

District School Board of Madison County

Greenville Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Greenville Elementary School

729 SW OVERSTREET AVE, Greenville, FL 32331

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

Demographics

Principal: Wallace Selph

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2021

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
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)	Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Greenville Elementary School

729 SW OVERSTREET AVE, Greenville, FL 32331

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

School Demographics

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-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	89%

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 Madison County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Roderick, Lisa	Principal	The principal has the responsibility of setting high expectations, monitoring standards based instruction and grade-level assessments, setting and monitoring data driven goals and benchmarks, developing a family- like culture, and maximizing the leadership abilities of staff members.
Collins, Joi	Teacher, K-12	Teacher of ELA for 4-5th grades. Literacy Leadership Team leader for grades 3-5.
Hopkins, Mannika	Teacher, K-12	Third grade teacher. Assisting with rigor and unit planning from Rural Connect. The planning includes lessons and units to work on text dependent questions and the rigor of the questions for each grade level.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/13/2021, Wallace Selph

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

2

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

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

6

Total number of students enrolled at the school

99

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

2

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

1

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	16	10	22	15	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	5	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	35	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	35	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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

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

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	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

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	18	13	9	16	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	5	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	35	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	18	13	9	16	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	5	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	35	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				44%	52%	57%	68%	64%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				41%	50%	58%	63%	60%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					49%	53%		50%	48%
Math Achievement				40%	57%	63%	79%	74%	62%
Math Learning Gains				31%	49%	62%	48%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					43%	51%		44%	47%
Science Achievement				54%	56%	53%	13%	48%	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	6%	40%	-34%	58%	-52%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	81%	50%	31%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	46%	-2%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	18%	45%	-27%	62%	-44%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	51%	-8%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	44%	12%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	56%	42%	14%	53%	3%
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 is given at least three times a year beginning with the September administration. The data shows that many students in grades 1 and 2 are below grade level and will need additional supports in place in the classroom. The lowest 25% will go through the SIT/MTSS process.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	1		
	Economically Disadvantaged	1		
	Students With Disabilities	0		
	English Language Learners	0		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0		
	Economically Disadvantaged	0		
	Students With Disabilities	0		
	English Language Learners	0		
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0		
	Economically Disadvantaged	0		
	Students With Disabilities	0		
	English Language Learners	0		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0		
	Economically Disadvantaged	0		
	Students With Disabilities	0		
	English Language Learners	0		

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	2		
	Economically Disadvantaged	2		
	Students With Disabilities	0		
	English Language Learners	0		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0		
	Economically Disadvantaged	0		
	Students With Disabilities	0		
	English Language Learners	0		
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	0		
	Economically Disadvantaged	0		
	Students With Disabilities	0		
	English Language Learners	0		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0		
	Economically Disadvantaged	0		
	Students With Disabilities	0		
	English Language Learners	0		

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	2		
	Economically Disadvantaged	2		
	Students With Disabilities	0		
	English Language Learners	0		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	1		
	Economically Disadvantaged	1		
	Students With Disabilities	0		
	English Language Learners	0		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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
BLK	23			33							
FRL	21			33							
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
BLK	47	42		42	31		60				
WHT	30			30							
FRL	44	48		41	36		55				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
BLK	71	69		77	42		15				

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
FRL	70	65		80	50		15				

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	30
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	59
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	27
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?

White students are not having their academic needs met at the same level of other subgroups at the school. In ELA, 30% of white students versus 47% of black students and 44% of FRL students. In Math, it is 30% for white students, 42% for black students and This is something that is being addressed in classroom instruction and through the RTI/MTSS process as well. It has also been

noted that looking at the current year's FSA data, students are not meeting their academic goals in grades 3-5 in Reading and grades 3-4 in Math (Reading grade 3 10% proficient, grade 4 10% proficient). RTI/MTSS will begin with these students as well. LLI will be used for interventions in Reading while Math teachers will be using the Moving with Math for those in need of Math support. Science scores also were not as high in 2021 (15% proficient), so there are extra supports that teachers are using (1 on 1 instruction, small groups and pulling in additional materials that help bridge learning gaps, and the addition of a district coach that comes to do hands on lessons with the teachers and students twice a month). Digging deeper into last year's data from iReady showed that in ELA, Grade K had 50% proficient, 1st had 30% proficient, 2nd had 20% proficient, Math showed, K had 39% proficient, 1st had 25% proficient, 2nd had 0% proficient.

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

Looking at the 2021 FSA data scores, Reading is the number one focus at GES this year. The teachers are all aware and are all pushing for students to make at least a year's worth of growth, or a learning gain in the 2021-22 school year. Teachers are using K12 Lift growth measurements to help them assess student needs and to address the needs in all areas, but especially Reading. Reading is the foundation for doing well in other subjects, which is why it is the focus for the year.

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

The pandemic played a part in the need for improvement with students not having access to internet to stay up to date on lessons when quarantined. However, other schools in the district were able to maintain or grow by a letter grade, so this is not an excuse for the performance of the students. (Remove this sentence) This year students are not reliant on just internet when they are quarantined at home, they have packets of work with directions for parents to help them. Soon, they also will have videos of those lessons (for those that have internet or cellular data) to help keep them current while they are out. Additionally, the school is using K12 Lift academic growth analysis to help identify and maintain a focus on academics in the classroom. Teachers are able to look at the academic growth, locate the need, set the goal and decide on the focus for their classroom to ensure students grow academically at the pace necessary for the student to achieve at high levels.

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

5th grade Math showed that 60% of students were proficient in 2021. In 2019 they were 52% proficient.

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

The math teacher is a highly effective teacher that has consistent success with her students. She ensures that those that need remediation get their educational needs met, and she plans this into her instructional time. We ensure we follow the SIT/MTSS process for students who need to be in Tier II and Tier III interventions as well. Additionally, she is using the K12 Lift growth analysis with each diagnostic to help ensure students are growing academically quickly enough.

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

To continue this we are using a new math interventions Moving with Math, and we are using Leveled Literacy Instruction for Reading to ensure that we can accelerate learning. Additionally, we are intentionally looking at our questioning and rigor in what is being taught in the classroom.

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.

The district has hired additional instructional coaches to help teachers work on their practices and move into the new standards this year. The new teacher will also receive a mentor and the mentor will work with her throughout this school year on planning, classroom management, academics, and any other needs assisted through the mentor program. She also has the assistance of the reading coach this year (as do all teachers, but she and grades 3-5 are scheduled to work with the coach twice a month), and an instructional coach that is to help her with classroom management.

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

The instructional coaches will serve for more than just this year helping to sustain the improvement. Additionally, teachers are getting (through coaches) assistance with the new standards that will help build their knowledge of and the rigor of the new standards going forward.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FSA data showed a significant decrease in student learning gains and proficiency. The 2018/2019 ELA proficiency was 44% and 41% of students made learning gains. The most recent 2020/2021 FSA scores indicated 24% of students scored proficiency in ELA and 35% of students scored proficiency in Mathematics. Digging deeper into last year's data from our progress monitoring tool, iReady showed that in ELA, Grade K had 50% proficient, 1st had 30% proficient, 2nd had 20% proficient, Math showed, K had 39% proficient, 1st had 25% proficient, 2nd had 0% proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>The school will increase learning gains in ELA on the 2022 FSA by at least 5% this year in grades 3-5.</p> <p>The school will increase learning gains in Math on the 2022 FSA by at least 5% this year in grades 3-5.</p> <p>The school will increase proficiency by 4% for grades KG-2 in ELA according to iReady data by the third assessment.</p>
Monitoring:	Use of iReady to monitor students learning growth as well as the use of instructional coaches for ELA classes. Additionally, reading will be focused on in social studies and in science this year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joi Collins (joi.collins@madison.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Our school will use a reading/writing intervention curriculum called Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) in small groups during intervention time.</p> <p>Use of the MTSS to analyze data and determine students who require additional assistance in area of ELA.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Leveled Literacy Intervention gives students the academic supports needed for reading proficiency which is done in small groups daily during the school's built in intervention time. It has been proven to work according to the What Work Clearinghouse in several studies that have been conducted on the supports.</p> <p>MTSS was chosen because students that are identified early are more likely to be able to overcome a reading deficiency. The MTSS process in place at G.E.S. works with students on ELA, Reading, Math, Attendance, Behavior and other needs throughout the year. This is also a proven strategy according to the What Works Clearinghouse in the several studies that have been conducted on this way of work.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Using iReady identify the lowest 25% of each grade level to begin LLI during intervention time.

Person Responsible Lisa Roderick (lisa.roderick@mcsbfl.us)

Using iReady and classroom data, refer students through the MTSS process to ensure that they are growing academically and changes are not needed on the interventions the team has put into place.

Person Responsible Lisa Roderick (lisa.roderick@mcsbfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Greenville Elementary is not listed on the Safe Schools for Alex website.

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.

The school is working with the community to ensure that we have a positive culture and environment. We implement PBIS at the school and look for good behavior in our students. Additionally, the school uses Class Dojo, an automated calling service, PeachJar to send home flyers electronically to parents on events and necessary community information as well as a Facebook page to help keep parents, families, students and the community up to date and informed of events, necessary information, community information (such as COVID-19 testing and vaccine sites, Farm Share dates and times, etc.), to help foster communications between the school, families, and the community at large.

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

SAC Committee-Made up of community leaders, parents, teachers and staff to help advise the school and lead the way for a positive culture and environment.

PTO-Made up of parents, teachers and families to help fundraise for the school and to assist in meeting the needs of families, students and the community.

School District Personnel-Assisting the school in various funding and overall support of academic and student growth goals.

Administrator-Leads the school in a positive path for academic growth, teacher success

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00