Griffin Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Griffin Middle School

800 ALABAMA ST, Tallahassee, FL 32304

https://www.leonschools.net/griffin

Demographics

Principal: Zelena O'banner

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: D (39%) 2017-18: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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 Leon 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

Griffin Middle School

800 ALABAMA ST, Tallahassee, FL 32304

https://www.leonschools.net/griffin

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	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	94%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		D	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon 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 at Griffin Middle School is to facilitate learning opportunities to empower students to recognize their potential by teaching rigorous and relevant skills that will equip students to be college and career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All Griffin Middle School, students will utilize various forms of technology to apply and expand skills, explore careers, and successfully transition to high school as productive citizens of society who are on track for technical careers, college, and/or the workforce.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
O'Banner, Zelena	Principal	The principal oversees all procedures and processes at school site, conduct classroom walk-through's, hold data chats with teachers, oversee the budgets, recruit and hire qualified teachers/staff, engage the community stakeholders in school initiatives, and maintain ongoing communication with leadership team.
Pollitt, Brian	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will oversee the master schedule, analyze student data on a regular basis, facilitate MTSS meetings, conduct classroom walk-through's, hold data chats with teachers, assist with common planning, plan and organize professional development opportunities for teachers, recruit and hire qualified teachers/staff, and provide ongoing communication with leadership team.
Wright, Patrick	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will oversee student attendance and discipline, ensure facilities are safe and functioning, conduct classroom walk-through's, hold data chats with teachers, and maintain ongoing communication with leadership team.
Sanders, Susie	Dean	Responsible for student attendance and discipline. Will monitor student daily attendance, following district protocol for students with excessive absences and/or tardiness. In addition, will work with students who receive discipline infractions.
Bryant, Ro'Tonda	Teacher, K-12	As the chair of English Language Arts Department, will facilitate common planning amongst department, ensure progress monitoring assessments are provided to students, review student data with department, and provide ongoing communication with leadership team
Tyson, Angel	Teacher, K-12	As the chair of Math Department, will facilitate common planning amongst department, ensure progress monitoring assessments are provided to students, review student data with department, and provide ongoing communication with leadership team
Wilkerson, Sandra	Teacher, K-12	As the chair of Social Studies Department, will facilitate common planning amongst department, ensure progress monitoring assessments are provided to students, review student data with department, and provide ongoing communication with leadership team
Jefferson, Tarran	School Counselor	As the Testing Coordinator, Guidance Counselor, and 504 Coordinator, will coordinate all district and statewide assessments to ensure all students are assessed, facilitate the student academic recovery programs, and provide ongoing communication with the leadership team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/1/2017, Zelena O'banner

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

593

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

12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	193	209	217	0	0	0	0	619
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	98	104	0	0	0	0	277
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	77	65	0	0	0	0	208
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	6	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	102	115	0	0	0	0	305
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	110	102	0	0	0	0	319
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	75	95	0	0	0	0	242
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	86	113	105	0	0	0	0	304

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	0	0	4	7	6	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	0	0	0	0	12

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/13/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	231	229	210	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	148	130	0	0	0	0	440
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	23	20	0	0	0	0	88
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	81	77	0	0	0	0	233
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	69	101	0	0	0	0	227
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	46	47	0	0	0	0	128
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	87	100	0	0	0	0	282

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	12

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	231	229	210	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	148	130	0	0	0	0	440
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	23	20	0	0	0	0	88
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	81	77	0	0	0	0	233
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	69	101	0	0	0	0	227
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	46	47	0	0	0	0	128
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	87	100	0	0	0	0	282

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	12

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	28%	53%	50%				29%	55%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	43%						44%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						43%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	27%	34%	36%				27%	59%	58%
Math Learning Gains	55%						36%	58%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%						33%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	26%	55%	53%				21%	49%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	92%	61%	58%				56%	75%	72%

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**
06	2022					
	2019	28%	54%	-26%	54%	-26%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	23%	56%	-33%	52%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
08	2022					
	2019	32%	59%	-27%	56%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019	18%	53%	-35%	55%	-37%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	25%	60%	-35%	54%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
08	2022					
	2019	26%	45%	-19%	46%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	11%	44%	-33%	48%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	95%	70%	25%	67%	28%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	54%	75%	-21%	71%	-17%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	85%	69%	16%	61%	24%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	67%	-67%	57%	-57%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	25	44	39	28	53	63	17	91			
ELL	25	59		11	29						
BLK	25	40	44	24	53	66	23	93	54		
HSP	23	55	70	23	48		45				
MUL	25	42		46	60						
WHT	50	70		43	70		36	91			
FRL	27	43	49	25	53	68	24	96	60		
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	22	34	29	20	30	24	10	48			
ELL	19	65	60	10	22						
BLK	25	30	24	15	17	22	11	54	33		

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
HSP	22	35		21	22		10				
MUL	43			31							
WHT	30	44		36	36			54			
FRL	25	31	28	14	17	21	11	50	29		

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	15	38	36	16	33	26	18	25			
ELL	8	40		17	25						
BLK	27	43	43	26	33	31	19	52	59		
HSP	44	70		56	58			80			
MUL	39	50		33	59						
WHT	47	42		24	48		27				
FRL	27	43	41	26	34	31	16	53	52		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	27
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	2
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	43
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Based on progress monitoring data, we noticed there was a positive trend for all grade levels in ELA proficiency and learning gains. Collectively, all grade levels increased proficiency from 10% (as measured by the baseline progress monitoring tool) to 27% (as measured by the spring progress monitoring tool). Further, looking at the ELL and SWD subgroups, there was also a positive trend in proficiency. ELL went from 10% to 32% and SWD went from 3% to 13%.

Based on progress monitoring data, we noticed there was a positive trend for all grade levels in MATH proficiency and learning gains. Collectively, all grade levels increased proficiency from 19% (as measured by the baseline progress monitoring tool) to 25% (as measured by the spring progress monitoring tool). Further, looking at the ELL subgroup, there was also a positive trend in proficiency. ELL went from 12% to 32%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

When comparing each individual component score on the 2022 state assessments with each individual component score on the 2021 state assessments, we increased in every component. However, when looking at the data more closely, one subgroup did not appear to be making the same rate of progress as the rest of the school. That subgroup is our SWD subgroup. When collectively the entire school was at 28% proficiency for ELA, our SWD subgroup only demonstrated 13% proficiency. When collectively the entire school was at 27% proficiency for MATH, our SWD subgroup only demonstrated 6% proficiency. We would expect our SWD subgroup proficiency percentages to be more aligned with our whole school proficiency percentages. Further, it is important to note that approximately 20% of our student population is identified as SWD.

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

Throughout the 2021-2022 school year, we had an increase in the number of students identified with a disability. Further, Griffin Middle School opted to incorporate the inclusion model in both 7th and 8th grade ELA and MATH core classes. Unfortunately, ESE teachers are in short supply and we were unable to fill a crucial inclusion teacher vacancy with a highly qualified person. We attempted to fill the vacancy using support staff as well as eventually hiring a teacher out-of-field. Historically, the SWD subgroup has not performed at or above the level as the rest of the student population at Griffin Middle School. Further, our SWD subgroup consistently falls short of the minimum federal index.

To address this need, Griffin is implementing the inclusion model for all three grade levels. Further, we

are actively recruiting highly qualified ESE teachers to ensure all ESE vacancies are filled prior to the start of the school year. Another critical component to address is providing much needed Professional Development to all of our core general education teachers. Not all general education teachers truly understand the concept of the inclusion model as well as not all general education teachers truly understand how to provide the specific accommodations outlined in the students' IEP.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

In reviewing our progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, our MATH learning gains showed the most improvement. Compared to 2021 state assessments, our MATH learning gains improved from 18% to 55%. Our ELL subgroups showed significant gains in proficiency in both ELA and MATH based on our progress monitoring data (comparing baseline to spring assessments). The ELL subgroup for ELA went from 10% proficiency to 32% proficiency, which was a higher percentage than the overall school proficiency of 27%. The ELL subgroup for MATH went from 12% proficiency to 32% proficiency, which was a higher percentage than the overall school proficiency of 25%.

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

The significant learning gains made in MATH can be contributed to several key factors. First, the master schedule was created to provide all core subjects with common planning. During common planning, teachers collaborated on identifying standards to teach, how to teach the standards, how to assess the standards, as well as plans for how to remediate and/or accelerate students. Second, the school placed a high priority on student data. State-tested subject area teachers were required to move individual student magnets after each round of progress monitoring. Data was shared monthly at the faculty meetings as well as in weekly newsletters. Administration met with both individual teachers to discuss the teachers specific data and to design plans of actions to continue to have the data move in a positive trend direction. Additionally, administration with each individual student to have the students chart their own learning on "bucket sheets". As students increased their scores, celebrations were held in the way of outdoor bar-b-que lunches. Everyone in the school took ownership in their data.

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

Griffin Middle School recognizes that we still have a high percentage of students who are not considered proficient in the areas of ELA and MATH. To help accelerate learning, and close those achievement gaps, Griffin Middle School will be incorporating a "W.I.N. Time" into the daily homeroom meeting period. "W.I.N." stands for What I Need. We are purchasing MyPath which customizes specific learning paths for students to accelerate in the standards that are missing. Data from the initial round of baseline testing will be used to help set the specific learning paths. Data will be collected on a continuous basis, identifying and analyzing areas such as: time-on-task, path completion, rate at which student is moving through the path, etc.

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 professional development opportunities that will be provided will include an overview and introduction training to the MyPath learning platform. Teachers and leaders will need to learn how to properly use this program. Further, training will be provided on how to assist students with using the program. Additional professional development will be developed based on the collected data and future analysis of needs.

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

The master schedule has been created to provide all core subject area teachers with common planning once again. The work initially started this past school year in common planning will continue. To aid in the common planning process, all teachers will be provided with a lesson plan template that must be used. In addition, teachers must submit their FOCUS calendars. Administration will use the FOCUS calendars as a reference when reviewing and checking lesson plans to ensure there is alignment. Further, classroom walk-throughs will continue to be a way of work at Griffin. Administration will be looking for student engagement, rigor of assignments, and listening for higher order questioning. Further, administration will be able to check to ensure that lesson submitted is being carried out in the classroom.

Data analysis played a vital role and will continue to play a vital role. Individual student magnets will be moved by teachers after each progress monitoring assessment. Teacher data chats will continue to take place with administration to work out needed plans of actions. Student data chats will be held with administration to ensure students feel ownership in their learning. During faculty meetings, and in weekly newsletters, data will be shared. The data shared will be whole school. grade level, and by subgroups.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our SWD subgroup showed minimal and negative trends based on progress monitoring data. Additionally, our SWD subgroup has consistently fallen below the federal index over the past years. When looking at the progress monitoring data, specifically proficiency, our SWD subgroups only increased from 3% to 13% in ELA and decreased from 11% to 6% in MATH.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Griffin Middle School plans to achieve the same proficiency percentage (36% for ELA and 35% for MATH) or better for our SWD subgroup when compared to the whole school proficiency percentage. The final proficiency percentage will be measured using the PM3 assessment that the state will issue in the areas of ELA and MATH during spring timeframe.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored using PM1 (first 30 days of school) and PM2 assessments (mid-year) provided by the state. Data analysis will be performed to determine the total percentage of students scoring proficiency on each of these PM assessments, then compared to the proficiency of just the subgroup SWD. Based on the collected data, action plans will be created as needed to help close the SWD gap.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	For master scheduling, all students in the SWD subgroup were scheduled first and their schedules were locked. This ensured the students were guaranteed a seat in the correct section with the correct instructional supports. Additionally, class sizes for our SWD subgroups were slightly reduced to provide more individualized instruction when necessary. Griffin has implemented a full inclusion model, which research has found is the most beneficial way for SWD subgroup students to receive services. A certified ESE teacher will be pushing into the core subject areas of ELA and MATH to provide the extra needed supports to allow our SWD students to be successful, and close the proficiency achievement gap.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	It is important to ensure our neediest students receive the propper instructional attention. This starts with the master schedule. The master schedule dictates where the resources are located. It was paramount our SWD students were provided a schedule that capitalized on the availalbe resources. Further, it was important to ensure SWD students are in least-restrictive environments. The inclusion model is the least-restrictive environment. SWD students are able to learn with their non-SWD peers.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

SWD students are identified and their IEP's are reviewed in detail.

Person Responsible   Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

Sections are created on the master schedule that are specific to SWD/Inclusion model. Teachers are selected to based on VAM rating to teach the inclusion sections. ESE teachers are selected to provide the inclusive services. SWD students are specifically scheduled into the courses/sections based on thier IEP needs.

Person Responsible   Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

Progress monitoring will take place at a minimum of three times a year. Data will tracked and shared with teachers. Best strategies to increase student proficiency will be identified and incorporated into the daily instruction.

Person Responsible   Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	In looking closely as specific student data, it was identified that students who were previously proficient in the areas of ELA and/or MATH had dropped to below proficiency. Although common planning was provided in the previous school year, the process was new. Teachers are now beginning to see the impact successful common planning had versus unsuccessful common planning. There is a need to ensure all common planning is successful, and that all teachers within a department are working collaboratively to ensure best instructional practices are understood and being utilized within the classroom.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Based on the PM3 state assessments in ELA and MATH, 90% of matched and qualified students who were previously identified as being proficient in the areas of ELA and MATH (as measured by the 2022 FSA state assessments) will continue to be proficient in those areas.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Data will be collected after PM1 and PM2 state assessments to determine what percentage of students who were previously proficient (based on 2022 FSA State Assessments) continue to be considered proficient. The data will be shared with the teachers and action plans will be developed to help ensure the 90% goal is obtained.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	During common planning, teachers will work collaboratively to unpack the BEST standards. Once the standard is unpacked, teachers will work collaboratively to identify resources and activities that can be used to teach the standard to the students. Lesson plans will be drafted and submitted for administration review.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.	Teacher collaboration provides shared responsibility. Content understanding, questioning, and lesson activities can be strengthened when working collaboratively as opposed to working in isolation. The common planning format will follow the general guidelines of a Professional Learning Community. There will be four key questions to guide every common planning session: 1 - What do we want the students to know (the standards) 2 - How will we know when a student mastered the content (the assessment) 3 - What will we do when a student does NOT master the content (data analysis /

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	activity planning) 4 - What will we do when a student has mastered the content (data analysis / activity planning)

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Progress Monitoring assessments will be provided to all students in the areas of ELA and MATH.

Person Responsible	Tarran Jefferson (jeffersont@leonschools.net)

Data from the progress monitoring assessments will be carefully reviewed and analyzed. The data will then be shared with the teachers.

Person Responsible	Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

Department leaders will faciliate common planning. Best instructional strategies will be discussed and incorporated into daily lessons. Data will be the driving force to determine which instructional strategies need to be adjusted to ensure students proficiency maintains proficiency.

Person Responsible	Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

#3. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	At the end of the 2021-2022 school year, several teachers left Griffin Middle School to obtain teaching positions in other schools. Anytime a teacher leaves a school, a school is losing human capital. In order for a school to stay sustainable, human capital loss must be minimal. Griffin is still in the "re-building" stages and it is vital human capital be at an all time.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	At the conclusion of the 2022-2023 school year, 90% of the teachers who started the school year will remain in place for the 2023-2024 school year.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Climate surveys will be used to keep an accurate pulse of teacher morale. Climate surveys will be issued three times: beginning of the year, middle of the year, end of the year. Data collected from the climate surveys will be used to help boost morale if there is a need.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Zelena O'Banner (obannerz@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Climate surveys are used to measure teacher morale. The climate survey will be constructed using a rating scale of strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree. The survey will be provided to teachers electronically and anonymously. Data will be collected and administration will be able to use the data to determine if adjustments need to be made in the area of teacher morale.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Research indicates that teachers leave the profession and/or school due to leadership. The time to fix teacher morale is earlier in the school year, rather than at the end. When teachers are not happy, their best work is not provided to the students. It is important teachers are feeling good so that they stay committed to their students and so that they stay committed to the school. In order for a school to stay sustainable, their needs to be continuous human capital.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Climate survey's will be created and shared with teachers

Person Responsible   Zelena O'Banner (obannerz@leonschools.net)

Results from the surveys will be reviewed by leadership team

Person Responsible   Zelena O'Banner (obannerz@leonschools.net)

Activities will be organized and planned to boost teacher morale.

Person Responsible   Tarran Jefferson (jeffersont@leonschools.net)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Griffin utilizes a House System to address positive school culture and environment. The school has created 8 houses and each member of the faculty, staff and student has been placed into a house. Each house has a crest, motto, song, color, chant and quote that create an identity for the members of the house to adopt and embody. Through this process, the school also created a contract with the students that includes a point system connected to behavioral goals called the G22. Students are able to earn points when caught completing tasks or exemplifying behaviors that are on the G22 list. While earning points throughout the year, students are able to redeem those points for small tokens from the point store, attendance at special school functions, and the highest point earners for each quarter are invited to participate in an off-campus luncheon with their House leaders and the Principal. Through this initiative, Griffin has built a culture and environment where students and adults alike are able to belong to a smaller family group within the larger school collective to create relationships and opportunities to build intrinsic motivation.

In addition, Griffin is building a culture that is focused on student growth and achievement. Department chairs are being empowered to facilitate common planning, whereby they will work collaboratively with content area teachers to understand standards, identify appropriate instructional methods and strategies, plan for assessments (both formative and summative), analyze the assessment data, and develop plans for those students who mastered the standards and plans for those students who have not mastered the standards yet. In addition, teachers will be able to participate in peer classroom walk-throughs to identify best teaching practices and strategies, and then incorporate those practices/strategies into their own classrooms as well as share with their colleagues.

Data will be used as an instructional tool to help teachers develop and to foster greater levels of student achievement and learning. After progress monitoring assessments, teachers will be able to move individual student names on the data tracking system. Meaningful data chats can be held allowing opportunity for teacher reflection, which will result in teacher transformation. Further, a system is in place to track attendance and discipline data to ensure students attend school on a consistent basis and feel safe when they are on the school campus.

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

Zelena O'Banner (Principal) - Allocates budgets for incentives related to the house system and data chats. Participates in the conversations and is the face of the school.

Brian Pollitt (Assistant Principal) - Creates and maintains the data walls, ensuring new students are added and withdrawn students are removed. Facilitates the data conversations held in common planning, and after each progress monitoring assessment.

Patrick Wright (Assistant Principal) - Responsible for the school facilities and ensuring they are safe. Consistently checking student attendance and processing any referrals so students continue to feel safe.

Tarran Jefferson (Guidance Counselor) - Oversees the entire House System. Assigns students/staff to houses, runs the house meetings, plans activities and events.

Veronica Rios (Parent Involvement Specialist) - Establishes community partnerships to help sponsor events for both students and staff.