Argyle Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Argyle Elementary School

2625 SPENCERS PLANTATION BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32073

http://aes.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.

The mission of Argyle Elementary School is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant, and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity, and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision 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.

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
Mainer, Dimitra	Principal	The function of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) is to analyze school-wide data to determine the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction for all students. Data to be analyzed includes K-2 Foundational Skills Assessment or alternative, 5th-grade Performance Matters benchmark science assessments (and other locally-created common assessments), and formal assessments such as the FSA or SAT-10. The Principal is a participant in the meeting. The Assistant Principal will attend the discussions in a support role for the Principal. The reading committee chairperson may provide effective interventions for the Tier 1, 2, or 3 instructional needs, as does the math committee chairperson in order to make recommendations for Math. The Intervention Team Facilitator is present to help ensure that the district's MTSS plan is followed. Lead teachers sometimes serve on the SBLT as a liaison to other teachers in their grade/content area grouping.
Neese, Shannon	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will attend the meetings in a support role for the Principal.
Leone, Casey	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will attend the meetings in a support role for the Principal.
Sutton, Tammy	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Sutton is the Kindergarten Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Miller, Traci	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Miller is the 6th-Grade Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Williams, Tara	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. William's is the ESE Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Nzuzu, Tamisha	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Nzuzu is the 1st-Grade Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Armenta, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Armenta is the 3rd-Grade Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stanhope, Amber	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Stanhope is the 4th-Grade Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Jenkins, Valerie	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Jenkins is the 2nd-Grade Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Matthews, Kayla	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Matthews is the 5th-Grade Team Lead. In this role, she will guide her team in Improving student achievement by modeling and supporting effective instructional practice, data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Aldridge, Nicole	School Counselor	Mrs. Aldridge is the School Counselor. In this role, she will provide input regarding testing and guidance issues. She will also offer support with data analysis, collegial learning, communication, and oversight.
Calloway-McCray, Deirdre	Other	Mrs. Calloway-McCray is our Title I Lead Teacher. In this role, she will provide leadership in carrying out the educational program of the school as it relates to Title 1.
Devine, Ariel	Behavior Specialist	Ms. Devine is our Behavior Site Coach. In this role, she serves as a site-based resource person to provide positive behavior support and expertise for all students. She provides instruction in life skills, conflict resolution, peer mediation, self-esteem building, and any other area as the need arises.

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.

Quarterly School Advisory Council meetings will be held during the school year to involve all stakeholders in school improvement efforts. During the 1st-quarter SAC meeting, the SIP will be presented and reviewed and feedback and input from stakeholders will be encouraged and reflected upon before the final SIP is approved and published.

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))

Quarterly School Advisory Council meetings will be held during the school year to involve all stakeholders in school improvement efforts. At each meeting, schoolwide progress monitoring data will be reviewed to ensure that student achievement and proficiency rates are in alignment with our established SIP goals. Adjustments to the plan, as needed, will be agreed upon by all stakeholders during these meetings to maximize effective instructional strategies to propel student learning.

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-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	72%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	56%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)* English Language Learners (ELL) 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: B 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	27	28	20	26	18	24	22	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	6	3	4	5	0	0	23
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	4	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	2	4	0	9	1	15	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	9	22	15	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	8	18	14	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	6	1	17	8	23	16	0	0	74

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	5	1	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	21
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	33	37	36	28	21	26	27	0	0	208
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	18	22	18	19	0	0	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	24	27	19	0	0	84
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	18	22	18	19	0	0	77

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	1	0	0	1	1	3	1	0	0	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	33	37	36	28	21	26	27	0	0	208
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	18	22	18	19	0	0	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	14	24	27	19	0	0	84
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	18	22	18	19	0	0	77

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	1	0	0	1	1	3	1	0	0	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	6
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*	50	59	53	56	63	56	59		
ELA Learning Gains				54			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			33		
Math Achievement*	52	64	59	59	51	50	53		
Math Learning Gains				66			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			33		
Science Achievement*	55	65	54	48	69	59	39		
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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	215
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
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	30	Yes	2	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	67			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	44			

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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	59			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	46			

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	50			52			55					
SWD	25			29			29				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			40			47				4	
HSP	60			62			68				4	
MUL	58			53							2	
PAC												
WHT	51			57			64				4	
FRL	42			41			37				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	56	54	46	59	66	54	48					
SWD	31	40	46	35	57	50	21					
ELL	29	47		31	79							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	51	53	48	50	55	39	39					
HSP	57	52	27	63	75	78	64					
MUL	60	79		62	80		36					
PAC												
WHT	60	49	42	64	63	36	48					
FRL	44	47	46	46	57	44	37					

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	59	55	33	53	39	33	39					
SWD	47	49	8	43	41	29	33					
ELL	46	62		38	31							
AMI												
ASN	60			60								
BLK	50	54	20	43	42	60	43					
HSP	57	56	42	52	31	15	27					
MUL	69	55		55	36							
PAC												
WHT	64	54	40	62	42	36	44					
FRL	49	50	27	48	45	45	24					

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	44%	55%	-11%	54%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	61%	-9%	58%	-6%
06	2023 - Spring	50%	61%	-11%	47%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	59%	-2%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	59%	75%	-16%	54%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	54%	62%	-8%	59%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	67%	-4%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	59%	-20%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	63%	-10%	51%	2%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was our achievement/proficiency rate in ELA. Based on our 2023 FAST ELA Spring scores, AES scholars were 50% proficient in the content area of ELA. Attendance (in all grades) and teacher allocation in fifth grade had a significant impact on student performance. Likewise, we had a large population of first-year teachers join our team last year. Although it is exciting to welcome beginning educators to the profession, there is also a learning curve when it comes to building teaching capacity in providing strong tier-1 instruction. Lastly, in fifth grade, we experienced high teacher turnover rates and assigned several long-term subs to those classrooms. Other contributing factors include more instructional development in targeting individual student needs, calibrating alignment of instruction in small groups and whole groups, and greater oversight via explicit progress monitoring. Based on student performance on statewide and local assessments, the trend in ELA proficiency has been declining since 2018/19.

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

The data components that showed the greatest decline from the prior year were our achievement/ proficiency rates in ELA and Mathematics. When comparing our 2023 and 2022 scores, we dropped by 6 percentage points in both content areas. The volatility of attendance (in all grades) and teacher allocation in fifth grade had a significant impact on student performance. Likewise, we had a large population of first-year teachers join our team last year. Although it is exciting to welcome beginning educators to the profession, there is also a learning curve when it comes to building teaching capacity in providing strong tier-1 instruction. Lastly, in fifth grade, we experienced high teacher turnover rates and assigned several long-term subs to those classrooms. Other contributing factors include more instructional development in targeting individual student needs, calibrating alignment of instruction in small groups and whole groups, and greater oversight via explicit progress monitoring.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Mathematics, although ELA was not far behind. Our Mathematics score was 2 percentage points lower than the state. Our ELA score was 4 percentage points lower than the state. Attendance (in all grades) and teacher allocation in fifth grade had a significant impact on student performance. Likewise, we had a large population of first-year teachers join our team last year. Although it is exciting to welcome beginning educators to the profession, there is also a learning curve when it comes to building teaching capacity in providing strong tier-1 instruction. Lastly, in fifth grade, we experienced high teacher turnover rates and assigned several long-term subs to those classrooms. Other contributing factors include more instructional development in targeting individual student needs, calibrating alignment of instruction in small groups and whole groups, and greater oversight via explicit progress monitoring.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement from the prior year was our achievement/ proficiency rate in Science. When comparing our 2023 and 2022 scores, we gained 17 percentage points in this area. Science teachers embraced professional development opportunities offered by the district. Many of our teachers consistently participated in the science collaboratives offered by district-level science curriculum specialists, allowing them to collaboratively plan with experts as well as other teachers throughout the district.

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

After reviewing and reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, one area of major concern is only many students we had in 5th grade who displayed two or more indicators (23 total students), as compared to the rest of the school community. The following indicators are potential areas of concern:
Absent 10% or more days: 24
Course Failure in Math: 15
Level 1 on ELA: 22
Level 1 on Math: 18

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

Teachers will continue to be trained on new reading materials (SAVVAS, Heggerty) as well as supplementary instructional programs to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, many of whom comprise our lower quartile and/or ESE population. Teachers will be provided with professional development on the use of Learning Targets, Checking for Understanding, and Aligning Instruction to Checks for Understanding to promote quality teaching and learning, as well as the most effective strategies for implementing small groups so that student needs will be addressed frequently and consistently. Through

PLCs and Vertical Teams, continuous progress monitoring, with consistent feedback from learning teams and administration will ensure that practice is refined on an ongoing basis. Teachers will have a deeper understanding of instructional strategies that align with BEST ELA and Math standards and the MTRs to promote student achievement. They will learn to use the components of the standards to ensure alignment between instructional delivery and grade-level expectations for mastery. Teachers will also learn how to use PENDA science to diagnose student strengths and weaknesses and target remediation, as needed. They will learn strategies for high-impact remedial instruction. Assistants who provide small group instruction in math will learn about RDW and Eureka math strategies for conceptual understanding of math concepts. They will learn how to use strategic question stems and strategies to promote productive struggle and increase the attainment of standards mastery.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 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.

We have chosen to focus on increasing student proficiency rates within the ELA content area. As reflected by current FAST data, our proficiency rate ELA was 50% for the 2022-2023 school year. We identified this as a critical need because proficiency rates reflect learning gaps. If our proficiency increases, that shows that our students' learning gaps are decreasing. That is our goal, to close those gaps that students have and help them achieve more academic success. Likewise, our ESSA subgroup of students with disabilities is performing below the federal percent of points index. To target this, special attention will be made to embed the following evidence-based strategies into daily classroom instruction:
Data-drive small group instruction.
Implementation of an research based program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading.
Direct-explicit reading/ELA instruction.
Explicit vocabulary instruction.
Teachers will engage families in constructing goals, monitoring progress, and supporting learning together.

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

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be Reading. By implementing research based strategies and an intentional action plan, Argyle Elementary School will increase overall student proficiency from 50% to 56% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Data monitoring sources will include FAST, Lexia, classroom assessments, etc. This data will be routinely reviewed by the school-based leadership and teachers regularly, and more formal "data meetings" will be scheduled quarterly. In addition, weekly classroom walkthroughs and ongoing progress monitoring will be used to monitor this area of focus for the desired outcome.

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

The following evidence-based strategies will be implemented:
Data-driven small group instruction.
Implementation of a Research based program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the Science of Reading.
Direct-explicit reading/ELA instruction.
Explicit vocabulary instruction.
Teachers will engage families in constructing goals, monitoring progress, and supporting learning together.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If all teachers implement on-level curriculum and instruction aligned to Florida State Standards, then student proficiency rates will improve in the area of ELA. Instructional interventionists, ESE teachers, and

general education teachers are all intentionally and thoughtfully trained and specialized in high-impact classroom

strategies that focus on accelerating learning for students whose performance is subordinate to that of their peers. Academically tested and proven, research-based curricular materials are effective if implemented with fidelity, thus improving student proficiency rates.

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.

Small Group Instruction: Classroom assistants will receive professional learning/support on best practices for small group instruction. These assistants will support data-based small-group instruction to help decrease the size of teacher-led intervention groups. Data-drive all group instructional will be conducted daily in ALL ELA classrooms on campus. In addition, at least three data chats will be held during the year to review instructional data, EWS, and MTSS as well as to plan data-driven instructional opportunities via whole-group and small-group instruction. Substitutes will be hired to facilitate teacher attendance at these meetings.

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

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Evidence-Based Program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading: We will implement SAVVAS as our evidence-based program as adopted by the district. We will hire a Tile I Instructional Coach to assist ELA teachers with instruction planning and execution. Large-screen interactive monitors will be used for whole-group instruction to provide engaging multi-sensory instruction.

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

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Direct-explicit ELA instruction: We will implement SAVVAS as our evidence-based program as adopted by the district. Classrooms will receive a set of recommended novels in the Florida BEST standards to supplement SAVVAS.

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

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Explicit vocabulary instruction: Spelling Morphology will be used in small groups to support vocabulary instruction for explicit, systematic, cumulative, multi-sensory morphology (word parts: morphemes), decoding, and encoding.

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

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Teachers engage families in constructing goals, monitoring progress, and supporting learning together: We will develop grade-level, appropriate ELA instructional support materials parents can use at home to support their students' learning throughout the year. Parental support for how to use the materials will be provided during parent and family engagement events and activities.

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

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

We have chosen to focus on increasing student proficiency rates within the Math content area. As reflected by current FAST data, our proficiency rate in Math was 53% for the 2022-2023 school year. We identified this as a critical need because proficiency rates reflect learning gaps. If our proficiency increases, that shows that our students' learning gaps are decreasing. That is our goal, to close those gaps that students have and help them to achieve more academic success.

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

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be Math. By implementing evidence-based strategies and an intentional action plan, Argyle Elementary School will increase overall student proficiency from 53% to 59% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Data monitoring sources will include FAST, iReady, ALEKS, classroom common assessments, etc. This data will be routinely reviewed by the school-based leadership and teachers regularly, and more formal "data meetings" will be scheduled quarterly. In addition, weekly classroom walkthroughs and ongoing progress monitoring will be used to monitor this area of focus for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@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.)

The following evidence-based strategies will be implemented:
Individual and Small-Group Instruction
Frequent Student Practice
Visual Representations
Demonstrate Multiple Problem-Solving Strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If all teachers implement on-level curriculum and instruction aligned to Florida State Standards, then student proficiency rates will improve in the area of Math. Instructional interventionists, ESE teachers, and general education teachers are all intentionally and thoughtfully trained and specialized in high-impact classroom
strategies that focus on accelerating learning for students whose performance is subordinate to that of their peers. Academically tested and proven, research-based curricular materials are effective if implemented with fidelity, thus improving student proficiency rates.

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.

Individual and Small Group Instruction: Data-driven small group instruction will occur daily in ALL Math classrooms. Small group instructional resources including anchor charts, manipulatives, dry-erase boards, markers, etc. will be provided. In addition, at least three data chats will be held during the year to review instructional data, EWS, and MTSS as well as to plan data-driven instructional opportunities via whole-group and small-group instruction. Substitutes will be hired to facilitate teacher attendance at these meetings. We will hire a Tile I Instructional Coach to assist Math teachers with instruction planning and execution.

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

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Frequent Student Practice: Students will focus on math fact fluency through the Reflex Math Fluency Program used by all math students K-5 and ALEKS used daily by all 6th-grade math students. Students will use Chromebooks and related technology supplies to use Relex Math in K-5, ALEKS in 6th grade, and iReady K-5.

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

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Visual Representations: K-6 Math teachers will be invited to join a book study of "Building Thinking Classrooms in Math". A book study guide will be provided for all teachers to work through during the year. We will also provide recommended mathematical instructional tools throughout professional learning. Eureka Squared Math manipulative kits will be provided to all K-6 math teachers.

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

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Demonstrate Multiple Problem-Solving Strategies: All K-6 Math teachers will use the Eureka Squared curriculum as adopted by the school district. Large Screen interactive monitors will be used for whole-group instruction to provide engaging, multi-sensory ways for students to explore mathematical problem-solving.

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

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

Inadequate student awareness and knowledge of behavioral expectations result in increased disciplinary actions of scholars, contributing to a lack of self-determination and self-motivation. An increase in disciplinary action, in turn, leads to a substantial decrease in total instructional time for affected students. If students know, practice, and are recognized for appropriate behaviors, then inappropriate behaviors will be reduced overall. This reduction will lead to more student/teacher contact time, increasing student confidence and engagement.

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

Based on Synergy discipline data, our area of focus will be school-wide behavior. During the 2022-2023 school year, Argyle teachers reported 171 disciplinary incidents. By implementing evidence-based strategies and an intentional PBIS action plan, Argyle Elementary School will increase overall student engagement which will in turn decrease discipline referrals by at least 30% for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

Synergy discipline data will be pulled every nine weeks. This data will be routinely reviewed by the school-based leadership and teachers regularly, and more formal "data meetings" will be scheduled quarterly. In addition, weekly classroom walkthroughs will be conducted to further track the progress of this goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@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.)

The following evidence-based strategies will be implemented:
Teacher Access to Training, Coaching, and Feedback
Define and Teach Positive Connections
Create and Provide a Continuum of Response Strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If all teachers implement the schoolwide, adopted PBIS strategies with fidelity, then student disciplinary action will decrease and student instructional time will increase. By teaching and defining positive expectations, we are ensuring that all students have a clear understanding of expected behaviors and we are teaching new life skill competencies. By establishing positive connections, students are more likely to engage in positive behaviors.

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.

Teacher Access to Training, Coaching, and Feedback: Teacher leaders will participate in a 3-day PBIS reboot to discuss schoolwide positive behavior supports and expectations. They can then train their team teachers in preparation for implementation. Likewise, all faculty and staff will participate in a condensed version of the PBIS reboot during pre-planning to further communicate the school-adopted PBIS initiative.

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

By When: Implementation will begin during pre-planning and continue during the first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Define and Teach Positive Expectations: Teachers will explicitly teach expectations using examples and student practice through provided lesson plans. Student expectations will be clearly posted in classrooms and around campus, so they may be referred to when interacting with students or correcting behaviors. PATHS (our school-based PBIS initiative) will be displayed during the morning news to provide time for reflection on how their school day will begin and end.

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

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Establish Positive Connections: Teachers will use effective praise that is specific, timely, and sincere that works for each individual student.

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

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Create & Provide a Continuum of Response Strategies: Token economies such as Pioneer Bucks can be earned and collected to make purchases from the school's PBIS store once per quarter. Students will be celebrated when they complete their PATHS passports by modeling the schoolwide expectations. Students who demonstrate positive behavior will be selected by their teacher once per quarter to join the administration team for a pancake breakfast. The book "Flooded" will be used as a book study for K-6 teachers. This study will take place throughout the year.

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

By When: Implemented during first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

#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 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.

We have chosen to focus on increasing student proficiency rates within the ELA content area, specifically relating to the learning of our students with disabilities. After a review of our ESSA Subgroup Data, we identified that our students with disabilities are performing below the federal percent of points index of 41%. Our students with disabilities are currently performing at 40%. Multiple measures will be initiated to aid in increasing this decline to include:
Collaborative planning with the Florida Inclusion Network.
Inclusive scheduling with the Florida Inclusion Network.
Continual professional development opportunities to increase the instructional capacity of ESE teachers and classroom teachers (i.e. ongoing professional development on new district-adopted curriculum as well as supplementary instructional programs to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, many of whom comprise our lower quartile and SWD population).
Classroom assistants will receive professional learning/support on best practices for small-group instruction; assistants will support data-based small-group instruction to help decrease the size of teacher-led intervention groups.
Targeted instructional book studies will be implemented to strengthen teacher understanding of high-leverage, research-based intervention strategies as well as strong Tier 1 instruction.
Data-drive small group instruction.
Implementation of an evidence-based program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading.
Direct-explicit reading/ELA instruction.
Explicit vocabulary instruction.
Teachers will engage families in constructing goals, monitoring progress, and supporting learning together.

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

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be Reading. By implementing evidence-based strategies and an intentional action plan, Argyle Elementary School will increase the overall student proficiency of students with disabilities, increasing their federal index score from 40% to 50%.

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

Data monitoring sources will include FAST, Lexia, classroom assessments, etc. This data will be routinely reviewed by the school-based leadership and teachers regularly, and more formal "data meetings" will be scheduled quarterly. In addition, weekly classroom walkthroughs and ongoing progress monitoring will be used to monitor this area of focus for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@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.)

The following evidence-based strategies will be implemented:
Data-drive small group instruction.
Implementation of an evidence-based program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading.

Direct-explicit reading/ELA instruction.
Explicit vocabulary instruction.
Teachers will engage families in constructing goals, monitoring progress, and supporting learning together.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If all teachers implement on-level curriculum and instruction aligned to Florida State Standards, then student proficiency rates will improve in the area of ELA. Instructional interventionists, ESE teachers, and general education teachers are all intentionally and thoughtfully trained and specialized in high-impact classroom
strategies that focus on accelerating learning for students whose performance is subordinate to that of their peers. Academically tested and proven, research-based curricular materials are effective if implemented with fidelity, thus improving student proficiency rates.

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.

Small Group Instruction: Classroom assistants will receive professional learning/support on best practices for small group instruction. These assistants will support data-based small-group instruction to help decrease the size of teacher-led intervention groups. Data-drive all group instructional will be conducted daily in ALL ELA classrooms on campus. In addition, at least three data chats will be held during the year to review instructional data, EWS, and MTSS as well as to plan data-driven instructional opportunities via whole-group and small-group instruction. Substitutes will be hired to facilitate teacher attendance at these meetings.

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

By When: Implemented during the first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Evidence-Based Program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading: We will implement SAVVAS as our evidence-based program as adopted by the district. We will hire a Tile I Instructional Coach to assist ELA teachers with instruction planning and execution. Large-screen interactive monitors will be used for whole-group instruction to provide engaging multi-sensory instruction.

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

By When: Implemented during the first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Direct-explicit ELA instruction: We will implement SAVVAS as our evidence-based program as adopted by the district. Classrooms will receive a set of recommended novels in the Florida BEST standards to supplement SAVVAS.

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

By When: Implemented during the first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Explicit vocabulary instruction: Spelling Morphology will be used in small groups to support vocabulary instruction for explicit, systematic, cumulative, multi-sensory morphology (word parts: morphemes), decoding, and encoding.

Person Responsible: Shannon Neese (shannon.neese@myoneclay.net)

By When: Implemented during the first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

Teachers engage families in constructing goals, monitoring progress, and supporting learning together: We will develop grade-level, appropriate ELA instructional support materials parents can use at home to support their students' learning throughout the year. Parental support for how to use the materials will be provided during parent and family engagement events and activities.

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

By When: Implemented during the first quarter, and monitored/supported yearlong.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

After a review of our ESSA Subgroup Data, we identified that our students with disabilities are performing below the federal percent of points index of 41%. Our students with disabilities are currently performing at 40%. Multiple measures will be initiated to aid in increasing this decline to include:
Collaborative planning with the Florida Inclusion Network.
Inclusive scheduling with the Florida Inclusion Network.
Continual professional development opportunities to increase the instructional capacity of ESE teachers and classroom teachers (i.e. ongoing professional development on new district-adopted curriculum as well as supplementary instructional programs to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, many of whom comprise our lower quartile and SWD population).
Classroom assistants will receive professional learning/support on best practices for small-group instruction; assistants will support data-based small-group instruction to help decrease the size of teacher-led intervention groups.
Targeted instructional book studies will be implemented to strengthen teacher understanding of high-leverage, research-based intervention strategies as well as strong Tier 1 instruction.

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 the results of the 2023 Spring Star Renaissance Reading Assessment, data indicated that 47% of our students (ranging from grades K-2) scored at a proficiency rate below 50.
Kindergarten: 52% of students scored at a proficiency rate below 50 on the Star Reading Assessment.
1st-Grade: 43% of students scored at a proficiency rate below 50 on the Star Reading Assessment.
2nd-Grade: 45% of students scored at a proficiency rate below 50 on the Star Reading Assessment.

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

According to the results of the 2023 Spring FAST English Language Arts Assessment, data indicated that 50% of our students (ranging from grades 3-5) scored below Level 3.
3rd-Grade: 43% of students scored below Level 3 on the statewide assessment.
4th-Grade: 48% of students scored below Level 3 on the statewide assessment.
5th-Grade: 56% of students scored below Level 3 on the statewide assessment.

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

By implementing research-based strategies and an intentional action plan, Argyle Elementary School will increase overall student proficiency from 47% to 53% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year, as measured by the 2024 Spring iReady Reading Diagnostic.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By implementing research-based strategies and an intentional action plan, Argyle Elementary School will increase overall student proficiency from 50% to 56% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year, as measured by the 2024 Spring FAST English Language Arts Assessment.

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.

Quarterly data meetings will take place, incorporating classroom teachers, ESE teachers, district reading specialists, and paraprofessionals where all data sources including FAST progress monitoring, Lexia Core5, Lexia PowerUp, Savvas, and other relevant interventions will be reviewed and triangulated to determine their effect upon our desired outcomes. As needed, our scholars may be evaluated for different and/or additional interventions. ELA PLCs will meet weekly to review/revise instruction. Observational data from administrator and/or district content coaches/specialists, including district calibration walks will be used to monitor progress The Literacy Leadership Team will meet regularly to oversee and monitor instruction. Teachers will meet with parents twice during the school year to review

student data and provide strategies to help at home. At the end of the year, evaluating the FAST data to determine if the curriculum and interventions used were effective.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Mainer, Dimitra, dimitra.mainer@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?

The following evidence-based strategies will be implemented:
Data-driven small group instruction.
Implementation of an evidence-based program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading.
Direct-explicit reading/ELA instruction.
Explicit vocabulary instruction.
Teachers will engage families in constructing goals, monitoring progress, and supporting learning together.

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?

If all teachers implement on-level curriculum and instruction aligned to Florida State Standards, then student proficiency rates will improve in the area of ELA. Instructional interventionists, ESE teachers, and general education teachers are all intentionally and thoughtfully trained and specialized in high-impact classroom
strategies that focus on accelerating learning for students whose performance is subordinate to that of their peers. Academically tested and proven, research-based curricular materials are effective if implemented with fidelity, thus improving student proficiency rates.

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
Small Group Instruction: Classroom assistants will receive professional learning/ support on best practices for small group instruction. These assistants will support data-based small-group instruction to help decrease the size of teacher-led intervention groups. Data-drive all group instructional will be conducted daily in ALL ELA classrooms on campus. In addition, at least three data chats will be held during the year to review instructional data, EWS, and MTSS as well as to plan data-driven instructional opportunities via whole-group and small-group instruction. Substitutes will be hired to facilitate teacher attendance at these meetings.	Mainer, Dimitra, dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net
Evidence-Based Program that addresses the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading: We will implement SAVVAS as our evidence-based program as adopted by the district. We will hire a Tile I Instructional Coach to assist ELA teachers with instruction planning and execution. Large-screen interactive monitors will be used for whole-group instruction to provide engaging multi-sensory instruction.	Mainer, Dimitra, dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net
Direct-explicit ELA instruction: We will implement SAVVAS as our evidence-based program as adopted by the district. Classrooms will receive a set of recommended novels in the Florida BEST standards to supplement SAVVAS.	Mainer, Dimitra, dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net
Explicit vocabulary instruction: Spelling Morphology will be used in small groups to support vocabulary instruction for explicit, systematic, cumulative, multi-sensory morphology (word parts: morphemes), decoding, and encoding.	Mainer, Dimitra, dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net
Teachers engage families in constructing goals, monitoring progress, and supporting learning together: We will develop grade-level, appropriate ELA instructional support materials parents can use at home to support their students' learning throughout the year. Parental support for how to use the materials will be provided during parent and family engagement events and activities.	Mainer, Dimitra, dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net