Grove Park Elementary School

2020-21 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: 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)	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%)
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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 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	74%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wright, Melissa	Principal	Responsible for all leadership activities and vision for the school.
Rodifer, Kellie	Instructional Coach	The Curriculum Coach is responsible directly to the principal for managing core content instruction as specified in the NGSSS/Common Core Standards and related curriculum maps. The Curriculum Coach will be a mentor and staff development facilitator for K-12 and ESE teachers.
Godwin, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Develops lesson plans which meet established school standards, adapts and reassesses lesson plans to meet specific student needs, comply with newly implemented guidelines or rules, update relevant information and include new developments in education, perform other duties as requested by the Principal.
Steinfurth, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	Develops lesson plans which meet established school standards, adapts and reassesses lesson plans to meet specific student needs, comply with newly implemented guidelines or rules, update relevant information and include new developments in education, perform other duties as requested by the Principal.
Manzi, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	Develops lesson plans which meet established school standards, adapts and reassesses lesson plans to meet specific student needs, comply with newly implemented guidelines or rules, update relevant information and include new developments in education, perform other duties as requested by the Principal.
Kennard, Whitney	Teacher, K-12	Develops lesson plans which meet established school standards, adapts and reassesses lesson plans to meet specific student needs, comply with newly implemented guidelines or rules, update relevant information and include new developments in education, perform other duties as requested by the Principal.
Thai, Luuly	School Counselor	1. Plan and develop the school counseling program of the school. 2. Provide the opportunity for individual and group counseling to all students. 3. Provide leadership and consultation in the school's program of pupil appraisal. 4. Provide assistance to students and parents in educational and occupational planning for the student. 5. Coordinate and initiate referrals ofstudentsto otherspecialistsin studentservices and to public and private agencies in the community. 6. May serve as a consultant for ESE screenings, staffing, and follow-up procedures.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		7. Provide placement services to students by assisting them in making appropriate choices of school subjects/courses of study, and in making transitions from one school level to another, one school to another, and from school to employment. 8. Consult with parents and act as resource person on the growth and development of their children. 9. Work closely with members of the administrative/teaching staff to the end that all school resources are directed toward meeting individual students' needs. 10. Assist in disseminating research findings to school staff members. 11. Interpret counseling and guidance services of the school to school staff members, parents, and community.
Ryan, Melodie	Administrative Support	Performs varied secretarial and clerical duties such as typing/word processing, compiling information and preparing routine reports and maintaining related records and files.
Spassoff, Mariah	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is directly responsible to the school principal. He/she serves in a staff relations with other assistant administrators in the school.
Jefferson, Justina	Teacher, K-12	Develops lesson plans which meet established school standards, adapts and reassesses lesson plans to meet specific student needs, comply with newly implemented guidelines or rules, update relevant information and include new developments in education, perform other duties as requested by the Principal.
Muffley, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Develops lesson plans which meet established school standards, adapts and reassesses lesson plans to meet specific student needs, comply with newly implemented guidelines or rules, update relevant information and include new developments in education, perform other duties as requested by the Principal.
Gillis, Devan	Teacher, K-12	Develops lesson plans which meet established school standards, adapts and reassesses lesson plans to meet specific student needs, comply with newly implemented guidelines or rules, update relevant information and include new developments in education, perform other duties as requested by the Principal.
Freeman, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	Develops lesson plans which meet established school standards, adapts and reassesses lesson plans to meet specific student needs, comply with newly implemented guidelines or rules, update relevant information and

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		include new developments in education, perform other duties as requested by the Principal.
Bailey, Dorothy	Teacher, K-12	Develops lesson plans which meet established school standards, adapts and reassesses lesson plans to meet specific student needs, comply with newly implemented guidelines or rules, update relevant information and include new developments in education, perform other duties as requested by the Principal.
Ragan, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	Develops lesson plans which meet established school standards, adapts and reassesses lesson plans to meet specific student needs, comply with newly implemented guidelines or rules, update relevant information and include new developments in education, perform other duties as requested by the Principal.
Green, Courtney	Teacher, ESE	The teacher is responsible directly to the principal for the instruction, supervision, and evaluation of students.
Greico, Christina	Teacher, K-12	Develops lesson plans which meet established school standards, adapts and reassesses lesson plans to meet specific student needs, comply with newly implemented guidelines or rules, update relevant information and include new developments in education, perform other duties as requested by the Principal.
Caballero, Kyle	Teacher, K-12	Develops lesson plans which meet established school standards, adapts and reassesses lesson plans to meet specific student needs, comply with newly implemented guidelines or rules, update relevant information and include new developments in education, perform other duties as requested by the Principal.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Justin Jones

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.*
1

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
32

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)	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%)
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.	

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	58	58	60	62	62	57	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	427
Attendance below 90 percent	7	9	6	7	7	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
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	0	0	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	0	3	2	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	2	3	4	6	8	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

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	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	

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	54	59	57	63	67	69	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	448
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	21	12	15	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	

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%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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	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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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				

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
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
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%	1
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%	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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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 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.

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.

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?

The two potential areas of concern are the number of students in grades 3-6 scoring a Level 1 on the statewide assessment (76 students) and the number of students with attendance below 90% (80 students).

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

1. Increase student achievement in all academic areas through fidelity of core curriculum
2. Positive Behavior Incentive Program
3. Differentiated Small Group Instruction w/Fidelity
4.Growth of Subgroups (Black/African American Students, Multi-racial, Economically Disadvantaged, Student with Disabilities)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	GPE will be working with multiple resources like: PBIS Rewards, the 7 Mindsets, Growing Great Gators program to help decrease the overall amount of behavior referrals in all subgroups, and increase a positive learning environment across campus.
Measurable Outcome:	The 2019-2020 school year there were 177 referrals. Our goal is to decrease the number of overall referrals by 20%, including our ESSA subgroup populations. SWD- 3 students totaled 20, AA- 21 students totaled 74 referrals,
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 and cool down kits in each room 9. G3 tickets and store 10. Hero Program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement our behavior flow chart, execute our PBIS strategies along with incorporating the 7 Mindsets, utilize our poster maker to create visual reminders of G3 expectations campus-wide, 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 Steps to Implement

Implement Culturally Responsive Teaching strategies and 7 Mindsets framework daily. Literature and resources will be intentionally selected that are relevant to our subgroups (Black/African American, Economically Disadvantaged Students, Multiracial Students, and Students with Disabilities).

Person Responsible	Rachel Freeman (rachel.freeman1@myoneclay.net)

G3 green tickets and store incentives implemented among all grade levels and throughout the school, as well as use of G3 red tickets near holidays and end of the year when behavior is heightened

Person Responsible	Rachel Freeman (rachel.freeman1@myoneclay.net)

Monthly Character Trait Ceremony to promote positive behavior

Person Responsible	Luuly Thai (luuly.thai@myoneclay.net)

Positive referrals and the Board of Distinction to recognize above and beyond positive behavior

Person Responsible	Melissa Wright (melissa.wright@myoneclay.net)

PBIS monthly meetings to discuss the behaviors and culture of the school.

Person Responsible Rachel Freeman (rachel.freeman1@myoneclay.net)

Implement book studies for various SEL topics.

Person Responsible Melissa Wright (melissa.wright@myoneclay.net)

Implement Zones of Regulation while providing kinesthetic tools (Calm Down Kits) to help students self-regulate their emotions

Person Responsible Luuly Thai (luuly.thai@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the school data from 2018 and 2019 FSA results, Grove Park is consistently falling below the county and state averages in Math and ELA. If all teachers implement standards-aligned core instruction with grade-appropriate tasks, then student achievement will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase 3rd-6th grade ELA proficiency to 50%+ Increase 3rd-6th grade Mathematics proficiency to 55%+ Increase 5th grade Science proficiency to 55%+ Improve Learning Gains in 3rd-6th grade ELA to 52%+ Improve Learning Gains in 3rd-6th grade Mathematics to 54%+ Improve L25% Learning Gains in 3rd-6th grade ELA to 52%+ Improve L25% Learning Gains in 3rd-6th grade Mathematics to 53%+
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Wright (melissa.wright@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 Steps to Implement

Vertical Team Committees and vertical planning sessions will help identify necessary pre-requisite skills to target the needs of students, and vertically align standards-based content.

Person Responsible	Melissa Wright (melissa.wright@myoneclay.net)

Learning Walks/Lesson Studies with teachers, curriculum coach, and admin to model best practices

Person Responsible	Melissa Wright (melissa.wright@myoneclay.net)

Implementation of looking at student work (LASW) protocol

Person Responsible	Melissa Wright (melissa.wright@myoneclay.net)

Parent learning opportunities and resources provided through Title 1 events, #Title1TipsforParents on FB, monthly newsletters that provide grade specific content

Person Responsible	Kristin Steinfurth (kristin.steinfurth@myoneclay.net)

Provide students the opportunity for productive struggles and perseverance in reasoning and problem solving through effective feedback.

Person Responsible   Melissa Wright (melissa.wright@myoneclay.net)

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   Kellie Rodifer (kellie.rodifer@myoneclay.net)

All grades will have monthly opportunities to do hands on science labs to apply grade level knowledge of science concepts.

Person Responsible   Joseph Ragan (joseph.ragan@myoneclay.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If we strategically plan and continually implement differentiated, small group instruction using multiple data points, 1:1 chromebooks and utilize supplemental educational platforms, student achievement will improve in all subject areas.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase 3rd-6th grade ELA proficiency to 50%+ Increase 3rd-6th grade Mathematics proficiency to 55%+ Increase 5th grade Science proficiency to 55%+ Improve Learning Gains in 3rd-6th grade ELA to 52%+ Improve Learning Gains in 3rd-6th grade Mathematics to 54%+ Improve L25% Learning Gains in 3rd-6th grade ELA to 52%+ Improve L25% Learning Gains in 3rd-6th grade Mathematics to 53%+ In addition, we will increase the number of students proficient in each ESSA subgroup by at least 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Wright (melissa.wright@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 Steps to Implement

iReady training and support in the area of small group instruction (bi-weekly).

Person Responsible	Melissa Wright (melissa.wright@myoneclay.net)

Quarterly Data Chats with extended time for planning, to include discussion of subgroup data and progress. Substitute coverage for the 2.5 hour data chats/planning sessions will be funded with Title I funds.

Person Responsible	Melissa Wright (melissa.wright@myoneclay.net)

Utilize weekly progress monitoring tools to set goals and track individual student achievement. Title I funds were used to purchase intervention resources (Math Intervention Kits and the Reading Strategies book) that will be used for tracking individual student achievement.

Person Responsible	Melissa Wright (melissa.wright@myoneclay.net)

Based on data collected through classwork, formative assessment and online data (iReady, Achieve, RAZZ Kids, etc.), teachers will conduct ongoing teacher-student data chats, and student-parent data chats.

Person Responsible	Melissa Wright (melissa.wright@myoneclay.net)

Additional Title 1 support personnel, including reading interventionist and assistants will provide targeted small group instruction. GPE also has a designated math interventionist and ESE assistant to support students in their specific areas of need.

Person Responsible   Melissa Wright (melissa.wright@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance Monitoring and Interventions
Who: Student Success Team (Tara Geller-Social Worker, Luuly Thai-School Counselor, Administration-Melissa Wright, Mariah Spassoff and Rachel Freeman-Behavior Coach)
Action: SST will monitor attendance reports every quarter, students w/ 80-85 % qualify for Tier 2 supports (self-monitoring calendars, HR teacher supports, & frequent check-ins from SSW/ Sch.Counselor), students with 80% or < qualify for Tier 3 supports (Tier 2 interventions & are assigned a staff mentor).
Resources Needed: Volunteer staff to be Mentors and Title 1 Funds for quarterly socials

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.

Grove Park Elementary is committed to fostering healthy partnerships with all stakeholders, to include parents, teachers, business partners and other local community members. We are aware of the importance of building and sustaining strong relationships within the community to ultimately increase student success, both academically and socially.
Through our Parent and Family Engagement Plan, there will be a variety of opportunities for stakeholders to participate and provide feedback on grade level content, tips for school success at home and how they can be more involved with school-wide decisions. Our School Advisory Council will meet at least three times per year (beginning, middle and end) to review and provide input into the effectiveness of schoolwide programs, budget and resources. At the last meeting of the year, we will evaluate the plans effectiveness and revise based on parent input. We will meet individual needs or participation barriers of families by utilizing a variety of communication tools, such as providing translated copies of flyers in Tuesday Folders, social media sites, google classroom and FB posts, and robocalls to all parents. We will provide presentations or minutes of all stakeholder meetings on our website, Title 1 Binder and through Google Classrooms.
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. Teachers will ensure that at least one parent-teacher conference is held throughout the year to discuss student progress and compacts.

In the Spring, we will send out information to our current families about Kindergarten registration, and provide information to local daycares on the registration process.

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: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00