

Clay County Schools

Argyle Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Argyle Elementary School

2625 SPENCERS PLANTATION BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://aes.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Dimitra Mainer

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">56%</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;">72%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B	B	A	A

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

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 learning environments conducive to the success of ALL students.
Brown, Easter	Assistant 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 learning environments conducive to the success of ALL students.
Williams, Tara	Teacher, ESE	Support ESE teachers and lead the work as it relates to best practices with our ESE team
Ayers, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Liaison between the the resource teachers and the leadership team. Communicate supports to teacher leaders regarding partnership between resource and academic classes.
Sutton, Tammy	Teacher, K-12	Provide primary perspective and communicate between leadership and primary teachers

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/28/2022, Dimitra Mainer

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Total number of students enrolled at the school

810

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

14

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	94	123	119	121	88	123	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	778
Attendance below 90 percent	33	37	36	28	21	26	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	208
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	0	0	0	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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	22	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	24	27	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	18	22	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	0	0	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/28/2022

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	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	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	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

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	56%	63%	56%				65%	65%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						66%	62%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						57%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	59%	51%	50%				72%	70%	63%
Math Learning Gains	66%						68%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						57%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	69%	59%				67%	65%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	69%	68%	1%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	64%	-3%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	64%	62%	2%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	72%	71%	1%	62%	10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	69%	3%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2022					
	2019	76%	64%	12%	60%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	66%	63%	3%	53%	13%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	31	40	46	35	57	50	21				
ELL	29	47		31	79						
BLK	51	53	48	50	55	39	39				
HSP	57	52	27	63	75	78	64				
MUL	60	79		62	80		36				
WHT	60	49	42	64	63	36	48				
FRL	44	47	46	46	57	44	37				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
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	383

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

This past school year our ELA proficiency decreased by 3%. Learning gains decreased by 1% however the learning gains of our lowest 25% increased by 13%. In math, our school's proficiency increased by 6%. Improvements were also made as our learning gains increased by 27% and our lower quartile increased by 21%. Our focus was on math and we saw improvements in this area.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

We will need to continue our focus on math and science but sharpen our lens on reading instruction.

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

Contributing factors would be the shift in standards and the implementation of a new curriculum.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

We showed considerable improvements in math

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

Factors that contributed to our improvement in math would be attention to a more intentional focus on the needs of individual students. We utilized an intervention block of time to support the remediation of prerequisite skills. Teachers were required to take ownership of their data as it related to progress monitoring and small group instruction. There was also a focus on district initiatives related to understanding a lesson's learning target and associated success criteria.

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

We will need to understand the data and how to analyze it when it comes from our new PM system. This data will be used to plan intentional lessons focusing on essential standards where we develop learning targets and student success criteria. Small groups will need to be based on student needs determined from the triangulation of progress monitoring data. The use of evidence-based programs to support the teaching of the standards.

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

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

ELA proficiency dropped from 59% to 56%. This is a 3% drop. This is an area of critical need because before or after the drop we are saying that almost 50% of our students are NOT proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

AES will increase proficiency in ELA by 6% resulting in a goal of 62%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

AES will utilize quarterly benchmark assessments, Lexia/Achieve data, and classroom assessments to monitor progress in all areas of math. Teachers will be creating intentional small groups in their classrooms and differentiating instruction to ensure every student is being met where they are.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers will participate in Savvas training so that the curriculum can be implemented with fidelity and used to support the standards being taught. Supported resources (Lexia, Achieve 3000, Heggarty, Phonics to Reading, Kid Lips) strengthen the interventions provided to small groups for target instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The district-adopted curricula materials are all evidence-based resources that support students at different tiers of instruction. The use of these materials provides opportunities for remediation to close gaps and accelerate learning. Teachers supporting individual student needs increases student success and leads to an increase in self-efficacy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Providing continual feedback to teachers.
2. Professional development on the district's initiatives as well as the implementation of SEL implementation in all classrooms.
3. Professional development on ELA curricular resources.
4. Establishing a culture of the implementation of differentiated and intentional small group instruction.

Person Responsible

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

This past year we increased our science proficiency from 39% to 48%. Our ELA focus will complement our science proficiency focus.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

AES will increase proficiency in science by 7% resulting in a proficiency of 55%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will use Penda, district and classroom assessments to monitor student mastery of standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Through an increase in student discourse and collaboration, teachers will identify student understanding, leading to an increase in science proficiency. This year our ELA focus on strengthening our small group instruction targeting specific student needs will help student transfer the reading strategies from ELA to content areas as well.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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 group.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Professional development for the implementation and use of the Penda CBL program.
2. Collaboration between reading and science teachers during PLC as well as vertical planning between science grade levels.
3. Targeted instruction in small groups based on data from progress monitoring tools

Person Responsible

Easter Brown (easter.brown@myoneclay.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to positive student to teacher interactions

**Area of Focus
Description and**

**Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Our climate survey results indicate that 51% of our school-based personnel somewhat agree that faculty/staff at our school frequently recognize students for good behavior. Based on our student population, 35.5% of our students somewhat agree that adults acknowledge when they do the right thing.

**Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

AES will increase the strongly agree category for this indicator for adults by 10% and by 10% for students as well.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

We will utilize a student focus group to represent the student population when vetting recognition programs. We will survey the student body for meaningful incentives through the use of google forms for survey purposes. Classroom walkthrough data for our year-long focus of positively acknowledging students. To monitor progress toward improvement in our climate survey scores, we will survey students at the end of each nine-week grading period

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Implementation of our PBIS initiatives (guidelines for success and lesson plans), support for the use of our classroom discipline matrix, school-wide and classroom-level consequences and rewards.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

The use of a discipline matrix will support the consistent implementation of rewards and consequences for student behavior. The use of lesson plans to teach appropriate behaviors will ensure consistent language across the grade levels.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Professional development for PBIS team
2. School-wide PD for PBIS

3. Book study with team leaders for Behavior Interventions Strategies for Educators, Counselors, and Parents

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Students with disabilities are below the federal index at 40%. This was identified based on our state testing data.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

SWD federal index will improve my 10%. This will raise our index to 50%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Quarterly data meetings
 Monthly ESE team meetings
 Walkthrough data
 Collaboration with FIN in our scheduling procedures

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction (Before, During, and After): Activate prior knowledge, question generation, monitor comprehension, identifying the main idea, paraphrasing, summarizing.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Students who have been explicitly taught multiple comprehension strategies demonstrate greater improvements in reading comprehension. However, students should be proficient with each strategy before they attempt to combine them. Strong evidence.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide professional development for the implementation of the comprehension strategy.

Person Responsible

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

ELA Improving Reading: Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction (Before, During, After)

For both reading comprehension domains on the iReady diagnostic 50% of AES students perform one grade level below on the first diagnostic. By the end of the year diagnostic only have of those same students have made improvements toward proficiency.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

ELA Improving Reading: Systematic, direct-explicit instruction

Historically AES exhibits proficiency in the 50% range in the key ideas and details and the integration of knowledge and ideas domains. In our subgroups, only 41% of our students are performing at proficiency.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

AES will increase the percent of proficient students in the reading comprehension domain by 5% raising overall proficiency from 50% to 55%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

AES will increase the percentage of proficient students in the reading comprehension domain by 5% raising overall proficiency from 50% to 55%.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Instructional leaders alongside teachers will monitor student progress towards goals using classroom assessments, state progress monitoring tools, and district level tools (Lexia, Achieve 300). Data chats will be scheduled quarterly to identify trends among the data points

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Mainer, Dimitra, dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The implementation of comprehension strategies will improve students' academic performance. Our adopted curriculum Savvas is an evidence-based curriculum. The supporting supplements such as Heggarty, Lexia, and Phonics to Reading strengthen our interventions used to close gaps in learning. Strategies such as activating prior knowledge, Question generation, monitoring comprehension, identifying the main idea, paraphrasing, and summarizing will support an increase in student comprehension.

B.E.S.T ELA Standards - Reading Comprehension

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The identified evidence-based practices/programs demonstrate strong evidence. An important part of comprehension strategy instruction is the active participation of students in the comprehension process. In addition, explicit instruction involves providing a sufficient amount of support, or scaffolding, to students as they learn the strategies to ensure success.

Students who have been explicitly taught multiple comprehension strategies demonstrate greater improvements in reading comprehension.

The strategies require students to engage in self-questioning, a process in which students ask themselves and then answer questions about what they have read. Doing so encourages students to be actively

engaged with the text, thinking about what they read before, during, and after reading, and in turn improving their ability to process that information.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Teachers and instructional leaders will participate in targeted professional development for the evidence-based curriculum adopted to support standards-based instruction.</p>	<p>Mainer, Dimitra, dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net</p>
<p>Teacher leaders will participate in the district's leadership academy supporting the district and school initiative to become a PLC. This will cultivate a culture of regular data analysis and the collaboration on researching evidence based strategies to be used to support closing gaps as we utilize small groups to meet individual student needs.</p>	<p>Mainer, Dimitra, dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net</p>
<p>As we strive to utilize our PLC work to support the analysis of our data to target the individual needs of students we must also look at the assessments used to determine whether students have mastered a standard. We will participate in professional development to understand the new state progress monitoring tools. In addition, we will use the PLC to analyze student work as we bring samples to discuss. Teachers will also vet assessments prior to administering them to ensure they assess the standard.</p>	<p>Mainer, Dimitra, dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net</p>

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

At Argyle Elementary, we are currently in the process of establishing our guidelines for success. We most recently, sent out a google form to have the staff vote on characteristics that embody our vision and mission statement. These character traits will be built around the acronym PATH. The PBIS will create lessons that are used to teach the character traits. It will be the basis of the language we use to encourage positive behavior interactions with our students and then our students with each other. Last year we established a school-wide token economy, which allows students to receive "bucks" for demonstration of positive behavior. Those bucks can then be used to purchase admission to events and items in our PBIS store.

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

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.