

Clay County Schools

Tynes Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Tynes Elementary School

1550 TYNES BLVD, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://tes.oneclay.net>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Clay County School Board on 10/5/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, and emotional learning.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brennan, Sarah	Principal	Develop and Monitor SIP including all relevant data and instructional practices related to improvement.
Christopher, Nakia	Assistant Principal	Develop and Monitor SIP including all relevant data and instructional practices related to improvement.
Huggins, Shelley	Instructional Coach	Monitor and implement MTSS plans and processes. Provide interventions and assess students to determine needs and support. Member of the SBLT and SLLT.
Granese, Victoria	Assistant Principal	Develop and Monitor SIP including all relevant data and instructional practices related to improvement.
Cambron, Michelle	SAC Member	Monitor SIP and hold meetings to collaborate with all stakeholders.
Green, Karen	Administrative Support	Attend SAC meetings as a representative and provide support related to the SIP and job description.
Wright, Eric	School Counselor	Monitor MTSS and 504 needs in relation to relevant SIP goals and increasing student achievement.
Goodwin, Cassie	Teacher, ESE	Monitor ESE needs in relation to relevant SIP goals and increasing student achievement.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

SAC met on 8/28 to review draft SIP and provide feedback.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored via the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT), and the School Literacy Leadership Team (SLLT) which both meet monthly, as well as by the administrative leadership team which meets weekly.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	38%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	46%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	32	25	21	24	18	21	30	0	0	171	
One or more suspensions	0	6	0	1	6	5	5	0	0	23	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	30	23	34	23	0	0	110	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	36	15	49	11	0	0	111	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	7	17	0	0	0	0	24	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	2	7	0	0	4	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	14	13	9	5	13	5	19	0	0	78	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	13	24	14	0	0	55	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	22	37	0	0	77	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	11	28	15	0	0	59	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	5	3	4	3	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	14	13	9	5	13	5	19	0	0	78	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	13	24	14	0	0	55	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	22	37	0	0	77	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	11	28	15	0	0	59	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	5	3	4	3	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	4	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	57	59	53	67	63	56	63		
ELA Learning Gains				63			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			47		
Math Achievement*	67	64	59	71	51	50	66		
Math Learning Gains				68			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			45		
Science Achievement*	50	65	54	74	69	59	71		
Social Studies Achievement*					70	64			
Middle School Acceleration					61	52			
Graduation Rate					64	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		55	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	226
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	1	1
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	50			
HSP	54			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	46			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	44			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	100			
BLK	67			
HSP	69			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	62			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	57			67			50					
SWD	26			34			19				4	
ELL	25			63							2	
AMI												
ASN	76			100							2	
BLK	55			62			41				4	
HSP	57			60			56				4	
MUL	53			61							2	
PAC												
WHT	57			68			50				4	
FRL	46			59			43				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	67	63	53	71	68	56	74					
SWD	39	42	40	47	58	51	33					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	100			100								

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	60	72	72	56	68	68	75					
HSP	76	70	60	76	67	64	67					
MUL	61	54		72	68							
PAC												
WHT	67	60	45	72	69	50	74					
FRL	59	61	54	59	66	63	70					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	58	47	66	62	45	71					
SWD	28	42	52	41	40	29	44					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53	50	45	49	54	33	41					
HSP	73	75		69	67		86					
MUL	69	47		64	60							
PAC												
WHT	63	57	41	69	64	45	74					
FRL	53	51	53	60	61	50	60					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	51%	55%	-4%	54%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	61%	2%	58%	5%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	66%	61%	5%	47%	19%
03	2023 - Spring	51%	59%	-8%	50%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	83%	75%	8%	54%	29%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	62%	-4%	59%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	67%	8%	61%	14%
05	2023 - Spring	53%	59%	-6%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	48%	63%	-15%	51%	-3%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Science proficiency declined from 74% to 48%. The 48% was significantly lower than both the district average of 63% and lower than the state average of 51%. Historically, science proficiency was a strength at Tynes. This was likely due to both a change in instructional staffing (both 5th grade science teachers moved to new positions) as well as a larger number of students with reading struggles.

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

Science proficiency declined from 74% to 48%. This was likely due to both a change in instructional staffing (both 5th grade science teachers moved to new positions) as well as a larger number of students with reading struggles.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

K-2 ELA, especially 1st grade ELA, was weaker than the state and the district. There was new programs and limited phonological awareness programs which could have led to the gap.

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

Overall, 4th grade improved in both reading and math proficiency from 22-23. Strategic placement of staff and personnel as well as strategic usage of online programs and supplemental materials.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Number of retainees at 3rd grade due to reading performance

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

1. K-2 Literacy
2. Students with significant reading deficiencies
3. SWD as compared to district.
4. Science proficiency

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our area of focus is positive recognition from adults while at school. 82% of adults strongly agreed that students received positive recognition from adults while only 30% of students strongly agreed with this statement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We hope to increase staff perceptions of positive recognition of students to 87% while increasing student perceptions to 35% strongly agreeing that they receive positive recognition from adults while at school.

Monitoring:

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

Climate and Culture surveys will be used to monitor the impact.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victoria Granese (victoria.granese@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Verbal and non-verbal praise and recognition by all staff members on campus using our school-wide PBIS system and Tiger PRIDE.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By using our School-Wide motto of PRIDE (positivity, respect, integrity, determination, and effort) we can strengthen our school culture while continuously providing students with positive reinforcement and recognition.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Students will receive frequent (at least once every day) positive recognition in the form of a PBIS Reward or verbal praise related to one of the 5 areas of Tiger PRIDE.

Person Responsible: Victoria Granese (victoria.granese@myoneclay.net)

By When: According to the 2023-2024 Student climate survey, students at least 35% of students will report that they strongly agree that they receive positive recognition from adults while at school. May 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Grades K, 1, 3, and 5 were all below the county and state average on ELA achievement according to the 2022-2023 end-of-year FAST assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase proficiency in ELA achievement in each grade level by at least 5% by the 2023-2024 EOY FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

By close monitoring of the FAST PM1 and PM2 data along with the PM3 FAST data we will be able to determine if our learning goals were beneficial in increasing student ELA Achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Brennan (sarah.brennan@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our evidence-based intervention for increasing student ELA achievement is to implement school-wide vocabulary programs that include opportunities for students to metacognitively determine the meanings of words in the context of all subject areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Vocabulary impacts all subject areas and can be a powerful strategy for determining word meanings and creating connections. Vocabulary strategies have a .64 effect size according to John Hattie's Visible Learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Professional Learning Communities and walkthrough logs will pay close attention to the effective implementation of this school-wide goal. Through the use of modeling, teacher spotlight examples, and planning opportunities teachers will effectively implement the school-wide vocabulary strategy into their content area instruction systematically and consistently.

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

By When: By October 2023, we will see consistent use of school-wide vocabulary strategies as evidenced by walkthrough logs and consistent student work samples.

#3. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The declining achievement of our SWD subgroup has put us on the ATSI list due to our proficiency dropping from 44% to 28% in grades 3-6 ELA and Math and 5th grade science based on the 2022-23 PM 3 data.

Currently our percentage of students with disabilities is approximately 31%, which is the 6th highest in the district out of 43 schools.

We have 62 students who are in self-contained ASD class all day, and about a third of those students are on access points.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal for our ATSI subgroup is to increase our proficiency from 28% to 41% or better based on PM #3 2-023-24 school year assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Our SWD subgroup has been cross referenced with other subgroups to monitor attendance and to ensure that the IEPs for our students has the needed goals, objectives, accommodations, and related services to ensure they are making adequate progress. Case managers, ESE department chairs, SBLT, and admin team will monitor their progress through data chats, IEP meetings, and parent teacher conferences as well as MTSS if appropriate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We have allocated RAISE and ESSER tutoring funds to focus on our students in the SWD subgroup, especially in the area of reading. Evidence based reading materials that will be used in RAISE and ESSER tutoring include: Lexia, Common Lit, Phonics to Reading, FCRR

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidence based reading materials will be selected and aligned with the specific area of need (foundational skills and/or comprehension) for reading as described in the decision tree. For mathematics, the materials will be selected from the decision tree.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

General education teachers and ESE teachers will collaborate to leverage the formative data that school has to increase student engagement and independence.

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

By When: PM #3

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

According to our school's 2022-2023 STAR Early Literacy data, current second-grade students showed a gap in ELA proficiency with an overall ELA proficiency achievement of 33%. The Renaissance State Benchmark Mastery report showed that the students show a deficiency in the area of vocabulary with a median mastery score of 48%. Across K-2 our vocabulary data showed a need for remediation. Vocabulary is an essential component of reading and oral comprehension. If a student is unaware of the meaning of words or the skills needed to decipher words, it can have an impact on their ability to comprehend a text.

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

According to our school's 2022-2023 PM3 ELA FAST data, 3-5th grade students displayed a need for growth in the area of vocabulary. Our 3rd and 5th-grade students both scored low in the area of vocabulary. 3rd Grade context and connotations were only 25% above the standard while 5th grade was only 24%. Vocabulary is an essential component of reading and oral comprehension. If a student is unaware of the meaning of words or the skills needed to decipher words, it can have an impact on their ability to effectively comprehend a text. This can have a cross-curricular impact on student learning.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Current K-2 grade students will increase their overall ELA proficiency by 5% to fill in the gaps and assist them in making learning gains on the statewide ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Our area of focus: vocabulary, will be closely monitored for desired outcomes via walkthrough logs and professional learning communities centered around evidence-based ELA practice, and inspecting student work samples. These monitoring techniques will hold students accountable for the school-wide initiative implementation as well as provide a basis for continuous metacognitive processes throughout lesson planning.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brennan, Sarah, sarah.brennan@myoneclay.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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?

Using John Hattie's Visible Learning as the basis for evidence-based vocabulary strategies and their effect size has helped us determine two vocabulary strategies with a 6.35 effect size- Semantic Mapping and Frayer Models.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The identified need to strengthen vocabulary is addressed by the focus and effect size of vocabulary instruction/programming. There is strong research to show the effectiveness of using vocabulary strategies within instruction to help students achieve higher levels.

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
The School-Based Literacy Leadership team will be tasked with monitoring and disaggregating students' data frequently to determine the next steps for support and how to increase the rigor of the school-wide initiative.	Huggins, Shelley, shelley.huggins@myoneclay.net
Professional Learning Communities will be help weekly to share ideas for implementation and work through barriers. These community of learners will also be used to create assessments that test with fidelity the purpose and effectiveness of our school-wide vocabulary strategy.	Granese, Victoria, victoria.granese@myoneclay.net