarten - 3rd Grade students will utilize a communication folder that includes classroom newsletters, teacher notes, parent informational letters, school calendars, lunch menus, graded papers, etc.

*5th-8th grades will utilize planners for all students for daily or weekly communication with parents.

* 3rd-grade teachers will conduct a meeting with parents to communicate 3rd-grade expectations and to prompt parental support for student success.

*A parent meeting will be conducted with parents of 11th and 12th-grade students to communicate graduation requirements along with all options to meet those graduation requirement.

Person**Responsible**

Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

Paxton School will implement a variety of parent involvement opportunities to encourage connections between parents, students, faculty, and staff.

*AP teachers will have a mandatory parent meeting.

*Science Department will host a Science Night for grades K-12 to explore scientific investigations.

*K-12 students, parents, and community members will be invited to a high school concert.

* 7th-grade parents of students placed in Algebra 1 will meet with teachers to prompt parental support.

*Paxton school will conduct senior parent meetings, an open house for all students, and orientations.

*The parental involvement team will create a survey to evaluate parental involvement activities and get input for suggested activities from parents.

Person**Responsible**

Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student behavior is always a vital aspect of any school. The way students act can increase or decrease the learning process of their learning and those around them. As a result of this, we are focusing on the climate/mental health of our student population to improve behavior. As of 2020-2021 school, we had a total of 168 referrals, which is 22% of the student population.

Measurable Outcome: Referrals for grades K-12 will be no more than 30% of the student enrollment.

Monitoring: The number of referrals at the end of each 9 weeks will be used to monitor referral rates throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Positive Behavior Support
Quarterly meeting
Suite 360
Capturing kids hearts

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Positive behavior support is a community-based approach that involves learning more about the environment in which a child or adult lives, and working collaboratively with everyone in that setting to design strategies for promoting positive social and communication skills. Preventing problem behavior becomes the focus of planning for larger groups so that all children and adults within a setting are interacting in positive and meaningful ways. (Association for Positive Behavior Support, 2021)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Paxton School will utilize positive behavior support strategies to promote positive character traits in our (K-12) students to see a reduction in behavioral referrals.
 - * Grades K-5 will participate in a PBS program to promote positive character traits.
 - * Grades 6-12 will participate in a quarterly meeting with the principal to review behavioral expectations, positive character traits, and referral data.
 - * Grades K-12 will participate in the character education program "Suite 360" to empower students to build positive relationships.
 - * Grades 6-12 students will participate quarterly in a reward program to decrease the number of referrals per grade level.
 - * Student of the Month for elementary, middle, and high will be recognized on the morning show and awarded medals.

Person Responsible Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

#7. Other specifically relating to AVID**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

To be career and college-ready, students need unique skills in this day and time. These skills can be taught through the AVID program. This program will allow students to use a more student-centered approach to learning and prepare students for a career, college, and life after school. Students' progression of AVID strategies through multiple grade levels in support of all academic areas and will help increase the school's graduation rate.

Measurable Outcome:

Students in each grade level will be taught specific AVID strategies that will advance with them throughout their academic careers and increase the graduation rate. The graduation rate for the 2020-2021 school year is 95%.

Monitoring:

Teachers will provide student artifacts of AVID strategies at the end of every 9 weeks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Interactive Notebooks or 2-Column Notes
One-Pagers
Focused Notes
Socratic Seminar
Planners
Tutorials

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The underachieving students seem to be growing rapidly and with the number of students per elective class limited, the only way to effectively help all students is to utilize the AVID strategies throughout the school (Watt, Yanes, & Cossio, 2002).

Action Steps to Implement

Vertical alignment of AVID strategies will be implemented in grades K-12. Multiple grade level teachers and subject areas will be involved. The Paxton AVID School Coordinator will facilitate professional development as needed for strategies.

* K-2nd grade students will utilize Interactive Notebooks or 2 Column Notes

* 3rd Grade students will utilize the one-pager strategy

* 4th Grade students will utilize the focused note-taking strategy

* 5th Grade students will utilize Socratic Seminars, One-Pager, Planners, and Focused Note-Taking Strategies

* 6th Grade students will utilize tutorial, Socratic Seminars, One-Pager, Planners, and Focused Note-Taking Strategies

*6th -12th AVID Students will complete a Tutorial request form weekly

7th -12th students will utilize all previously taught strategies in grades 3-6

6th-12th AVID students will use AVID weekly for critical reading in content areas

Person Responsible

Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to SafeschoolsforAlex.org, Paxton is considered a combination school that ranked #207 out of 313 combination schools statewide. There is an average of 1.5 incidents per 100 students, which is less than the statewide combination school rate of 1.6 incidents per 100 students. Paxton has a moderate rating for violent incidents, a very low rating for property incidents, and a very high ranking for drug/public order incidents. Also, the suspension ratings are above the statewide rate at 9.4 suspensions per 100 students. After analyzing the data, we would like to monitor our drug/ public order incidents through the school culture and environment strategies.

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.

At Paxton, we "Bring Our Best" in everything we do, from the classroom to the court and everywhere in between. Our school and the surrounding community have become an extended family, and it shows in our school culture and environment. We are always reaching out to the community to consult on various aspects of the school, speak with students about exciting career opportunities, and leading community support when needed. We have also created a School Advisory Council compiled of administration, instruction, and non-instructional personal, students, parents, and business leaders in our community. This advisory council provides guides on the vision and direction of our school. One last aspect is that our school employees are an open door policy. Our administration and teachers are always available to help if problems arise, but also available to support and encourage a positive school culture.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our most important stakeholders are the students. They also have the most important role in promoting a positive culture and environment. Teachers and faculty will promote a positive school culture, but the students will be the ones to create the culture in the hallways, lunchroom, and outside of school grounds. Teachers and faculty will need to implement and provide a safe learning community that includes parents,

students, and community members. Parents and community members are also stakeholders that can promote a positive culture.

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | | | | \$0.00 |
|--|----------|--|----------------------|--------------------------|-----|-------------------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$1,448.99 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | | 0101 - Paxton School | School Improvement Funds | | \$597.00 |
| <i>Notes: Hear builder (k)</i> | | | | | | |
| | | | 0101 - Paxton School | School Improvement Funds | | \$190.00 |
| <i>Notes: History/Intensive Reading</i> | | | | | | |
| | | | 0101 - Paxton School | School Improvement Funds | | \$661.99 |
| <i>Notes: Complex Reading texts</i> | | | | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | | | | \$250.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | | 0101 - Paxton School | School Improvement Funds | | \$50.00 |
| <i>Notes: Science Fair medals (4th /5th grade)</i> | | | | | | |
| | | | 0101 - Paxton School | School Improvement Funds | | \$200.00 |
| <i>Notes: Science Night Supplies</i> | | | | | | |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities | | | | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement | | | | \$1,832.01 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | | 0101 - Paxton School | School Improvement Funds | | \$607.00 |
| <i>Notes: Communication Folders (PK - 3)</i> | | | | | | |
| | | | 0101 - Paxton School | School Improvement Funds | | \$1,225.01 |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--|
| | | | | | | <i>Notes: Planners for 5-8th grade</i> |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: School Safety | | | | \$100.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | | 0101 - Paxton School | School Improvement Funds | | \$100.00 |
| | | | | | | <i>Notes: Student of the Month medals</i> |
| 7 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: AVID | | | | \$4,109.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | | | 0101 - Paxton School | School Improvement Funds | | \$3,809.00 |
| | | | | | | <i>Notes: AVID Certification</i> |
| | | | 0101 - Paxton School | School Improvement Funds | | \$300.00 |
| | | | | | | <i>Notes: Paper for each AVID teacher to copy AVID materials, expo markers, and chart paper.</i> |
| | | | | | Total: | \$7,740.00 |