Groveland Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Groveland Elementary School

930 PARKWOOD AVE, Groveland, FL 34736

https://gel.lake.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Nichole Moses

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 (48%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	
* 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 Lake 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

Groveland Elementary School

930 PARKWOOD AVE, Groveland, FL 34736

https://gel.lake.k12.fl.us/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to intentionally develop pride, accountability, and equitable opportunities for student success by providing a mutually respectful and caring learning environment.

"One community, empowering future citizens and tomorrow's leaders"

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to consistently foster creative innovative leaders that produce pathways to lifelong learning and success.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Moses, Nichole	Principal	Oversee all instructional, human resources and operations for Groveland Elementary
Meadows, Melissa C.	Assistant Principal	Assists in oversing instrucitonal, human resource and operational management of Groveland Elementary
Boyd, Dawn	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach
Elder, Doreen	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Overall curriculum with an intense focus on Math
Orsini, Ricardo	Dean	Oversee behavior and ESOL for Groveland Elementary
Jones, Jennifer	Other	Oversees the Multi-Tiered System of Support and assist with Grades 3 - 5 Reading
Petit-Phare, Vanessa	Science Coach	Over sees STEAM and assists with math remediation.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/12/2021, Nichole Moses

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

Total number of students enrolled at the school

764

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

22

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

17

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	86	120	110	131	125	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	711
Attendance below 90 percent	36	44	48	38	43	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	252
One or more suspensions	16	20	4	24	46	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
Course failure in ELA	38	22	27	57	71	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	273
Course failure in Math	38	22	27	57	71	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	273
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	14	29	21	88	90	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	338

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	0	0	0	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/12/2021

2020-21 - 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	77	82	87	111	103	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	12	22	13	13	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	2	4	8	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	9	8	14	17	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in Math	9	8	14	17	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	54	52	91	90	74	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453

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	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

2020-21 - 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	77	82	87	111	103	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	12	22	13	13	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	2	4	8	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	9	8	14	17	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in Math	9	8	14	17	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	54	52	91	90	74	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453

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	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				49%	58%	57%	43%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	57%	58%	51%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	49%	53%	48%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	60%	63%	59%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				54%	56%	62%	53%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	39%	51%	43%	41%	47%
Science Achievement				50%	54%	53%	54%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	48%	60%	-12%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	60%	-12%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	59%	-16%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	45%	62%	-17%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	61%	-3%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	48%	56%	-8%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady K-5, LSA Science Grade 5, APM 3-5

Grade 1			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18%	20%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	20%	36%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	6%	12%
	English Language Learners	0%	8%	38%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9%	13%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	13%	35%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	12%	24%
	English Language Learners	0%	15%	38%

Grade 2			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11%	19%	28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	19%	28%
	Students With Disabilities	18%	36%	64%
	English Language Learners	14%	14%	29%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4%	4%	12%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4%	4%	12%
	Students With Disabilities	27%	27%	27%
	English Language Learners	0%	14%	14%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9%	17%	20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	17%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	11%	21%
	English Language Learners	13%	25%	19%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3%	8%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	3%	8%	
	Students With Disabilities	11%	11%	
	English Language Learners	0%	31%	

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9%	12%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	12%	
	Students With Disabilities	0%	7%	
	English Language Learners	0%	9%	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4%	7%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	4%	7%	
	Students With Disabilities	3%	7%	
	English Language Learners	0%	27%	

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6%	18%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	18%	
	Students With Disabilities	7%	7%	
	English Language Learners	15%	23%	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5%	14%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	5%	14%	
	Students With Disabilities	0%	4%	
	English Language Learners	15%	23%	
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%		
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%		
	Students With Disabilities	4%		
	English Language Learners	33%		

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	10	26	35	11	22	29	12				
ELL	17	33		24	39		32				
BLK	24	29	30	18	19	10	22				
HSP	30	38	50	31	42	25	42				
WHT	36	45		41	42		45				
FRL	23	31	45	23	30	17	31				
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	21	26	16	28	37	25	19				
ELL	51	59	30	58	52		55				
ASN	82	64		82	82						
BLK	35	38	18	31	46	35	26				

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
HSP	53	55	46	56	53	40	61				
MUL	54			57	60						
WHT	46	47	50	60	56	29	48				
FRL	51	49	33	53	53	37	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	20	28	18	40	53	44	25				
ELL	41	57		59	57						
ASN	75			83							
BLK	31	41	46	42	42	54	50				
HSP	46	51	37	62	57	38	54				
MUL	33			71	80						
WHT	44	56	67	59	51	45	58				
FRL	43	52	46	60	56	47	53				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	290
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	22
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	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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	42
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	31
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Trend across grade level is phonics, phonemic awareness, and vocabulary which eventually leads to comprehension deficiency in the higher grades.
Core content will be the understanding and use of content specific vocabulary.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

All data components. Math achievement level took the greatest hit.
Informational text for state assessment from 2019.
Phonics and Vocabulary from iReady
Number Sense

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Explicit focus and instruction of phonics until mastery. Clear and explicit instruction using vocabulary within the context of the content versus stand alone.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Learning gains in the lowest quartile of ELA was the component.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We implemented Leveled Literacy Instruction and an additional remediation teacher that focused on literacy skills for grades 3-5.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Intense focus on student needs. Utilizing, a diagnostic to identify the problem area and the remediation/acceleration block for ELA/Math to assist triage the problem.
Number talks will be utilized in Math.
ELA will use content specific vocabulary with a spiral review.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Sanford Harmony and Restorative Practices will assist with managing behaviors and building relationships.
CHAMPs school wide so that all students and teaches are communicating the same language.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Wit & Wisdom will be utilized in all grade levels, Fundations in grades K-2, weekly spotlight walks to identify areas of need to drive our focus. We will continue to utilize small group interventions and remediation times in math and reading. Students will be offered additional after school tutoring, which can impact a higher number of students than prior years.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data shows a consistent increase in referrals and number of suspensions in the past 5 years. The number of referrals in 2020 had doubled from 2018. In 2020, there were 581 referrals documented. The two highest reasons for referrals was Inappropriate Conduct and Defiance of Authority. Our total number of suspensions was 452, with Inappropriate Conduct and Physical Aggression being the highest reasons. During the last quarter, there were 33 referrals for Inappropriate Conduct and 47 referrals for Physical Aggression. By focusing on behavior management and utilizing positive behavior interventions, the learning environment will become more productive and conducive to learning. This will allow teachers to focus more on student learning and less on classroom disruptions.
Measurable Outcome:	We will decrease the amount of referrals concerning Inappropriate Conduct and Physical Aggression by 30% by the end of the 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored on a monthly basis through running a skyward report on infraction counts and suspension counts.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ricardo Orsini (orsinir@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	CHAMPS program and Sanford Harmony program will be utilized to teach clear expectations and social-emotional skills. Restorative Practices will be utilized to build community and manage conflicts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	CHAMPS will allow clear behavioral expectations for all settings. It will allow for consistent rules and expectations throughout all classrooms. Sanford Harmony teaches skills that aide in character development and emotion regulation.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement PBIS plan after training teachers.

Person Responsible	Yallonda Scheidler (scheidlery@lake.k12.fl.us)

CHAMPS and Sanford Harmony Training for all staff

Person Responsible	Melissa C. Meadows (meadowsm1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Monitor that all teachers are utilizing CHAMPS strategies in every classroom, every day.

Person Responsible	Melissa C. Meadows (meadowsm1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Monitor that all teachers are utilizing Sanford Harmony lessons during the morning meeting in every classroom, every day.

Person Responsible	Melissa C. Meadows (meadowsm1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Classroom management Professional Development opportunity for any teacher that requests assistance or mentoring.

Person Responsible	Melissa C. Meadows (meadowsm1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Monthly reports of infraction and suspension counts

| **Person Responsible** | Ricardo Orsini (orsinir@lake.k12.fl.us) |

Discipline team meets monthly to discuss data

| **Person Responsible** | Melissa C. Meadows (meadowsm1@lake.k12.fl.us) |

Restorative Practice Training for leadership followed by faculty. Recorded sheet of attendance will be monitored.

| **Person Responsible** | Melissa C. Meadows (meadowsm1@lake.k12.fl.us) |

Provide student, faculty and staff incentives weekly/monthly to acknowledge PRIDE behavior on campus. To assist with building and recognizing students, staff and faculty,.

| **Person Responsible** | Melissa C. Meadows (meadowsm1@lake.k12.fl.us) |

Provide resources for consistent update positive and informative communication. Provide a stipend for a staff member to keep up with the website and social media.

| **Person Responsible** | Melissa C. Meadows (meadowsm1@lake.k12.fl.us) |

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 20-21 data, 31% of students in grades 3-5 demonstrated proficiency. According to end of the year i-Ready data: -47% of our students in 1st and 2nd grades are 2 or more grade levels behind in phonics. -In grades 3-5, 60% of our students are 2 or more grade levels behind in phonics and/or vocabulary. The area of focus in grades K-2 will be phonics and in grades 3-5 will be phonics and vocabulary. By focusing on these areas, fluency and comprehension will also improve.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, GES expect to increase percentage of 3rd grade, 4th and 5th grade students scoring level 3 or higher on 2022 ELA standardized assessment from 31% to 35%.
Monitoring:	To monitor this area of focus, we will create a data log for every student below proficiency. In grades 3 - 5 we will use iReady to track student progress through out the year on a monthly. Consistent walkthrough during remediation and intervention times will be used to monitor the fidelity of instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dawn Boyd (boydd@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	GES will use Wilson Fundations Curriculum, a promising evidence on the ESSA evidence scale and the Florida Center for Reading Research noted 8 major strengths and no program weaknesses to increase phonics instruction in K-2. Fundations will be used to decrease the number of students behind grade level in phonics from 47% to 40%. For students in grades 3 -5 during the reading intervention block explicit, direct instruction and small group instruction will be used to assist students with decoding issues. For students that data identifies as having comprehension deficiencies, Leveled Literacy Instruction will be used. In all grades, implement core ELA materials aligned to the science of reading and integration of content-rich texts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to iReady, 63% of our student body are one or more grade level behind on phonics. With the majority of our population struggling to decode words are in grades 3 - 5. Focusing on explicit and systematic instruction on phonics in grades K-2 will diminish the that is being seen in the upper grades. Wilson Fundations curriculum has promising evidence on the ESSA evidence scale and the Florida Center for Reading Research noted 8 major strengths and no program weaknesses. Implementation of core ELA materials aligned to the science of reading and integration of content-rich text will expose students to vocabulary, increase interest creating more engagement and a natural love of learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Creation and consistent monitoring of a Tier 1 phonics intervenion for grades 3 - 5 using iReady instructional grouping profiles. All teachers on the grade level, during intervention will teach the same lesson and assess on Fridays. Schedule and assessment will be created for each grade level. All data will be reviewed weekly to provide just in time support for students falling behind in that area.

Person Responsible	Dawn Boyd (boydd@lake.k12.fl.us)

Using iReady, lowest quartile a tutoring program using SIPPs to target students 2 or more grade levels behind in phonics. Literacy coach will assigned tutors and monior assessments.

Person Responsible Dawn Boyd (boydd@lake.k12.fl.us)

Spotlight Walks will be used to identify trends and allow for feedback for school wide improvement, with intentional focus of starting on time, fidelty of implementation of curriculum with high expectations, and instructional framework.

Person Responsible Melissa C. Meadows (meadowsm1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Established a focused Collaborative Planning times on data driven discussions to review lessons and assignments to strengthen core classroom instruction and differentiation.

Person Responsible Doreen Elder (elderd@lake.k12.fl.us)

Provide genralized data chats for classrooms, grade level, and overall school quarterly

Person Responsible Nichole Moses (mosesn@lake.k12.fl.us)

Create and monitor a consistent spotlight walk schedule focused on proper implementation of curriculum (Fundations & Wit & Wisdom), and proper implementation of the district and GES acadmeic framework. Leadership will be required to walk take data and give teacher feedback on the spotlight walk tool

Person Responsible Nichole Moses (mosesn@lake.k12.fl.us)

Create and provide remediation programs and resources for lower quartile and/or students with disabilities, kindergarten readiness, retained students in the form of tutoring and small group intervention instruction.

Person Responsible Dawn Boyd (boydd@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 20-21 data, 31% of students in grades 3-5 demonstrated proficiency. According to end of the year i-Ready data, 61% of our students are 2 or more grade levels behind in numbers and operations. The area of focus will be numbers and operations.

Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, utilizing FSA data from 2021, we expect to see increases by18% in each category.
Monitoring:	To monitor this area of focus, we will utilize data from weekly collaborative planning (summative and formative), district common assessments, and learning walks.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Doreen Elder (elderd@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To improve in the area of numbers and operations, we will use number talks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Number talks are designed to elicit strategies that focus on number relationships and number theory. They allow students to reason about numbers and build connections to key conceptual ideas in mathematics. During numbers talks, mathematical problems are expected to be solved accurately, efficiently, and flexibility.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide on going Number Talks training for all instructional staff.

Person Responsible	Doreen Elder (elderd@lake.k12.fl.us)

Monitor and support implementation of Number Talks through Spotlight Walks.

Person Responsible	Nichole Moses (mosesn@lake.k12.fl.us)

Monitor i-Ready data in the area of numbers and operations.

Person Responsible	Doreen Elder (elderd@lake.k12.fl.us)

Organize and schedule before and after school tutoring programs for Math and club.

Person Responsible	Doreen Elder (elderd@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Groveland is ranked as "very high" in levels of suspensions. Data shows that over the past 5 years, the amount of suspensions has steadily increased. When looking at the data from 2020, Groveland had 581 infractions written, resulting in multiple suspensions. The three highest areas of concern are Inappropriate Conduct, Physical Aggression, and Defiance of Authority. Discipline data will be collected from Skyward reports on a monthly basis and discussed with the Discipline team to determine if additional steps are needed to decrease these incidents.

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.

Groveland Elementary School will create, build, and sustain a positive school culture and environment by implementing school wide Positive Behavior and Support (PBIS) plan rewarding students with Panther bucks that students can use to purchase items at the Panther Store, or VIP lunches. In addition, Groveland Elementary will implement CHAMPS and Sanford Harmony. CHAMPS will set consistent rules and expectations throughout all classrooms. Through Sanford Harmony, we will focus on character development and emotional regulation. To enhance supervision and monitoring of students, a program can be added to enhance our current plans and streamline the process.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

At Groveland Elementary school, all teachers and staff will use the same rules and expectations established through CHAMPS and practice Sanford Harmony strategies in their classrooms, lunchroom, and common areas.
The members listed below provide support for behavior management, trainings on PBIS, assistance with behavior tracking and documenting interventions, and professional development opportunities throughout the year focused on building a positive culture and environment.
The following teachers and coaches are the support team for PBIS:
• Dawn Boyd (Literacy Coach)
• Sara Cox (Behavior Support Teacher)
• Jennifer Creech (5th Grade Teacher)
• Doreen Elder (CRT)

- Jennifer Jones (Potential Specialist)
- Ricardo Orsini (Dean)
- Melissa Meadows (Assistant Principal)
- Yallonda Scheidler (School Counselor)
- Elizabeth Stites (Food Service)
- Tara Williams (1st Grade Teacher)
- Tiffany Woods (PASS)