
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Greenville Elementary School

729 SW OVERSTREET AVE, Greenville, FL 32331

<http://ges.madison.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Wallace Selph

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
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 Madison County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Greenville Elementary School

729 SW OVERSTREET AVE, Greenville, FL 32331

<http://ges.madison.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">85%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Madison 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.

Greenville Elementary School's mission is to provide a safe and challenging learning environment through the use of effective teaching strategies and to inspire students to use their creativity, individuality, and minds to succeed beyond the elementary level.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Greenville Elementary School will produce successful and well-rounded students who are equipped to handle both academic and life challenges with a positive attitude and determination.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sneed, Michael	Principal	The principal has the responsibility of setting high expectations, monitoring standards based instruction and grade-level assessments, setting and monitoring data driven goals and benchmarks, developing a family- like culture, and maximizing the leadership abilities of staff members.
Jackson, Natalie	Teacher, ESE	Support staff to ensure they are using effective teaching strategies that will assist Tier 1, 2, and 3 students. Provide support services to students with disabilities. Oversee MTSS/RTI process. Provide resources for teachers and parents to accommodate student learning.
Collins, Joi	Teacher, K-12	Develop and execute lesson plans that align with fourth and fifth grade Florida Standards. Implement and maintain eminent expectations for a productive classroom environment. Sustain one-on-one attention to individual students, while maintaining focus of the entire class. Establish differentiated learning environment to meet the needs of all pupils. Encourage students to exhibit supreme work ethic at all times. Incorporate technology within the classroom. Maintain an effective rapport with parents on student performance and behavior issues through written, phone or email. Collaborate with other educators to deliver instruction to a specific group of students.
Hopkins, Mannika	Teacher, K-12	Develop and execute lesson plans that align with third grade Florida Standards. Implement and maintain eminent expectations for a productive classroom environment. Sustain one-on-one attention to individual students, while maintaining focus of the entire class. Establish differentiated learning environment to meet the needs of all pupils. Encourage students to exhibit supreme work ethic at all times. Incorporate technology within the classroom. Maintain an effective rapport with parents on student performance and behavior through written, phone or email. Collaborate with other educators to deliver instruction to a specific group of students.
Jones, Tracie	Teacher, K-12	Develop and execute lesson plans that align with fourth and fifth grade Florida Standards. Implement and maintain eminent expectations for a productive classroom environment. Sustain one-on-one attention to individual students, while maintaining focus of the entire class. Establish differentiated learning environment to meet the needs of all pupils. Encourage students to exhibit supreme work ethic at all times. Incorporate technology within the classroom. Maintain an effective rapport with parents on student performance and behavior through written, phone or email. Collaborate with other educators to deliver instruction to a specific group of students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Wallace Selph

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

6

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	18	13	9	16	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	5	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	35	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/4/2020

Prior Year - 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	
Number of students enrolled	24	20	17	24	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	5	0	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	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	10	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
---------------------------------	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	

Number of students enrolled	24	20	17	24	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Course failure in ELA or Math	7	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
-------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	5	0	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	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	10	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
---------------------------------	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	44%	52%	57%	44%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	41%	50%	58%	44%	47%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	53%	0%	47%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	40%	57%	63%	75%	72%	61%
Math Learning Gains	31%	49%	62%	61%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	43%	51%	0%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	56%	53%	33%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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	2019	6%	40%	-34%	58%	-52%
	2018	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		-94%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	50%	31%	58%	23%
	2018	79%	48%	31%	56%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
05	2019	44%	46%	-2%	56%	-12%
	2018	29%	38%	-9%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	18%	45%	-27%	62%	-44%
	2018	100%	60%	40%	62%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		-82%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	51%	-8%	64%	-21%
	2018	79%	56%	23%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2019	56%	44%	12%	60%	-4%
	2018	53%	44%	9%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	42%	14%	53%	3%
	2018	12%	38%	-26%	55%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		44%				
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
BLK	47	42		42	31		60				
WHT	30			30							
FRL	44	48		41	36		55				

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
BLK	71	69		77	42		15				
FRL	70	65		80	50		15				

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
BLK	41	40		71	60		36				
FRL	46	45		71	60						

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	210
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
---------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
-----------------------	--

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	30
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 the 2018-2019 school year our third grade ELA was the lowest performance component. There had been several changes in leadership for the previous years. The teachers did not receive a VAM score of highly effective after having 100% proficiency in 3rd grade ELA the year before. Since the 3rd grade teacher VAM rating is based on i-Ready performance there was a strong focus on i-Ready.

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

Third grade ELA proficiency decreased by 94% from the previous school year. The contributing factors are mentioned above as there was a stronger focus on i-Ready by the teachers due to a desire to improve their VAM scores.

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.

Third grade ELA was also the component that showed the largest gap when compared to the state average, with a difference of -52%. The contributing factors are mentioned above as there was a stronger focus on i-Ready by the teachers due to a desire to improve their VAM scores.

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

Fifth grade science showed the most improvement from the previous year, growing from 12% in 2018 to 56% in 2019. For this school year the teacher was allotted 90 minutes per day for science instruction. The school also provided after-school tutoring.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

One area of concern was the number of Kindergarten retainees for the 2019-2020 school year.

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

1. 3rd - 5th Grade ELA
2. 5th Grade Math
3. Subgroup proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2019 FSA results along with our i-Ready Fall diagnostic, we have decided to focus on 3rd - 5th grade ELA. The 2019 3rd grade students scored 6% proficiency in ELA. They are now 5th graders and on their fall i-Ready diagnostic test, 100% scored at risk for tier 3. The current 3rd grade students have 57% of students at risk for tier 3 and the 4th grade students have 67% at risk for tier 3.

Measurable Outcome: The school plans to achieve a minimum of 45% proficiency in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michael Sneed (michael.sneed@mcsbfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy that will be implemented for this area of focus is standards based instruction and grade-level material provided through the FLVS curriculum.
School wide phonics program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Standards-based instruction: focus on standard mastery and interventions.
Differentiated instruction: i-Ready, small grouping, and school-wide intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

During mandatory school intervention block, evidence-based strategies will be intentionally implemented by each teacher.

Person Responsible: Natalie Jackson (natalie.jackson@mcsbfl.us)

District Reading Coach will monitor teachers' implementation of grade level material in the classroom and give specific feedback of teacher effectiveness, and possible suggestions for improvement.

Person Responsible: Michael Sneed (michael.sneed@mcsbfl.us)

Students will receive at least 60 minutes a week on i-Ready in ELA to increase proficiency in struggling areas.

Person Responsible: Michael Sneed (michael.sneed@mcsbfl.us)

Weekly data meetings will be held with each teacher to analyze current student performance and guide intervention planning for each week.

Person Responsible: Michael Sneed (michael.sneed@mcsbfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to the 2019 FSA data we will focus on 5th grade math. In 2019 our current 5th graders were in the 3rd grade and were 18% proficient in math. On our most recent i-Ready diagnostic 63% of our students demonstrated performance that was at risk for Tier 3. 38% were Tier 2. We do not have any current 5th graders who are on grade level in mathematics.

Measurable Outcome: The school plans to achieve a minimum of 45% proficiency in 5th grade math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michael Sneed (michael.sneed@mcsbfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy that will be implemented for this area of focus is standards based instruction and grade-level material provided through the FLVS curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Standards-based instruction: focus on standard mastery and interventions. Differentiated instruction: i-Ready, small grouping, and school-wide intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

During mandatory school intervention block, evidence-based strategies will be intentionally implemented by each teacher.

Person Responsible Natalie Jackson (natalie.jackson@mcsbfl.us)

Students will receive at least 60 minutes a week on i-Ready in Math to increase proficiency in struggling areas.

Person Responsible Michael Sneed (michael.sneed@mcsbfl.us)

Weekly data meetings will be held with each teacher to analyze current student performance and guide intervention planning for each week.

Person Responsible Michael Sneed (michael.sneed@mcsbfl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to White

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Caucasian subgroup will increase their proficiency as they had a federal index of 30%.
Measurable Outcome:	Caucasian student subgroup will be 45% proficient in ELA and Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Sneed (michael.sneed@mcsbfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy that will be implemented for this area of focus is standards based instruction and grade-level material provided through the FLVS curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based instruction: focus on standard mastery and interventions. Differentiated instruction: i-Ready, small grouping, and school-wide intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

During mandatory school intervention block, evidence-based strategies will be intentionally implemented by each teacher.

Person Responsible Natalie Jackson (natalie.jackson@mcsbfl.us)

District Reading Coach will monitor teachers' implementation of grade level material in the classroom and give specific feedback of teacher effectiveness, and possible suggestions for improvement.

Person Responsible Michael Sneed (michael.sneed@mcsbfl.us)

Students will receive at least 60 minutes a week on i-Ready in ELA to increase proficiency in struggling areas.

Person Responsible Michael Sneed (michael.sneed@mcsbfl.us)

Weekly data meetings will be held with each teacher to analyze current student performance and guide intervention planning for each week.

Person Responsible Michael Sneed (michael.sneed@mcsbfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

In addition to our areas of focus, the leadership team will also be addressing the number of Kindergarten students who are retained each year. With a clear focus on formative assessment and early intervention we will work to decrease the number of students retained in Kindergarten by 25%.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by establishing effective communication through the use of Class Dojo, Facebook and an automated phone service. Additionally, the school will host events, such PTO meetings to ensure parents are aware of school events. We will also have Parent Family Night where we will discuss student progress and suggestions on how to implement strategies which will assist in student achievement.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: White	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00