

Clay County Schools

Tynes Elementary 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 | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 46% |
| 2020-21 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%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| 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 is pending approval by the Clay County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

| Table of Contents | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Tynes Elementary School

1550 TYNES BLVD, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://tes.oneclay.net>

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-6 | No | 34% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 35% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | A | A | 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 | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| Brennan, Sarah | Principal | Responsible for all leadership activities and the vision for the school. Responsible for maintaining a school that has a safe and caring environment as well as quality instruction. Administers balanced budget, promotes a positive work environment, and involves community stakeholders and parents. |
| Bright, Steven | Assistant Principal | |
| Christopher, Nakia | Assistant Principal | |
| Cambron, Michelle | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Gilpin, Terri | 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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

75

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,017

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

4

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

4

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 | 154 | 147 | 156 | 120 | 132 | 139 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 982 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 28 | 27 | 28 | 31 | 29 | 28 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 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 FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/28/2021

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 | 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 | |

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 | 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 | |

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 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | | | | 69% | 65% | 57% | 70% | 63% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 61% | 62% | 58% | 60% | 59% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 51% | 54% | 53% | 46% | 50% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 76% | 70% | 63% | 67% | 69% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 64% | 66% | 62% | 56% | 68% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 51% | 56% | 51% | 47% | 56% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 75% | 65% | 53% | 71% | 66% | 55% |

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 | 75% | 68% | 7% | 58% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 71% | 64% | 7% | 58% | 13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -75% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 62% | 1% | 56% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -71% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 64% | -5% | 54% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -63% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 82% | 71% | 11% | 62% | 20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 69% | 4% | 64% | 9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -82% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 64% | -2% | 60% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 81% | 70% | 11% | 55% | 26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 63% | 10% | 53% | 20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready - Reading and Math
Performance Matters- Science

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 28/19% | 51/33% | 77/48% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/8% | 7/20% | 13/35% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 18/12% | 57/37% | 89/56% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/8% | 9/25% | 13/35% |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 24/22% | 69/61% | 89/79% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1/3% | 14/39% | 21/58% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 13/12% | 58/52% | 79/69% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/6% | 13/36% | 20/56% |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 57/44% | 88/66% | 100/73% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/10% | 11/37% | 20/64% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 1/50% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 20/15% | 68/50% | 89/65% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2/7% | 8/26% | 13/42% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 1/50% |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 54/41% | 71/52% | 78/56% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/12% | 7/22% | 7/22% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 37/27% | 75/55% | 101/73% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/9% | 10/32% | 11/35% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |

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 | 28 | 42 | 52 | 41 | 40 | 29 | 44 | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | 50 | 45 | 49 | 54 | 33 | 41 | | | | |
| HSP | 73 | 75 | | 69 | 67 | | 86 | | | | |
| MUL | 69 | 47 | | 64 | 60 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 63 | 57 | 41 | 69 | 64 | 45 | 74 | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 51 | 53 | 60 | 61 | 50 | 60 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |

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 | 59 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 412 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 39 |
| 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 | 46 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 74 |
| 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 | 60 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 59 |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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?

Our math proficiency and learning gains was at or above district and state levels at all grade levels except 5th.

Our bottom 25% learning gains was 100% at 4th grade and 66% at 6th grade, but only 13% at 5th grade.

Our ELA proficiency was above state average but below district average. Our ELA learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains were lowest in 5th grade.

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

The 5th grade cohort who is now in 6th grade demonstrated limited proficiency and growth in both ELA and math.

ELA learning gains and lower quartile gains will be an area of focus for Tynes Elementary this year

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

This cohort of students began the year with long term substitutes in two tested areas. Due to COVID 19, we had a very high number of 5th graders who elected to begin their year online. Although our online learners had the same teachers and curriculum, they did not get to benefit from the same instructional practices including targeted small group instruction.

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

6th grade ELA and Math and 5th grade science were areas to celebrate

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

5th grade science - detailed data analysis with focus on priority standards and collaborative planning
6th grade ELA and math - outstanding support by the ESE inclusion teacher and again teaching the standards with a focus on ongoing formative assessment to identify areas of need vs opportunities for acceleration

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

PLC work across the campus is more structured and formalized
More frequent and robust progress monitoring
Implementation of the BEST standards in ELA and new curriculum, as well as new Tier 2 and 3 supports that are evidence based

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.

Leadership Academy for PLC work
BEST Standards, Lexia, and SAVVAS training for ELA and Sci/SS teachers

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

Ongoing PD with Lexia with a focus on data analysis
Mini PD re: Math BEST standards to be implemented next year

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students will be able to achieve academically if they feel safe in school and free from distractions such as conflicts with peers. Our school climate survey and discipline data indicate that most of our students feel safe but that they feel there are students in their classrooms who are interfering with their ability to learn and/or the teachers' ability to teach. We want to address this perceived gap.

Measurable Outcome: We will decrease the number of behavior incidents by 5% in the category of student on student confrontation and inappropriate behaviors, which were our highest incidents reported last year (after BIT referrals which were primarily used to track behaviors of students who had already been identified as needing additional behavioral supports)

Monitoring: Monthly analysis of discipline data
Mid and end of year disaggregation of discipline data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Steven Bright (steven.bright@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS Rewards
7 Mindsets Curriculum

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS Rewards is a schoolwide program used prek-6 to positively acknowledge students for academics, Tiger P.R.I.D.E. and school safety. 7 Mindsets Curriculum is taught explicitly through our SEL resource class and reinforced campus wide in the classrooms, cafeteria, and by our guidance department and MFLC.

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly meeting of PBIS team with representatives from each grade level or department

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

Administrative walk throughs will collect evidence of positively acknowledging students.

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

Students K-6 will continue to attend SEL resource 2x per rotation and have the 7 Mindsets curriculum taught with fidelity.

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

If students receive office referrals, 7 Mindsets language will be utilized by administrators and/or guidance counselor when supporting students with ways to make better decisions in the future.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Based on 2021 FSA data, Tynes declined in all areas related to ELA: % proficient, learning gains, and learning gains of LQ students. The school was even with the district averages of 59% proficient and 53% learning gains, but below the district average of 40% gains for the BQ students at only 33%. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Tynes will exceed the district average in all areas of reading this year, including learning gains for our students in the bottom quartile. Tynes will increase learning gains for our students in the bottom quartile by 3%. Learning gains for the bottom quartile will increase from 47% to 50%. |
| Monitoring: | TES admin team will work closely with district coaches Sharyse Tutler and Sarah Joshua, along with Literacy Director Bianca Montoro to ensure that all ELA teachers are utilizing district and state approved curriculum and resources that are evidence based. We will use progress monitoring data to ensure that students who are not showing learning gains are receiving appropriate Tier 2 or 3 interventions. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Sarah Brennan (sarah.brennan@myoneclay.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Teachers preK-6 will implement Tier 1 instruction with fidelity and engage in progress monitoring as detailed by the CCDS K-12 CERP Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Decision Trees. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | The CCDS CERP was designed to ensure that all students develop foundational skills in reading by grade 3. Tynes teachers will ensure that the curriculum resources and instructional strategies used with our children support the science of reading and support the implementation of the B.E.S.T standards. |

Action Steps to Implement

Tier 1 instruction will occur with fidelity utilizing ONLY district and state approved curricula and strategies.

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

PLC work will focus on reviewing student data to plan lessons to support achievement especially in our lower quartile students and with those students identified as having reading deficiencies.

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

Administrators will look for evidence during informal walkthroughs of targeted small group instruction for students who need additional support in reading.

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

Data chats will be held with all ELA teachers in the fall, winter, and spring to review progress monitoring data and have conversations with the ITFs and literacy team about students who may be in need of Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 supports.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Based on 2021 FSA data, Tynes declined in learning gains in our bottom quartile related to Math. Tynes is above the district average for learning gains for the bottom quartile, but saw a decline based on 2019 data as compared to 2021 data.

Measurable Outcome: Tynes will increase learning gains in the bottom quartile by 5% moving from 45% to 50% based on 2022 FSA results.

Monitoring: TES admin team will work closely with district coaches Govinda Poor and Tiffany Hradil to ensure that all teachers are utilizing district and state approved curriculum and resources that are evidence based for math. We will use progress monitoring data to ensure that students who are not showing learning gains are receiving appropriate Tier 2 or 3 interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sarah Brennan (sarah.brennan@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers preK-6 will implement Tier 1 instruction with fidelity and engage in progress monitoring as detailed by the CCDS Curriculum Map. Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction will be targeted and focused on students whose data reflects they are in need of support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Tynes teachers will ensure that the curriculum resources and instructional strategies used with our children are taught with fidelity to ensure that all learners are progressing to maximize their learning potential.

Action Steps to Implement

Tier 1 instruction will occur with fidelity utilizing ONLY district and state approved curricula and strategies.

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

PLC work will focus on reviewing student data to plan lessons to support achievement especially in our lower quartile students and with those students identified as having reading deficiencies.

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

Administrators will look for evidence during informal walkthroughs of targeted small group instruction for students who need additional support in math.

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

Data chats will be held with all Math teachers in the fall, winter, and spring to review progress monitoring data and have conversations with the ITFs and math team about students who may be in need of Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 supports

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

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.

Based on the reporting period 2019-20, the data for our school is very low as compared to the district and the state. Tynes was ranked #1 of 22 in the county and #124 of 1395 elementary schools in the state. The five violent incidents reported were all categorized as "harrassment" under the student code of conduct.

This summer our leadership team analyzed our 20-21 data on discipline and were proud to see that our number of incidents, along with our suspensions, had decreased. We attribute that to our robust PBIS programming, including the implementation of PBIS Rewards in February 2021.

This year the administrative team completed our SESIR training and identified bullying and harrassment as an area of focus for educating our students, families, and faculty.

We will also continue to support the district's year long focus on acknowledging positive student behaviors.

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.

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 a weekly Smore newsletter from the principal as well as on social media platforms. Teachers communicate with families regularly to keep them informed of their students' progress, both academic and social emotional via phone calls, notes, Synergy email, and PBIS rewards points. This summer we worked diligently to provide information and support for parents to register for Synergy ParentVue accounts to be able to monitor their children's attendance and progress. Schoolwide implementation of PBIS initiatives to communicate with all stakeholders include positive behavior referrals, PBIS Rewards incentives including visits to the Tiger Den, our school store, and implementation of the 7 Mindsets Curriculum.

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

Teachers and staff all utilize the PBIS Reward program across campus to recognize positive behaviors of individuals and classes. Teachers and staff all have blue Tiger P.R.I.D.E. bracelets matching the students to demonstrate that we are all connected.

Students are all given a blue Tiger P.R.I.D.E. bracelet at the beginning of the year and to all new students to teach and reinforce our motto and to provide them a visual reminder to make those positive choices.

Parents and extended family are partners in our work to acknowledge positive decision making.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|--------|--------|--|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |