Grove Park Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Grove Park Elementary School

1643 MILLER ST, Orange Park, FL 32073

http://gpe.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Justin Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2019

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (44%) 2014-15: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Grove Park Elementary School

1643 MILLER ST, Orange Park, FL 32073

http://gpe.oneclay.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	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	67%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Grove Park Elementary is to prepare students to become successful and productive global thinkers in an ever-changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Grove Park Elementary School is to inspire all students to become respectful, responsible, and safe citizens who are independent thinkers and lifelong achievers.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jackson, Stephanie	Principal	Responsible for all leadership activities and vision for the school.
Rodifer, Kellie	Instructional Coach	
Godwin, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Steinfurth, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	
Manzi, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	
Kennard, Whitney	Teacher, K-12	
Thai, Luuly	School Counselor	
Ryan, Melodie	Administrative Support	
Spassoff, Mariah	Assistant Principal	
Gorman, Keri	Teacher, ESE	
Jefferson, Justina	Teacher, K-12	
Muffley, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Gillis, Devan	Teacher, K-12	
Benjamin, Crystal	Teacher, K-12	
Freeman, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
Bailey, Dorothy	Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	54	59	57	63	67	69	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	448
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	21	24	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
25

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 8/15/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

Prior Year - 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	5	14	7	11	12	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	65%	57%	42%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	62%	58%	60%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	54%	53%	45%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	43%	70%	63%	45%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	41%	66%	62%	54%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	56%	51%	41%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	65%	53%	29%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	54 (0)	59 (0)	57 (0)	63 (0)	67 (0)	69 (0)	79 (0)	448 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (4)	0 (3)	0 (5)	0 (12)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)	7 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	21 (4)	24 (3)	28 (5)	76 (12)

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	48%	68%	-20%	58%	-10%
	2018	51%	68%	-17%	57%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	64%	-25%	58%	-19%
	2018	30%	62%	-32%	56%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	34%	62%	-28%	56%	-22%
	2018	40%	59%	-19%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
06	2019	53%	64%	-11%	54%	-1%
	2018	43%	63%	-20%	52%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	71%	-26%	62%	-17%
	2018	57%	70%	-13%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	69%	-36%	64%	-31%
	2018	46%	66%	-20%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2019	52%	64%	-12%	60%	-8%
	2018	47%	65%	-18%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
06	2019	38%	70%	-32%	55%	-17%
	2018	30%	68%	-38%	52%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	63%	-22%	53%	-12%
	2018	49%	64%	-15%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	24	34	33	14	39	53	20				
ELL	35	86		35	53						
BLK	34	37	38	35	40	43	28				
HSP	48	51		51	45		40				
MUL	33			45							
WHT	63	61		48	37		68				
FRL	40	45	30	38	42	50	47				

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	21	41	24	23	38	41	45				
ELL	25	60		44	53						
BLK	37	48	43	40	46	37	47				
HSP	45	48	36	55	67		58				
MUL	20			40							
WHT	52	50		52	36		59				
FRL	41	48	44	46	49	44	54				

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	25	47	41	22	38	36	15				
ELL	38	62		54	69						
BLK	32	53	43	37	49	35	17				
HSP	43	63	36	49	57	50	29				
MUL	55			36							
WHT	53	67	60	51	60		46				
FRL	42	61	42	38	50	37	18				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	341

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

For our school level data, our overall ELA L25 proficiency was 33%, a decrease of 9% (2018=42%).
Our science achievement overall proficiency was 42%, a decrease of 9% (2018=52%).
For our grade level data, our 4th grade cohort dropped the most in proficiency in both ELA (-12%) and Math (-24%).
For our subgroup data, SWD had the lowest performance in Math Achievement at 14%.
Contributing Factors:
*Need for more social/emotional support for students.
*Change of curriculum mid-year for ELA in grades 3rd-5th.

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

Science Achievement had the lowest performance with an average drop percentage of 17.
There was a new teacher instructing in this area, which was a factor that contributed to this decline.

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 greatest gap compared to the state average was our math L25% , a -21% difference.
Factors:

Attendance below 90%
Level 1 achievement on previous state assessment

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

The most improvement occurred within the math L25 with an increase of 8% from 41% to 49%. New actions included increasing small group instruction, utilizing print copied of iReady lessons for remediation and improved data analysis and intervention.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

There are 5 students in 6th grade that have 2 or more indicators.

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

1. Science Achievement
2. Positive Behavior Incentive Program
3. Differentiated Small Group Instruction w/Fidelity
4. Fidelity of Core Curriculum
5. Growth of Subgroups (Black/African American Students, Multi-racial, Economically Disadvantaged, Student with Disabilities)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Positive Behavior
Rationale	GPE will be working with multiple resources like: PBIS Rewards, the 7 Mindsets, Growing Great Gators program to help decrease the amount of behavior referrals and increase a positive learning environment.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The 2018-2019 school year there were 266 referrals. Our goal is to decrease the number of referrals by 20%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Rachel Freeman (rachel.freeman1@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Growing Great Gators G3 Tier 1 Program (PBIS Rewards) 2. 7 Mindsets Implementation 3. Behavior Flow Chart 4. Buddy Bench 5. Character Trait Assemblies 6. Positive Referrals 7. Gator Girls and Gator Gents Mentor Program 8.Zones of Regulation 9. Kelso's Choices 10. Sanford Harmony 11. G3 tickets and store 12. Hero Program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we implement our behavior flow chart, execute our PBIS strategies along with incorporating the 7 Mindsets, and continue creating a culturally responsive teaching environment we should see a decrease in the number of referrals and an increase in a positive learning environment.
Action Step	
Description	1. 7 mindsets training and implementation into daily schedule 2. G3 green tickets and store incentives implemented among all grade levels and throughout the school 3. G3 red tickets and Store incentives near holidays and end of the year when behavior is heightened 4. Monthly Character Trait ceremony to promote positive behavior 5. Positive referrals and the Board of Distinction to recognize above and beyond positive behavior 6. PBIS monthly meetings to discuss the behaviors and culture of the school
Person Responsible	Rachel Freeman (rachel.freeman1@myoneclay.net)

#2	
Title	Differentiated Small Group Instruction
Rationale	If we strategically plan and continually implement differentiated, small group instruction using multiple data points, student achievement will improve in all subject areas.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase 3rd-5th grade ELA proficiency to 50%+ Increase 3rd-5th grade Mathematics proficiency to 55%+ Increase 5th grade Science proficiency to 55%+ Improve Learning Gains in 3rd-5th grade ELA to 52%+ Improve Learning Gains in 3rd-5th grade Mathematics to 54%+ Improve L25% Learning Gains in 3rd-5th grade ELA to 52%+ Improve L25% Learning Gains in 3rd-5th grade Mathematics to 53%+
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mariah Spassoff (mariah.spassoff@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will participate in job-embedded professional development focused on Response to Intervention (MTSS), specifically data-based decision making, resources and materials, and progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The longevity of support and training over a year's time will help ensure the appropriate implementation of remedial and enrichment plans, and the targeted instruction to meet the needs of all students.
Action Step	
Description	1. I-Ready Training and support in the area of small group instruction (bi-weekly) 2. Quarterly Data Chats with extended time for planning. Substitute coverage for the 2.5 hour data chats/planning sessions will be funded with Title 1 funds. 3. Utilize weekly progress monitoring tools to set goals and track individual student achievement. Title 1 funds were used to purchase intervention resources (Math Intervention Kits and The Reading Strategies Book) that will be used for tracking individual student achievement. 4. Conduct ongoing teacher-student data chats, and student-parent data chats. 5. Bi-weekly support from the district I-Ready representative/specialist 6. Reading interventionists was purchased with Title 1 funds to support targeted small group instruction. 7. Math interventionist is used to support students in small group instruction.
Person Responsible	Stephanie Jackson (stephanie.jackson@myoneclay.net)

#3	
Title	Implementation of Core Curriculum
Rationale	If all teachers implement standards-aligned core instruction with grade-appropriate tasks, then student achievement will increase.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase 3rd-5th grade ELA proficiency to 50%+ Increase 3rd-5th grade Mathematics proficiency to 55%+ Increase 5th grade Science proficiency to 55%+ Improve Learning Gains in 3rd-5th grade ELA to 52%+ Improve Learning Gains in 3rd-5th grade Mathematics to 54%+ Improve L25% Learning Gains in 3rd-5th grade ELA to 52%+ Improve L25% Learning Gains in 3rd-5th grade Mathematics to 53%+
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mariah Spassoff (mariah.spassoff@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	All teachers will implement, standards-aligned instruction that incorporates grade appropriate rigorous tasks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	When our assignments provide students sufficient opportunities to work with grade-level standards, engage with subject-specific critical practices, and connect academic work to real-world issues and contexts students are better prepared to master grade level standards.

Action Step	
Description	1. Vertical Team Committees will help identify necessary pre-requisite skills to target the needs of students, and vertically align standards-based content 2. Learning Walks/Lesson Studies with teachers, curriculum coach, and admin to model best practices 3. Implementation of looking at student work (LASW) protocol 4. Parent learning opportunities and resources provided through Title 1 events, #Title1TipsforParents on FB, monthly newsletters that provide grade specific content 5. Provide students the opportunity for productive struggles and perseverance in reasoning and problem solving through effective feedback. 6. Curriculum coach will provide professional development for creating a student-centered environment that incorporates a variety of collaborative active learning strategies to increase student engagement.
Person Responsible	Stephanie Jackson (stephanie.jackson@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.

Grove Park Elementary is committed to fostering healthy partnerships with parents. We are aware of the importance of building and sustaining strong relationships with our parents to ultimately increase student success, both academically and socially. Throughout the year, parents will have the opportunity to participate in a variety of events that will allow them to learn about grade level content, tips for school success at home and how they can be more involved with school-wide decisions. Parent, student and teacher compacts help to foster a positive relationship between school and home in order to better meet the needs of all students.

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.

Grove Park has a guidance counselor who is available to discuss any concerns students might have. Through a partnership with Clay Behavioral, an on site Licensed Mental Health Counselor is available to students in need. Grove Park also offers a mentoring program to our 4-6th grade students in which community based mentors come to the school during lunch to support students academically and socially.

Proactive Character Education/Emotional Regulation strategies are taught in guidance lessons, resource classes, and general education classrooms. Social Thinking, Kelso's Choices, Sanford Harmony, and Zones of Regulation are utilized as resources school wide. Classroom teachers are given a manual of ready-to-teach lesson plans differentiated for Primary and Intermediate levels. As a Seven Mindsets full implementation school, teachers have access to the Seven Mindsets portal for resources to utlize in the classroom.

Every quarter our Student Success Team monitors at-risk students based on the EWS for attendance and other factors that may impact student success. As students are identified, they are assigned to appropriate tiers of support based upon need. Students with attendance issues are invited to join our HEROES program, academic at-risk students are invited to participate in our RISE program and/or Gator Guides mentoring program. GPE also offers teacher sponsored mentoring programs for our 5th-6th grade students through both our GatorGirls and GatorGents club, which foster personal development skills in the area of leadership, service to others and empowerment.

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

For our incoming Kindergartners, we held a transition event through Title 1 which was our Kindergarten Ice Cream Social. At this event, parents were able to meet the kindergarten teachers and administrators, and were able to have a Q and A session with them. Families also took a tour of the school, and students were screened to determine the students' acquisition of specific skills and knowledge. The FLKRS assessment is also given within the first 30 days of school to determine school readiness and the child's ability to form meaningful relationships.

The sixth grade teachers, along with our guidance counselor work closely with the junior high schools to inform and prepare future students. OPJH administrators and/or counselor visit GPE in the spring to speak with students about junior high expectations and course selection information. Two ideas we are looking into are the ideas of having our sixth graders visit the OPJH campus for that transition talk and possibly graduation being held on their campus as well.

End of the year articulation meetings are held for the upcoming school year for all PreK (if applicable) and 6th grade students. Pre-kindergarten and Kindergarten teachers collaborate on assigning and assessing students based on their academic and developmental needs. The articulation meeting assists kindergarten teachers in ensuring each child successfully transitions to our elementary school program. The articulation meetings for 6th graders mark the first time that the student becomes actively involved in the IEP team process. Decisions are also made regarding best placement options and level of support anticipated at the junior high level.

Kindergarten Round Up offers families with incoming kindergarten students the opportunity to pre-register for kindergarten. Students gain exposure to their new school and are provided a bag of books and other resources designed to help them prepare for kindergarten.

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.

School administration and coaches meet on a weekly basis to determine instructional needs of the staff (ie. formal coaching cycles, need for PD, etc.). Grade level teams will meet quarterly with admin and coaches to analyze current data, and work on creating appropriate instructional decisions to meet the needs of our students.

The Intervention Team meets monthly to help guide and collaborate with teachers about the MTSS process and discuss student progress based on response to interventions. The team will also ensure that student updates are documented once a month in FOCUS and Unify.

Push-In assistants are utilized to help provide daily targeted small group instruction in the regular education classroom for both reading and math for all grade levels. Their lessons and focus are determined by the regular education teacher, who oversees lesson implementation and effectiveness. Student progress is monitored through student work samples/anecdotal notes.

Supplemental use of resources such as Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) is monitored by the Instructional Coach and there is a formal check in/check out procedure in place for these materials. Additional reading and math resources are available to teachers on an as needed basis using a similar check-out system.

The School Advisory Committee works collaboratively with school leaders to help make school-based decisions that determine appropriate use of funds, resources and personnel to impact student achievement. This committee will meet at least 3 times per year, but additional meetings will be scheduled as the need arises.

GPE offers in-school remediation to all students who are performing below grade level. Extended Day Tutoring is provided to our third through sixth grade students in need of additional remediation in the areas of reading, math and science.

See section 1.a above for additional information contained in our Parent and Family Engagement Plan.

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

The sixth grade teachers and guidance counselors work closely with the junior high schools to inform and prepare future students. OPJH administrators visit GPE in the spring to speak with students about junior high expectations and course selection information. This course selection process can be a crucial first step towards making goals for college and career.

GPE has many mentors for students in need who are members of the local Rotary Club. The relationships built help to foster an understanding of life after school and to share the mentors experiences and lessons learned.

Our Achieve program also offers an opportunity for students to select a future career as part of an interest inventory. This helps tailor article suggestions for students that match their career interests. Students are also encouraged to meet their grade level College and Career Ready expectation that shows they are acquiring skills and traits that have been determined to lead to success in college and future careers.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Positive Behavior				$0.00
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Differentiated Small Group Instruction**				**$700.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		140-Substitute Teachers	0232 - Grove Park Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$700.00
			Notes: Substitute will be secured so teachers can meet with coaches and administrators for quarterly data chats and extended planning sessions.			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Implementation of Core Curriculum**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$700.00**