

Clay County Schools

Argyle 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 | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Argyle Elementary School

2625 SPENCERS PLANTATION BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://aes.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Dimitra Mainer

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 56% |
| 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: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (62%) |
| 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 | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Argyle Elementary School

2625 SPENCERS PLANTATION BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://aes.oneclay.net>

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">40%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">64%</p> |

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.

The mission of Argyle Elementary School is to equip students with the skills needed to forge the future's next discoveries, inventions, solutions, and adventures in a world of new possibilities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The School District of Clay County and Argyle Elementary School exist to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

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 |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| Mainer, Dimitra | Principal | The School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) is comprised of a teacher representing each grade level, including ESE and administrators. Each member is responsible for helping to make data-driven decisions based on student data and grade appropriate benchmarks and standards. The SBLT will collaborate on sustaining a learning environments conducive to the success of ALL students. |
| Brown, Easter | Assistant Principal | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Dimitra Mainer

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.*

2

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

704

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

7

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 | 103 | 99 | 94 | 89 | 100 | 98 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 684 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 24 | 22 | 17 | 19 | 20 | 25 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 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 | 12 | 16 | 11 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 17 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 11 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |

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

Friday 10/1/2021

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 | 89 | 89 | 76 | 94 | 106 | 92 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 651 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

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 | |

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 | 89 | 89 | 76 | 94 | 106 | 92 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 651 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 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 | | | | 65% | 65% | 57% | 62% | 63% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 66% | 62% | 58% | 60% | 59% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 57% | 54% | 53% | 51% | 50% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 72% | 70% | 63% | 74% | 69% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 68% | 66% | 62% | 68% | 68% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 57% | 56% | 51% | 53% | 56% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 67% | 65% | 53% | 59% | 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 | 69% | 68% | 1% | 58% | 11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 64% | -3% | 58% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -69% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 62% | 2% | 56% | 8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -61% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 72% | 71% | 1% | 62% | 10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 72% | 69% | 3% | 64% | 8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -72% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 76% | 64% | 12% | 60% | 16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -72% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 66% | 63% | 3% | 53% | 13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data from the Spring diagnostic assessment was used to compile this data.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | 65 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | 64 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | 69 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | 62 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | 79 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | 65 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | 51 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | 62 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | 51 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | 59 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | | | 39 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

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 | 47 | 49 | 8 | 43 | 41 | 29 | 33 | | | | |
| ELL | 46 | 62 | | 38 | 31 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 60 | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 54 | 20 | 43 | 42 | 60 | 43 | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 56 | 42 | 52 | 31 | 15 | 27 | | | | |
| MUL | 69 | 55 | | 55 | 36 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 54 | 40 | 62 | 42 | 36 | 44 | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | 50 | 27 | 48 | 45 | 45 | 24 | | | | |
| 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 | 46 | 59 | 55 | 55 | 67 | 63 | 53 | | | | |
| ELL | 56 | 54 | | 67 | 93 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 71 | 73 | | 86 | 91 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 52 | 63 | 67 | 67 | 66 | 69 | 60 | | | | |
| HSP | 68 | 75 | 73 | 73 | 74 | 62 | 75 | | | | |
| MUL | 79 | 87 | | 67 | 64 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 69 | 58 | 38 | 76 | 66 | 39 | 67 | | | | |
| FRL | 59 | 65 | 67 | 68 | 68 | 57 | 65 | | | | |
| 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 | 39 | 46 | 54 | 47 | 49 | 36 | 39 | | | | |
| ELL | 79 | 80 | | 79 | 80 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 89 | 82 | | 94 | 65 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 52 | 61 | 48 | 71 | 73 | 58 | 37 | | | | |
| HSP | 70 | 50 | | 70 | 60 | 27 | 86 | | | | |
| MUL | 68 | 59 | | 73 | 63 | | 82 | | | | |
| WHT | 63 | 59 | 57 | 76 | 67 | 56 | 60 | | | | |
| FRL | 59 | 61 | 54 | 73 | 71 | 57 | 57 | | | | |

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 | 44 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 311 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |
| 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 | 44 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 60 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 45 |
| 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 | 40 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 54 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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?

Two of the lowest performing areas were 5th grade Math Proficiency at 40%, a decrease of 36% from 2019 Spring FSA and 5th grade Science at 38%, a decrease of 26% from 2019 Spring FSA. Lack of student discourse and work in small group settings did not allow students to demonstrate their understanding which did not allow teachers to scaffold and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students, particularly those students who were making necessary progress.

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

Proficiency and gains decreased across the board. Identifying and progress monitoring LQ was not in place in classrooms.

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

Taking into consideration that the 2020-2021 school year had its set of challenges resulting from the Covid 19 pandemic, there are other areas that could have been beneficial if implemented effectively. Effective use of data to plan instruction did not happen and contributed to this need for improvement.

Providing professional development around digging into data and using it to plan instruction will improve intentional and targeted teaching, ultimately increasing student achievement.

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

There was no improvement between the 2019 and 2021 Spring FSA scores. All data components decreased in 2021.

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

There was no improvement between the 2019 and 2021 Spring FSA scores. All data components decreased in 2021.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we will need to focus on being intentional with the creation of small groups. We will also need to establish clear learning targets and ensure related tasks align.

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.

Teachers will participate in training to support the use of the new reading curriculum and the integration of the new standards with a focus on our current Florida Standards. Our whole group PLCs will focus on the district's Vision for Instruction and the strategies used in the classroom to support student achievement.

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

- teacher leaders (leadership academy)
- New teacher program at the school level

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math proficiency on the FSA dropped from 72% proficiency in 2019 to 53% proficiency in 2021, a drop in 19%.

Measurable Outcome: AES will increase proficiency in math by 9% resulting in a goal of 62% proficiency.

Monitoring: AES will be utilizing quarterly benchmark assessments and ready to monitor progress in all areas of math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Through an increase in student discourse and collaboration, teachers will identify student understanding, leading to an increase in math proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By increasing student discourse teachers will be able to identify and target students who do not comprehend math concepts. This will allow teachers to target individual student needs and address them during small groups.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development with staff regarding student discourse

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

During walk throughs the admin team will provide feedback regarding student discourse.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

Through data chats with teachers we will identify students that are struggling with math concepts.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Science proficiency on the FCAT dropped from 67% proficiency in 2019 to 39% proficiency in 2021, a drop in 28%.

Measurable Outcome: AES will increase proficiency in science by 11% resulting in a goal of 50% proficiency.

Monitoring: AES will be utilizing quarterly benchmark assessments, penda online learning tools, and classroom assessments to monitor this focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Through an increase in student discourse and collaboration, teachers will identify student understanding, leading to an increase in science proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By increasing student discourse teachers will be able to identify and target students who do not comprehend science concepts. This will allow teachers to target individual student needs and address them during small groups.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development with staff regarding student discourse.

Person Responsible: Easter Brown (easter.brown@myoneclay.net)

During walk throughs the admin team will provide feedback regarding student discourse.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

Through data chats with teachers, we will identify students that are struggling with science concepts.

Person Responsible: Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@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.

During the 2020-21 school year, Argyle scored in the middle category for incident rank. As reported our students experienced difficulty with threat and intimidation incidents. We will support more positive interactions with peers through the use of conflict resolution strategies. Effective implementation of the PBIS program will result in a decrease in the number of our OSS consequences by 2%.

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.

This year our school re-introduced PBIS to our staff and students. This committee has worked on creating very clear expectations for all and have developed a reward system for good behavior.

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

All staff members will follow the flowchart of options before a behavior is sent to the office for an office referral. The last step for staff members before it becomes an office referral is to make sure parents have been looped in as an attempt to allow them to be part of the solution.

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: Science | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |