

Polk County Public Schools

Griffin Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Griffin Elementary School

3315 KATHLEEN RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/griffin>

Demographics

Principal: Roberta Stinson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2022

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
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (45%) 2018-19: D (35%) 2017-18: D (35%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Griffin Elementary School

3315 KATHLEEN RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

<http://schools.polk-fl.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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	77%

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 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.

To provide all students a safe environment wherein they are provided an equitable opportunity for learning and growing.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All stakeholders will assist in helping students to grow to reach their full potential academically, socially and emotionally.

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
Stinson, Roberta	Principal	<p>The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school which leads and assists in setting up structures for high impact instruction, data-based decision-making, and a collaborative culture. The Principal monitors the progress of intentional planning by attending weekly grade level collaborative planning sessions as well as PLCs. She also conducts daily walkthroughs, provides consistent formative feedback to support the professional growth of all teachers, and openly communicates with parents to build positive relationships.</p>
Pagan Cartagena, Keila	Assistant Principal	<p>Assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, in the assessment of school staff, and assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation. The Assistant Principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas. She provides commentary on a weekly basis and works with the principal to make schedule adjustments as needed. The Assistant Principal also provides and supports common vision for PBIS by enforcing protocol and policy. The Assistant Principal will also ensure that classrooms have the necessary materials/furniture/arrangements that are conducive to learning based on teacher discretion.</p>
Brown, Janel	Behavior Specialist	<p>The Behavior Interventionist is responsible for teacher-to-teacher classroom support, modeling, mentoring, and collaborating to promote better behavior management strategies for teachers and students. Mrs. Brown is also responsible for supporting teachers in data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based behavior strategies and programs; and school improvement. Mrs. Brown works closely with the leadership team to review schoolwide data and plan, implement, and monitor strategies to teach schoolwide rules and expectations.</p>
Smith, Jill	Math Coach	<p>Conducts grade level collaborative planning focused on B.E.S.T. standards, monitors for the rigor of the instruction with a focus on high yield strategies. Develops and delivers professional learning opportunities that are aligned with our priority strategies. Provides grade level and one on one coaching as well as gathers resources for all three tiers of student instruction. Meets weekly with Administration to provide feedback on teachers and grade levels. Develops Blueprint assessments for bi-weekly administration and meets with admin to analyze data.</p>
Missouri, Dedra	Psychologist	<p>Are uniquely qualified members of school teams with expertise in mental health, learning and behavior to help all students succeed. They are primarily responsible for providing student evaluations to determine eligibility and services in ESE. They consult and collaborate with various teams to help schools implement MTSS. They also provide services and training in individual/group counseling, crisis intervention, behavior planning and interventions. They are key members of the SST.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brown, Alicia	Other	Mental Health Facilitators are mental health professionals who provide individual and group counseling, case management, and crisis team support. They are available to provide training in threat management, mental health and wellness, and trauma-informed strategies. The facilitators serve on school-based threat management teams and work collaboratively with other mental health professionals to identify and provide interventions for high-risk students in need of mental health support.
Sabat-Romero, Karla	School Counselor	Supports MTSS and serves as the LEA
Nations, Wendy	Other	Works with students not scoring proficiently on bi-weekly blueprint tests

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/24/2022, Roberta Stinson

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.*

2

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

17

Total number of students enrolled at the school

314

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

3

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

4

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	66	54	51	61	55	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	340
Attendance below 90 percent	33	22	18	18	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	4	2	5	4	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	22	26	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	19	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	40	32	30	21	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173

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	22	16	14	12	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 6/24/2022

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	66	48	56	58	49	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	329
Attendance below 90 percent	0	25	18	10	24	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	5	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	15	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	26	19	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	33	46	27	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	11	12	10	12	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

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

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	66	48	56	58	49	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	329
Attendance below 90 percent	0	25	18	10	24	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	4	3	5	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	15	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	26	19	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	33	46	27	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	11	12	10	12	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%	47%	56%				37%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						39%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						32%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	42%	42%	50%				30%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	58%						36%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						43%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	49%	59%				31%	47%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	37%	52%	-15%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	29%	48%	-19%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2022					
	2019	30%	47%	-17%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	29%	56%	-27%	62%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	33%	56%	-23%	64%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2022					
	2019	19%	51%	-32%	60%	-41%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	27%	45%	-18%	53%	-26%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						

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	17	40		31	33		13				
ELL	25	50		44	60						
BLK	38	35	20	28	50	50	40				
HSP	35	57		49	67		42				
WHT	40	57		48	55		29				
FRL	38	53	44	39	58	44	41				
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	15			15							
ELL	27			23							
BLK	23	31		27	46						
HSP	37	31		37	38		7				
WHT	32			29							
FRL	24	27		24	33		3				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	24	29	31	34	52	55	25				
ELL	32	45		32	57		25				
BLK	33	34		25	25		35				
HSP	48	47		38	52		29				
WHT	23	33		33	28		33				
FRL	33	32	26	23	31	45	31				

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	347
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	46
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	44
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?

The data on each cell in FSA improved. The learning gains in ELA fell below Math as well as learning gains. All grade levels improved considerably helping the school obtain a C school grade. Only two ESSA sub-groups scored below the 41%- Black and SWD. Science improved by 31%. Looking at 3-year data showed double digit improvements in all but 2 cells. ELA achievement improved by 6% while LG of BQ math dropped by 17 points even though it still scored at 43%.

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

According to the 2022 State Assessment 5th grade math demonstrated the greatest need for improvement.

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

Developing strategic interventions and acceleration where students are targeted and support staff can provide extra scaffolding. Some students are being measured in multiple subgroups, therefore they need to be part of RTD groups for additional support.

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

According to the 2022 Sate Assessment Math showed the most improvement. Science also showed a drastic increase of 31% to 39% where it was 8%.

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

Our faculty was almost completely staffed with certified teachers. One of the contributing factors was that the interventionist target specific students based on biweekly Blue Print data. 3rd and 4th grade students were pulled four times a week for RTD groups. District science coach immersed herself with 5th grade science teacher. Reading interventionist taught science through the reading lens.

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

Focused instructional design based on the results of biweekly benchmark assessments in both reading and math. Planning will include restorative practice, higher order thinking questions, high yield strategies, task alignment and equivalent practices. The development of the learning arc during planning and MOU will also be a strategy to immerse the teachers in the benchmarks and the intent of the state.

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 goal is to provide teachers with weekly professional learning opportunities based on school wide need. In addition to one on one coaching cycles with instructional coaches, interventionist and administrators. PD and work with the learning arc will be a continuous process.

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

RTD will be implemented with fidelity, providing tutoring for students targeted for intervention/ acceleration. K-2 students will be included in this to ensure sustainability for beyond next year. Interventionists, instructional paras and ESE support will be focusing on students that are not successful on their biweekly benchmark assessments. These groups will be fluid and can change as need it. The assessments will be designed using Performance Matters and will include seven to ten questions which reflect the four day cycle of instruction.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

62% of students school wide are not proficient in ELA and 58% are not proficient in math. In order to continue to increase school-wide proficiency, common planning will be established with a focus on standard-task alignment and equivalent experiences. A math and reading coach will assist admin in monitoring instruction and adjusting professional development to strategically target teacher needs/strengths. An academic interventionist will work directly with students to accelerate learning.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

State data will show a minimum of 1% increase as well as 10% of students who fall just below the proficiency line will become proficient.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Griffin Elementary will monitor student progress in Math, ELA, and 4/5 Science through a biweekly assessment. Students who are not successful in the biweekly assessment (blueprint) will receive immediate intervention. The students receiving intervention will be adjusted based on the next weekly assessments. Through this intervention, we will be able to identify the students struggling in each area and work to provide supports and additional strategies for the students' success. We will also work to identify any barriers that might be keeping the student from learning and provide support in those areas during weekly leadership meetings. Focused walk throughs will also be implemented where teachers know the expectations bi-weekly. Coaches will provide weekly feedback to administration as to the rigor of implementation of our focus strategies and compare to administration's observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Roberta Stinson (roberta.stinson@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy

Collaborative Planning with the Leadership and Instructional Coaches in the areas of working with high yield strategies that include use of restorative practice, collaborative pairs, task alignment, equivalent practice and using higher order thinking questioning. Use of the Learning Arc during planning sessions will also be implemented.

being
implemented
for this Area
of Focus.

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**
Explain the
rationale for
selecting
this specific
strategy.
Describe the
resources/
criteria used
for selecting
this
strategy.

During the 21-22 school year, these evidence-based strategies were instrumental in increasing the school grade from a D to a C. Restorative practices and equivalent practices were only a focus in the second semester. With immediate implementation and the addition of the learning arc, Griffin should continue to grow.

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.

Observational data in K-2 showed a lack of implementation of B.E.S.T. Standards with fidelity. Transitioning B.E.S.T. Standards into 3-5 will require targeted training in task alignment/B.E.S.T Benchmarks. All grade levels will be included in the targeted training in order to increase fidelity of the implementation process. A master schedule will be developed to include common planning utilizing the learning arc in order to ensure that all students are receiving equitable instruction of B.E.S.T standards.

Person Responsible Roberta Stinson (roberta.stinson@polk-fl.net)

Administration will meet with teachers to review prior year data during pre-planning. 1-5 teachers will analyze their final FSA or STAR/EL to examine ESSA sub-group performance. K teachers will

Person Responsible Keila Pagan Cartagena (keila.pagancartagena@polk-fl.net)

Leadership team will meet during pre-planning to calendar the first month of areas of focus based on EPCs and benchmarks/focus strategies. Calendar will be given to teachers for planning purposes. The calendar will be directly linked to Journey EPCs to ensure teacher understand it is not just compliance.

Person Responsible Keila Pagan Cartagena (keila.pagancartagena@polk-fl.net)

A calendar of focused walk throughs will also be implemented. Teachers know the expectations bi-weekly. Coaches will provide weekly feedback to administration as to the rigor of implementation of our focus strategies and compare to administration's observations. Artifacts and anecdotal notes will be discussed as well as observational notes based on Domain 3. This will occur weekly during leadership team meetings.

Person Responsible Keila Pagan Cartagena (keila.pagancartagena@polk-fl.net)

Blueprint and progress monitoring data will be analyzed by leadership team and during MOU meetings after school. Discussions will be conducted as to trends across grade levels and ESSA subgroups. Individual teachers will submit reflections on their data monthly.

Person Responsible Roberta Stinson (roberta.stinson@polk-fl.net)

Informal data chats will be conducted with students bi-weekly. Formal data chats with students will be conducted before progress monitoring assessments are given. All above action steps will repeat for the course of the year with areas of focus timelines changing as needed.

Person Responsible Roberta Stinson (roberta.stinson@polk-fl.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Feeling safe and valued is important to a child's development. When a school community is characterized by positive relationships between both students and teachers, genuine respect is the norm, students feel they belong, and can excel because they have ownership of their learning and actions. At Griffin, we believe in developing the whole child by allowing students and teachers to build positive relationships while cultivating a classroom and schoolwide culture in which students challenge their own growth, take ownership of their own learning, self-regulate their actions, and continually to positively grow emotionally through positive recognition in both academics and behavior. Teachers will assist students in creating individual academic and behavioral goals in which they will analyze monthly. MTSS procedures will be put in place and supports established to help students struggling to meet their behavior goals. As a result during the 2022-2023 school year, we will see a decrease in our office discipline referrals by 5% from the total submitted during the 2021-2022 school year.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

With monthly individual academic and behavioral goals and the implementation of MTSS behavior supports, we will see a 5% decrease in the total number of office referrals submitted and suspensions for the 2022-2023 school year, which will allow for more in class instructional time for all students.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student goals will be reviewed monthly to ensure that all data is being analyzed with students, goals are being set, and action steps are being developed. Teachers will also submit monthly PBS data documenting which students earned participation in the monthly PBS reward. Monthly data chats will be held with teachers to discuss students who are consistently not earning participation in the PBS reward, and MTSS Behavior plans will be developed. MTSS behavior plans will be monitored, reviewed, and adjusted as needed each month to ensure they are being followed with fidelity and students are making progress towards their goals. Monthly discipline data will also be reviewed through data chats with teachers and the schoolwide leadership team. A behavior interventionist will work closely with the Guidance Counselor to monitor this data and implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janel Brown (janel.brown@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy

Evidence of student PBS/behavior data will be tracked and monitored by the teacher, school counselor and administration. Schoolwide PBS and discipline data will be tracked through an excel spreadsheet that will be monitored by administration and PBIS Team. MTSS plans will be implemented by the teacher and monitored by school counselor and administration.

being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The rationale for selecting this strategy is to keep students aware of their actions and assist in the development of their responsibility for those actions.

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.

We will teach leadership skills to assist students in taking ownership of their learning and actions. We will start with a general overview of skills in August and then have a focus habit each month.

Person Responsible Karla Sabat-Romero (karla.sabat-romero@polk-fl.net)

Students will track their academic and PBS/behavior data, set goals for themselves, and develop actions steps to achieve those goals.

Person Responsible Janel Brown (janel.brown@polk-fl.net)

Schoolwide PBS and discipline data will be tracked and reviewed with all stakeholders.

Person Responsible Roberta Stinson (roberta.stinson@polk-fl.net)

Implementation of MTSS behavior plans will be monitored for fidelity. Data and student performance will be discussed monthly and plans will be adjusted to ensure student success

Person Responsible Janel Brown (janel.brown@polk-fl.net)

Sanford Harmony professional development will be held for all staff members to develop their understanding, student leadership, and student ownership of learning and behavior. K-3 SEL pilot program through the University of Alabama will be implemented to support sustaining Griffin's success.

Person Responsible Karla Sabat-Romero (karla.sabat-romero@polk-fl.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

69% of kindergarten and 1st grade students showed proficiency level in Early Literacy. 39% of second grade students showed proficiency level in Star Reading. In order to continue to increase school-wide proficiency, common planning will be established with a focus on standard-task alignment and equivalent experiences. Teachers will be implementing new benchmarks with fidelity and supporting their lessons utilizing the resources provided by the district. The learning Arc will be implemented with fidelity and model teachers will be utilized to support teachers. Diagnostic testing will be completed during the first 2 weeks of school for Kindergarten in order for teachers to have a baseline of skill base for their students. Words Their Way will be implemented in Power Hour.

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

62% of students school wide are not proficient in ELA. In order to continue to increase school-wide proficiency, common planning will be established with a focus on standard-task alignment and equivalent experiences. Teachers will be implementing new benchmarks with fidelity and supporting their lessons utilizing the resources provided by the district. SRA Corrective Reading will be implemented during Power Hour.

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)

Our past year scores were as follows: Kinder 69%, 1st grade 69% and 2nd grade 39%. Our goal is to improve each grade level by 10%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Our past year scores were as follows: 3rd - 40%, 4th - 35%, 5th - 40%. Our goal is for all students to make gains in ELA; and to for our ELA scores to be 50% or higher in each grade level.

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.

Our Reading Coach will train the K-2 Power Hour Teachers on how to use "Words Their Way". After training is completed, the coach will work with the teachers to develop their Power Hour small group rotations, implementing the program with fidelity. 3-5 teachers will receive training in SRA Corrective Reading which will be implemented during Power Hour.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Stinson, Roberta, roberta.stinson@polk-fl.net

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?

In order to meet the HB 7011 - Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) (ELEM), Griffin Elementary will provide professional development for our teachers in Grades K-2 in the program

"Words Their Way". This program will be used during our Power Hour program, where we work with students in small groups to improve their reading. SRA Corrective Reading will be implemented in 3-5 in order to improve on our past year scores which were as follows: 3rd - 40%, 4th - 35%, 5th - 40%.

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?

Students in grades K-2 will be administered the primary spelling inventory or the elementary spelling inventory to determine their initial developmental spelling stage. Through explicit word study instruction, collaborative activities and independent practice, students will progress through the wordy study continuum each week. Progress monitoring will be in the form of weekly word study assessments that will determine the subsequent word study pattern. The following chart provides the goal, per the program's developers, for each grade level.

Grade level *End of Year Spelling Stage Goal

K Middle Letter Name Alphabetic

1 Early Within Word Pattern

2 Late Within Word Pattern

3 Early Syllables and Affixes

4 Middle Syllables and Affixes

5 Late Syllables and Affixes

* A student will be encouraged and supported to extend beyond the end of year goals if appropriate.

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
All Teachers K-2 will receive training Words Their Way All teachers 3-5 will receive training in SRA Corrective Reading	Stinson, Roberta, roberta.stinson@polk-fl.net
Admin and Reading Coach will schedule walk thru calendars to monitor implementation and leadership will meet weekly to discuss needed supports. For SRA, groups will be fluid and everchanging. Data will be reviewed as determined by the prescription of the program. Admin and Coach will monitor assessment data to ensure targeted skills and students are aligned. Any professional development needed throughout the year will be provided by Reading Coach.	Stinson, Roberta, roberta.stinson@polk-fl.net

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.

The school addresses building a positive school culture and environment promoting respect and equity to staff and students.

- Our principal will post weekly updated messages on our school's webpage and Facebook pages for parents and students.
- Each grade level has been provided a Leadership Team member. This member will assist in bringing teacher needs and concerns to the weekly meetings so that any issues can be addressed immediately. This Leadership Team member will act as a liaison between school and home, helping teachers and parents to work more effectively together for the student's success.
- recognizing staff and students hard work daily
- supporting teachers and students throughout the day
- PBIS events monthly for students
- random acts of kindness for teachers
- Team building exercises during MOU meetings
- School-wide family engagement events
- Encouraging parental participation in students' learning
- PD on increasing family engagement with improving/increasing communication between school and home
- Developing and active SAC and PTO
- Working with community Liaison to increase business partners who support staff and student incentives
- Administration works to enhance their relationships with parents by providing random positive feedback

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

-The Leadership Team's goal is to improve communication on the campus with students and staff, and improve communication to our parents/guardians.

Griffin's stakeholders include but are not limited to, all school staff including teachers, administration, office staff, para educators, cafeteria, and custodial staff, students, parents, advisory board members, business partners, PTO, and local community members. Stakeholders provide ongoing feedback about school culture and environment through surveys, meetings, school and community events, as well as social media. By understanding our mission and values, stakeholders are continuously provided opportunities to enhance and support our school culture. Stakeholders in the school are expected to model and uphold school norms and values. Through classroom lessons, parent meetings, and school events, stakeholders will be engaged, interactive and in collaboration with each other to ensure a positive culture and environment.