Garden Grove Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Garden Grove Elementary School

4599 CYPRESS GARDENS RD, Winter Haven, FL 33884

http://www.polk-fl.net/gardengrove

Demographics

Principal: Laura Neidringhaus

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2021

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 (53%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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 Polk 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

Garden Grove Elementary School

4599 CYPRESS GARDENS RD, Winter Haven, FL 33884

http://www.polk-fl.net/gardengrove

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	90%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Believing all children can learn, we will work together in a safe and caring environment, guiding each individual toward lifelong learning and responsible productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Garden Grove Elementary is to develop well rounded, confident and responsible individuals who aspire to achieve their full potential by providing an environment where all children feel loved, respected, and encouraged to reach their full potential.

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
Neidringhaus, Laura	Principal	The principal will serve as the instructional leader for the school, as well as overseeing the day-to-day operations of the school.
Bearden, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Assist Principal for various school duties. Assist with collaborative planning and progress monitoring.
Burkholder, Brooke	School Counselor	School counselor. Assist with MTSS and student social/emotional development.
Greene, Stephanie	Other	Assist with progress monitoring. Provide interventions to students in small group settings.
Ward, Danyel	Teacher, K-12	Grade 5 ELA teacher
Riggeal, Susan	Instructional Coach	Coach Teachers Collaborative Planning Progress Monitoring
Bataille, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Gifted Teacher Science Support Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/19/2021, Laura Neidringhaus

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

518

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

8

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

10

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	93	114	83	84	89	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	25	34	15	11	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	2	3	2	6	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	6	22	11	21	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Course failure in Math	8	13	2	25	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	26	26	31	24	32	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168

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	2	7	7	9	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	10	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	3	3	2	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/19/2021

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	113	91	83	83	81	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	538
Attendance below 90 percent	13	15	8	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	9	7	6	5	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
December 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	0	18	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
December 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	5	9	7	12	8	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	1	5	5	9	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	113	91	83	83	81	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	538
Attendance below 90 percent	13	15	8	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	9	7	6	5	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	12	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
December 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	0	18	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
December 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	5	9	7	12	8	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	1	5	5	9	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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 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				53%	51%	57%	54%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	51%	58%	56%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	49%	53%	53%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				62%	57%	63%	67%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	56%	62%	59%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	47%	51%	50%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	47%	53%	54%	53%	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	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	47%	4%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	68%	56%	12%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	56%	-11%	64%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	51%	14%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	48%	45%	3%	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.

The progress monitoring tools used for ELA 1-2 was Star Early Lit and 3-5 Star was used. Math progress monitoring tools used for grades 1-5 was Star Math. The district quarterly assessments were used for 5th grade Science.

Grade 1			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18%	17%	17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	17%	17%
	Students With Disabilities	18%	9%	9%
	English Language Learners	20%	20%	20%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33%	33%	48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	33%	48%
	Students With Disabilities	18%	1%	36%
	English Language Learners	40%	40%	40%

Grade 2			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6%	1%	0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	1%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11%	19%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	19%	23%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	14%	14%
	English Language Learners	0%	17%	25%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12%	13%	13%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	13%	13%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	6%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28%	36%	38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28%	36%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	12%	25%	31%
	English Language Learners	33%	33%	50%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17%	21%	8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	21%	8%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	23%	7%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29%	35%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	35%	29%
	Students With Disabilities	27%	17%	8%
	English Language Learners	0%	14%	14%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5%	4%	6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5%	4%	6%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11%	22%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	22%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0%	5%	4%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	5%	4%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

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	12	38	30	27	23		15				
ELL	39			36							
BLK	22	39		27	33		18				
HSP	42	41		41	56		28				
WHT	50	36		65	47		47				
FRL	40	47	40	43	45	30	38				
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	31	33		31	43	36	27				
ELL	20	50		40	50	50					
BLK	30	44	41	36	38	41	6				
HSP	49	54		57	54	55	64				

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
MUL	64			91							
WHT	64	56	45	74	67	57	60				
FRL	44	51	45	51	54	50	42				

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	34	55	54	35	36	36	10				
ELL	7			43							
BLK	25	43	54	47	46	40	22				
HSP	62	73		66	79		74				
MUL	62			85							
WHT	64	52	54	75	55	45	63				
FRL	43	54	53	63	57	57	49				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	352
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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

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

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	28
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	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
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	49
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

All grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas show achievement declines in reading and math as measured on the April STAR Assessments.

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

ELA 2019 FSA Most Recent STAR Projection Math 2019 FSA Most recent STAR Projection 53% Proficient 40%(decline of 13%) 62% Proficient 45% (decline of 17% decline)

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

A large percentage of students began the year enrolled in the eSchool model. Students transitioned in and out causing an increase in the achievement gap. Teacher absences contributed to the current decline.

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

ELA showed the smallest decline. Neither data components showed improvement. When reviewing STAR Progress Monitoring data, ESSA Sub-groups remained consistent in all three test administrations with our Black, SWD, and ELL being below the 41%.

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

There was not any improvement.

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

Core instruction needs more consistent alignment with standards.

Data driven small group instruction is necessary to close achievement gaps in all areas using weekly error analysis to form small groups in reading, writing, math, and science.

Consistent Monitoring / Verifying learning for all students will assist teachers when planning small group instruction.

Addressing the needs of all sub-groups will increase the achievement of the overall student population.

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.

Administration, school and district based coaches will work with teachers to development a differentiated (tiered) professional development plan based on teacher completion of a professional development needs assessment, walkthrough, observations, and collaborative planning

conversations.

Professional development will be developed for paraeducators working with small groups of students. These professional opportunities will include:
• Words Their Way (Literacy Development)
• LLI (Literacy Development)
• New Florida Wonders Intervention materials
• What's My Place? What's My Value (Math Literacy Development)
• Number Talks (Math Fluency and Problem Solving)

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

• Weekly Leadership meetings
• Weekly formative assessment will be administered in reading and math to provide data for error analysis and
determine small skill groups for the following week.
• During collaborative planning, acceleration activities will be developed to help support students preview
upcoming skills and build background knowledge.
• In school push in support will be provided by administration to work with struggling students during the
school day.
• Administration will look at providing extended learning after school and/or on Saturday.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	At Garden Grove Elementary, all students will receive standards-based grade level instruction to increase student achievement in reading, math, and science. Students will receive instruction that is aligned to state standards and at the intended rigor. Students will be provided with differentiated instructional interventions that will build on their current instructional level closing the gap in proficiency. Based on STAR Progress Monitoring Data, the projected proficiency for ELA is 40% proficient. This is a decline of 7% from the 2018-2019 FSA. The projected proficiency for Math as measured by the STAR is 45%. This is a decline of 17%. Using the 2018-2019 FSA as a measuring tool, all ESSA subgroups performed at the 41% or higher with the exception of our Black and SWD subgroups. The STAR Progress Monitoring tool projects our Blacks, SWD, and ELL subgroups will be below the 41% threshold. In 2018-2019, 52% of fifth grade students scored a level 3 or higher as measured by the state Science assessment. Comparing the number of students proficient in Science in 2028-2019 with 2020-2021 fourth grade students taking the Quarter 3 District Science Quarterly, less than 10% of the students demonstrated a score of 70% or higher.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of the standards-based instruction in core content areas, 60% of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will earn a score of Level 3 or higher on the state reading assessment with a minimum of 60% showing learning gains. 68% of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will earn a score of Level 3 or higher on the state math assessment with a minimum of 65% of students showing learning gains. 55% of the students is grade 5 will earn a score of Level 3 or higher on the state science assessment. All ESSA subgroups will perform at a minimum of 41% overall. Student learning will be monitored through weekly grade level formative assessments and district progress monitoring tools.
Monitoring:	Weekly formative assessments will be used in reading and math for error analysis and the formation of small groups and standards alignment and bi-weekly in grade 5 science. District progress monitoring assessments for writing, math, and science (grades 4 and 5) will be used to determine small pull-out groups for additional remediation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laura Neidringhaus (laura.neidringhaus@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative planning will be used to facilitate: 1. Unpacking of grade level standards (Florida Standards and B.E.S.T. Standards) using content Item Specification, Achievement Level Descriptors, and district curriculum maps 2. Development of weekly formative assessments to be used for error analysis and small group formation 3. Developing grade level common task and analyzing student work samples 4. Alignment of task to grade level standards 5. Vertical planning and curriculum alignment 6. Monitoring Tier II and Tier III MTSS students and collaborating on identifying interventions to address achievement gaps 7. Supporting K-2 teachers with implementation of new Florida B.E.S.T. Standards in reading and math 8. Identification of professional development needs and delivering professional development

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative planning creates a team approach environment where educators can learn and collaborate with other educators of common grade level groups or content areas for the purpose of engaging in an in-depth look at high yield instructional strategies aligned with state standards. It also encourages sharing of best practices and opportunities for teachers to grow through productive conversations, reviewing and sharing student work sample.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly collaborative planning with Instructional Coach(s). Use research-based resources to help teachers create engaging lessons and center activities. Resources will be allocated and/or purchased to ensure teachers have the necessary tools to create rich, engaging lessons.

Person Responsible   Susan Riggeal (susan.riggeal@polk-fl.net)

Development of formative assessments to check students' mastery of reading skills to be used in between the district reading assessment. This formatives will be used for error analysis and formation of small groups for the upcoming week.

Person Responsible   Susan Riggeal (susan.riggeal@polk-fl.net)

Development of weekly math formative assessments to check students' progress as the move through multi-week learning modules. This formatives will be used for error analysis and formation of small groups for the upcoming week.

Person Responsible   Melissa Bearden (melissa.bearden@polk-fl.net)

Development of bi-weekly science formatives to check student understanding of multi-week science units. This formatives will be used for error analysis and formation of remediation, acceleration, and enrichment small groups.

Person Responsible   Amanda Bataille (amanda.bataille@polk-fl.net)

Use Achievement Level Descriptors and new B.E.S.T. Standards to analyze student work samples to ensure alignment of task to standard and teacher understanding of expectation of standard outcome. Data collected from student work samples will also be used to form small remediation, acceleration, and enrichment groups.

Person Responsible   Laura Neidringhaus (laura.neidringhaus@polk-fl.net)

K-2 teachers will be provided support for the implementation of the new B.E.S.T. Standards. Planning time will be devoted to teachers in K-2 learn new standards and new reading series for effective implementation for reading. They will also learn and implement new math standards with the support of the interventionist.

Person Responsible   Stephanie Greene (stephanie.greene@polk-fl.net)

A walk-through monitoring tool will be developed by administration to provide instant feedback to teachers about the level of student engagement in their classrooms. This walkthrough tool will be used on a daily basis so teachers are able to track their progress over time.

Person Responsible   Laura Neidringhaus (laura.neidringhaus@polk-fl.net)

Assistant Principal will develop a schedule for teachers to participate in peer walks and classroom observations to see "Best Practices" and form across level relationships. This will provide opportunities for teachers to work together for horizontal and vertical planning.

Person Responsible	Melissa Bearden (melissa.bearden@polk-fl.net)

Work with community volunteer program to implement Ready, Set, Read with first grade students on a one-to-one basis two times per week to increase the level of proficiency in reading.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Greene (stephanie.greene@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will administer paper reading assessments to teach test taking strategies and use as a tool for reteaching.

Person Responsible	Melissa Bearden (melissa.bearden@polk-fl.net)

Teachers in grades 3-5 will use the district created Highlighted Task for Math. Paper highlighted task will be used with the district created Power Points to enhance the mathematics curriculum.

Person Responsible	Laura Neidringhaus (laura.neidringhaus@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	At Garden Grove Elementary, students will be provided with differentiated instructional interventions that will build on their current instructional level closing the gap in proficiency. Based on STAR Progress Monitoring data, 31% of the student population is identified as having a substantial reading deficiency. Data from the most recent STAR Math progress monitoring identifies 20% of students with an achievement gap. The high percentage of students with a substantial reading deficiency supports the need to focus on differentiation as close the achievement gap. Focusing on all subgroups will improve the overall performance of the school.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of the differentiating small group instruction in core content areas, 60% of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will earn a score of Level 3 or higher on the state reading assessment with a minimum of 60% showing learning gains. 68% of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will earn a score of Level 3 or higher on the state math assessment with a minimum of 65% of students showing learning gains. 55% of the students is grade 5 will earn a score of Level 3 or higher on the state science assessment. All ESSA subgroups will perform at a minimum of 41% overall. Student learning will be monitored through weekly grade level formative assessments and district progress monitoring tools.
Monitoring:	Weekly formative assessments will be used in reading and math for error analysis and the formation of small groups and standards alignment and bi-weekly in grade 5 science. District progress monitoring assessments for writing, math, and science (grades 4 and 5) will be used to determine small pull-out groups for additional remediation. Monthly team MTSS meetings will held to review the effectiveness of the interventions being implemented, review of progress monitoring data, and identifying necessary next steps.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laura Neidringhaus (laura.neidringhaus@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted small group instruction will be led by teachers and interventionists, with assistance by paraprofessionals. This small group instruction will provide interventions, acceleration, and enrichment, according to student need, using various research based programs and strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction is the key to learning gains, as it allows teachers time to provide targeted interventions and track the student responses to those interventions.

Action Steps to Implement

Literacy Coach and Interventionist (with para assistance) will provide targeted interventions for selected students based on previous FSA data coupled with current STAR data. Each interventionist and para will be assigned a group of students, and they will monitor the progress of these student on a weekly basis..

Person Responsible Stephanie Greene (stephanie.greene@polk-fl.net)

Facilitate monthly MTSS Team Meetings to discuss and review MTSS data. In these meetings the team will review the effectiveness of the interventions being used, the fidelity of implementation, and plan the appropriate next steps to meet the needs of the targeted students.

Person Responsible Brooke Burkholder (brooke.burkholder@polk-fl.net)

Strategic scheduling and grouping of students to ensure interventionists, ESE and ELL teachers are able to maximize the time spent with students in small group settings

Person Responsible Laura Neidringhaus (laura.neidringhaus@polk-fl.net)

Use research based content resources to provide opportunities for reteaching, acceleration, remediation, and enrichment during small group and center time. Resources for small group instruction will be allocated and/or purchased to ensure teachers have the necessary tools to create engaging small group lessons. These resources will include Words Their Way and Florida Ready for reading, and Curiosity Baits, and What's My Place? What's My Value? to assist with math literacy development.

Person Responsible Melissa Bearden (melissa.bearden@polk-fl.net)

PD will be provided on the use of effective progress monitoring strategies. Teachers will then implement these strategies to form and sustain adaptive groups that will allow teachers to remediate and enrich students based on formative and summative assessment data.

Person Responsible Laura Neidringhaus (laura.neidringhaus@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	At Garden Grove Elementary, all students will receive standards-based grade level instruction to increase students' achievement in reading. Students will receive instruction that is aligned to state standards and at the intended rigor. Students will be provided with differentiated instructional interventions that will build on their current instructional level closing the gap in proficiency. According to House Bill 7011 Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence, Garden Grove Elementary meets the criteria as a result of less than 50% of students in grades 3-5 scoring below a level 3 on the 2021 statewide ELA assessment. Based on the 2021 ELA portion of the Florida Standards Assessment, only 42% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient, 41% of students showed learning gains, and 39% of our lowest 25% demonstrated learning gains. This data indicates a critical need to improve instructional strategies through the implementation of standards based tasks, to ensure the intended rigor of the benchmark/standard is being met.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of benchmark/standards based instruction, 60% of students in grades 3-5 will earn a score of Level 3 or higher on the 2022 ELA Florida Standards Assessment with a minimum of 60% showing learning gains.
Monitoring:	Weekly formative assessment will be used for error analysis and the formative of small groups to remediate students who need additional to demonstrate partial to full mastery of the benchmarks/standards. STAR Reading will be used in January and April as a further measuring tool and predictor of student achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laura Neidringhaus (laura.neidringhaus@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Collaborative planning will be used to facilitate development formative assessment. 2. Shared responsibility between teachers and students for verification of student learning. 3. Developing grade level formative assessments and common tasks to be used to analyze student outcomes and modify instruction to meet the needs of students. 4. Monitoring Tier II and Tier III MTSS students and collaborating on identifying interventions to address achievements. 5. Identifying professional development needs and delivering professional development on more effective use of formative assessments to accelerate learning in the K-5 classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative planning creates a team approach environment where educators can learn and collaborate with other educators of common grade in the reading content area for the purpose of engaging in an in depth look at high yield instructional strategies, such the implementation of formative assessments, aligned with state benchmarks/standards. It also encourages the sharing of best practices and opportunities for teachers to grow through productive conversations, reviewing, and student work samples.

Action Steps to Implement

Train teachers on effective implementation of Leveled Literacy Intervention Kits (LLI) to address learning gaps identified by the weekly formative assessments.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Greene (stephanie.greene@polk-fl.net)

Train teachers on effective implementation of Words Their Way to address learning gaps identified by the weekly formative assessments.

Person Responsible   Stephanie Greene (stephanie.greene@polk-fl.net)

Facilitate weekly collaborative planning with Instructional Coach(s) using research-based resources to help teachers create aligned common tasks and formative assessments to improve the teaching and learning in all ELA classrooms and check students' mastery of reading skills.

Person Responsible   Susan Riggeal (susan.riggeal@polk-fl.net)

Develop and implement professional development on the creation of aligned common tasks and formative assessments.

Person Responsible   Laura Neidringhaus (laura.neidringhaus@polk-fl.net)

Use Achievement Level Descriptors and new B.E.S.T. Standards to analyze students' understanding through common tasks and formative assessments.

Person Responsible   Laura Neidringhaus (laura.neidringhaus@polk-fl.net)

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

When reviewing the data as reported on SafeSchoolsforAlex.org for the 2019-2020 school year, we see there was a need to address student behavior. In 2019-2020 there were 258 total referrals, including 51 bus referrals which averaged approximately 37 referrals per month over a seven month year (school closure due to pandemic). 2019-2020 was an unusual year with two students with serious behaviors that contributed to the majority of serious behavior referrals.

Most recently, in 2020-2021, the average number of discipline referral declined to an average of approximately 24 referrals per month over a ten month school year. Contributing factors to the decline were more consistency in the schoolwide discipline program and the absence of the student(s) with the serious problem behaviors.

For 2021-2022, our school will focus on more consistent implementation of our CHAMPS program and our Positive Behavior Supports and Interventions (PBIS) program. As a staff we will work together to develop a better understanding, appreciation, and respect for our students and where they are coming from. Our school counselor will deliver lessons that will demonstrate for our students problem solving skills and provide a model for respecting self and others.

The Assistant Principal, along with our teaching staff will provide professional development using the book, The Essential 55, by Ron Clark. This book will provide a platform for students, and staff, to work collectively to create a positive and enriched learning environment where students feel valued and want to reach their fullest potential.

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.

At Garden Grove Elementary we strive to have a positive school culture and environment with a specific focus on our student, staff and parent stakeholder groups. We are working on strengthening our relationships with all stakeholders.

Garden Grove Elementary staff members foster and promote the positive school culture and environment; they are the closest connection and provide an integral link between the students, families, and community stakeholders

For our student stakeholders we will continue to work towards promoting a positive school culture by providing an environment where all children feel loved, respected, and encouraged to reach their full potential. We will do this by:
1. CHAMPS - We use the CHAMPS model for effective proactive and positive behavior management.
2. Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports - We use PBIS as a school wide program to promote a positive
learning environment for all students.
3. Caught Being Good - We use "Caught Being Good" as an immediate reinforcer for desired behavior and a way
for staff members outside of the classroom to build relationships with students.
4. DRUMBEAT - We use this for students who need additional social skills instruction and are recommended for
participation in the program.
5. Guidance Lessons - Our school counselor delivers social skills lessons to students to promote feelings of self-
worth and respect for self and others.
6. One School, One Book - we will emphasize the importance of literacy through this schoolwide program. This
program is used to connect the school and families as they read together and participate in literacy activities.

Communication is critical to our positive school culture and environment. We make sure families receive clear and relevant information as quickly, and in as many formats as possible. We use ClassDojo as a platform to keep parents more engaged digitally. ClassDojo, coupled with our active Facebook presence, we are able to demonstrate and promote our positive climate and culture. We also are able to demonstrate and promote our climate and culture through the events we present for our parents such as open house, orientation, conference nights, and parent/community events.

Administration works to ensure a positive model for staff. We strive to provide opportunities that improve the climate and culture outcomes. This includes a strong commitment to providing positive incentive and appreciation events for them, engaging in meaningful and supportive professional learning, providing for staff to serve in leadership capacities in furthering their skills and career goals. Staff members are celebrated by being "Spot Lighted" on the school Facebook page.

Community stakeholders play an integral role in promoting a positive culture and environment for our school and our school families. Community members are invited to Volunteer and serve on our School Advisory Council and Parent Advisory Group. Garden Grove Elementary reaches outside our school to participate in community events. These include, but are not limited to, membership with the Chamber of Commerce, participation in Community Day, and community fine art opportunities.

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

All stakeholders will play a role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Administration will continue to ensure a positive model for students, staff, families, and community stakeholders. They will provide positive incentives and appreciation events for staff. They will also form relationships with the students by cultivating a school environment built on respect and acceptance for all students.

Teachers will promote a positive culture and environment by creating classroom environments where students feel valued and safe. Learning will focus on the whole child.

Parents will work with school staff to deepen the relationship between the school and home. This will be done through our Title I Parent Nights, Back-to-School Orientation, Open House, and Parent Data Nights. The school with provide parents with resources to assist at home.

Community members will continue to support the school through established partnerships. The school has partnered with many local churches and businesses to help build a more positive culture. One partnership with a church is "Adopt a Teacher." Staff members are provided with monthly words of encouragement and treats. Donations such as bikes have been provided as student incentives.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	510-Supplies	1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School			$0.00
			Notes: Florida Wonders Assessments grades K-5 from district print shop for students to be able to annotate text and apply testing taking strategies.			
	5100	510-Supplies	1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School			$0.00
			Notes: Grades 3-5 District Math Highlighted Task from district print shop for student use.			
	5100	510-Supplies	1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School			$0.00
			Notes: Print B.E.S.T. Standards Resource guide for teachers to use during collaborative planning.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School			$0.00
			1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School			$0.00
			1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School			$0.00
			1711 - Garden Grove Elementary School			$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:				$0.00
					Total:	$0.00