# Griffin Elementary School



## 2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Griffin Elementary School

3315 KATHLEEN RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

http://schools.polk-fl.net/griffin

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2017-18 Title I School** | **2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 100% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 74% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | D | F | F | D* |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Our Mission: To provide a high quality education for all students.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To establish cooperative, professional relationships with parents, staff and students in order to reach the goal of educating and nurturing the whole child.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

| Name | Title |
|------|-------|
| Missouri, Dedra | Psychologist |
| Brown, Janel | Other |
| Durrance, Melissa | Principal |
| Gilliam, Theresa | Teacher, K-12 |
| McCallum, Anne | Teacher, ESE |
| Roth, Suzie | Teacher, K-12 |
| Suttles, Mike | Other |
| Paige-Culmer , Kaila | School Counselor |
| Stinson, Roberta | Assistant Principal |

**Duties**

**Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.**

The top three areas of focus for the leadership team are planning, monitoring, and coaching. The team works collaboratively to implement and monitor the goals and strategies of the school improvement plan. The school based leadership team also reviews all school data including state assessment scores, attendance, behavior, and progress monitoring data (RtIB, iStation, STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading and Math, and the Early Warning System). The team plays an active role in discussing our school wide implementation of standards based instruction, high yield strategies, and the differentiation of instruction k-5.

### Early Warning Systems

**Year 2017-18**

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 10 | 34 | 22 | 39 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 23 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 11 | 12 | 9 | 35 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 2 | 1 | 5 | 23 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |

**Date this data was collected**
Tuesday 6/26/2018

**Year 2016-17 - As Reported**

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 20 | 13 | 9 | 28 | 12 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| One or more suspensions | 9 | 2 | 6 | 30 | 15 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 18 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Lowest ELA FSA Quintile | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 19 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 19 | 14 | 12 | 44 | 39 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 181 |

**Year 2016-17 - Updated**

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 20 | 13 | 9 | 28 | 12 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| One or more suspensions | 9 | 2 | 6 | 30 | 15 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 18 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Lowest ELA FSA Quintile | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 19 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 19 | 14 | 12 | 44 | 39 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 181 |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**Assessment & Analysis**
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

**Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?**

Proficiency and learning gains in both ELA and Math were the components that performed the lowest. This has been the trend for the past five years.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

Math learning gains in the bottom quartile showed a decline from the prior year.

**Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?**

Proficiency in ELA and math have the biggest gap when compared to the district average. District average is 47 for both areas. Griffin scored 25% proficiency in ELA and 23% proficiency in math.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?**

Learning gains and learning gains of the bottom quartile in ELA showed the most improvement. The gains in the bottom quartile demonstrates a trend from the past year.

**Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.**

Changes and actions that led to improvement include a concentrated focus on the progress of the students identified in this subgroup. Increased usage of Accelerated Reader also contributed to the improvement in learning gains. In addition, there was a change in administration this past school year.

**School Data**
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 23% | 50% | 56% | 25% | 48% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 48% | 51% | 55% | 39% | 49% | 52% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 45% | 48% | 26% | 42% | 46% |
| Math Achievement | 22% | 58% | 62% | 23% | 54% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 36% | 56% | 59% | 31% | 52% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | 44% | 47% | 30% | 41% | 46% |
| Science Achievement | 26% | 53% | 55% | 32% | 46% | 51% |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 (20) | 10 (13) | 34 (9) | 22 (28) | 39 (12) | 30 (18) | 135 (100) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (9) | 2 (2) | 3 (6) | 4 (30) | 23 (15) | 13 (23) | 45 (85) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (15) | 0 (0) | 0 (2) | 0 (18) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (13) | 30 (18) | 22 (39) | 52 (70) |

**Grade Level Data**
**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 26% | 51% | -25% | 57% | -31% |
| | 2017 | 29% | 53% | -24% | 58% | -29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 33% | 48% | -15% | 56% | -23% |
| | 2017 | 20% | 51% | -31% | 56% | -36% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 27% | 50% | -23% | 55% | -28% |
| | 2017 | 20% | 44% | -24% | 53% | -33% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 18% | 56% | -38% | 62% | -44% |
| | 2017 | 25% | 58% | -33% | 62% | -37% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

### MATH

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 04 | 2018 | 32% | 57% | -25% | 62% | -30% |
|  | 2017 | 24% | 60% | -36% | 64% | -40% |
| Same Grade Comparison |  | 8% |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |  | 7% |  |  |  |  |
| 05 | 2018 | 23% | 56% | -33% | 61% | -38% |
|  | 2017 | 5% | 47% | -42% | 57% | -52% |
| Same Grade Comparison |  | 18% |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |  | -1% |  |  |  |  |

### SCIENCE

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 05 | 2018 | 27% | 51% | -24% | 55% | -28% |
|  | 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Subgroup Data

### 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SWD | 8 | 17 | 20 | 8 | 42 | 33 | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| ELL | 14 | 53 |  | 19 | 41 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 24 | 47 | 38 | 17 | 35 | 56 | 19 |  |  |  |  |
| HSP | 26 | 55 |  | 24 | 24 |  | 42 |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 17 | 40 |  | 29 | 48 |  | 21 |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 21 | 46 | 44 | 18 | 32 | 46 | 20 |  |  |  |  |

### 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SWD | 11 | 20 | 15 | 3 | 20 | 33 | 27 |  |  |  |  |
| ELL | 13 | 24 |  | 23 | 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLK | 18 | 29 | 33 | 11 | 25 | 38 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| HSP | 19 | 26 |  | 26 | 39 |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 34 | 33 |  | 20 | 23 | 40 | 38 |  |  |  |  |
| FRL | 24 | 29 | 26 | 16 | 28 | 52 | 16 |  |  |  |  |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement
Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

| Areas of Focus: | |
| --- | --- |

| Activity #1 | |
| --- | --- |
| **Title** | Literacy |
| **Rationale** | Only 25% of the students are proficient on the FSA ELA. |
| **Intended Outcome** | Increase ELA proficiency to 35% as measured by the FSA ELA. |
| **Point Person** | Lacey Jurnigan (lacey.jurnigan@polk-fl.net) |

| Action Step | |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | Foundational Literacy PD<br>Disciplinary Literacy PD<br>Great Habits, Great Readers Book Study (PLC)<br>Collaborative Planning/PLC<br>Students will meet or exceed their Accelerated Reader goal<br>Focus on teaching tier 2 vocabulary words in the content areas<br>Power Hour- Students will participate in spelling inventories through Words Their Way<br>Analyzing student work samples ie. standards based, writing samples, etc. frequently<br>Recognizing staff who come to or remain at the school<br>Instructional Supplies for Curriculum Planning, PD, and small group intervention<br>Extended Learning program will utilize Florida Ready materials for remediation.<br>School will participate in a school wide book study on the book "The Lemonade War" to increase student engagement in literacy |
| **Person Responsible** | Lacey Jurnigan (lacey.jurnigan@polk-fl.net) |

| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | Frequent classroom observations , formative assessments, and analysis of student work samples will be used to monitor effectiveness. In addition, data from Istation and STAR will be used to monitor effectiveness. |
| **Person Responsible** | Melissa Durrance (melissa.durrance@polk-fl.net) |

| Activity #2 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Math |
| **Rationale** | Only 23% of students are proficient in Math. |
| **Intended Outcome** | Proficiency in math will increase to 35% |
| **Point Person** | Laurie Croft (laurie.croft@polk-fl.net) |
| Action Step | |
| **Description** | Focus of number fluency<br>Students will increase their automaticity in number fluency to be able to complete more complex math problems.<br>Disaggregate FSA data to determine areas of weakness in the reporting categories<br>Integrating literacy standards into the math block to allow students to better comprehend word problems<br>Analyzing student work samples, ie. students writing to explain how they solved math problems, standards based, etc.<br>Collaborative planning/PLC<br>Focus on tier 2 vocabulary<br>Students will use tier 2 vocabulary in their descriptive writing and in class discussions. |
| **Person Responsible** | Laurie Croft (laurie.croft@polk-fl.net) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| **Description** | Formative assessment data, classroom observation, and analyzing student work samples will be used to monitor effectiveness. Progress monitoring data from IStation and STAR math will also be used to monitor effectiveness. |
| **Person Responsible** | Melissa Durrance (melissa.durrance@polk-fl.net) |

| Activity #3 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Discipline |
| **Rationale** | There are 18 students that have received more than two office discipline referrals. |
| **Intended Outcome** | To decrease the number of referrals per student by 50%. |
| **Point Person** | Janel Brown (janel.brown@polk-fl.net) |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | Mindful Schools to assist with Tier 2/3 behavior interventions and to support and coach new teachers with classroom management.<br>CHAMPs- Students will follow the CHAMPs expectations.<br>PBIS<br>Mentors for the students<br>Staff awareness PD for teaching students from poverty<br>Tier 1 Behavior support will be CHAMPs and PBIS<br>Students who receive more than 2 office discipline referrals will be referred to the problem solving team. |
| **Person Responsible** | Janel Brown (janel.brown@polk-fl.net) |

| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | Disaggregation of data from the Early Warning System<br>CHAMPs rubric used during walkthroughs<br>Student daily point sheets (for Tier 2) |
| **Person Responsible** | Roberta Stinson (roberta.stinson@polk-fl.net) |

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

**Additional Title I Requirements**
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

We will continue to grow our School Advisory Council. We will also hold three Community Assessment Team meetings to inform and involve parents. In addition, we will host ten parent evenings in which we will share student progress and build capacity with the parents. Social media and monthly newsletters will be used to share opportunities for parents to become involved with school happenings.

**PFEP Link**
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

Teachers are provided with lesson plans from Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBiS) that are tied to the school-wide expectations and CHAMPS. The lesson plans address various social skills that are taught and modeled through daily lessons. Students have an opportunity to practice the social skills within the classroom community as well as throughout the campus.
Mindful Schools Project is providing Griffin with a social-emotional learning program called Second Step and will be helping with the professional development and implementation process. Second Step has a special curriculum for each grade level.
The School Psychologist and School Counselor provides small group social skills lessons for targeted students needing additional support. Members of the PBIS team work with students who have been identified as having academic and behavioral needs. Students on Tier 2 check in and out with their mentor on a daily basis to set goals and discuss their progress. Polk Vision has also partnered with Griffin to help increase student attendance.
Individual counseling is provided for students who require more intensive support.
Leadership team will monitor the Early Warning System to identify and target students that have more two indicators to provide additional supports.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

Griffin's Pre-K works closely with the kindergarten team to align curriculum to ensure students are prepared to transition successfully.

Middle school representatives visit Griffin to hold informational meetings to help parents and student prepare for the transition.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

In order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes, the leadership team analyzed performance data and aligned academic coaches and personnel to meet those specific needs. Title One Federal dollars and local district allocations are utilized to secure additional support personnel and resources. The academic coaches guide collaborative planning and provide coaching and modeling for teachers. Administration and the leadership team monitors the alignment of the resources on a weekly basis through analysis of assessment data, observations, walk through data, feedback from academic coaches and other personnel. The problem solving process is utilized to make decisions and adjustments as needed.
In addition, to assist with our migrant population, we collaborate with the Migrant Liason and Hearth is used as a resource for our homeless students. Polk Vision has partnered with Griffin to provide support, resources, and data analysis to help increase our student attendance with their "Strive for Less than Five" program. Mindful School Project is assisting with the implementation of our social-emotional learning program. In addition, a new position of Behavior Interventionist has been added to help support students and teachers with classroom management. This position will also act as a parent liaison to provide with resources to increase positive behavior and academic success.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

N/A

## Part V: Budget

| | |
|---|---:|
| **Total:** | **$164,706.00** |