

Lake County Schools

Groveland 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

Groveland Elementary School

930 PARKWOOD AVE, Groveland, FL 34736

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

Demographics

Principal: Nichole Moses

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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: D (34%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 8/22/2022.

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

Groveland Elementary School

930 PARKWOOD AVE, Groveland, FL 34736

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">77%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 8/22/2022.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to become one community, empowering future citizens and tomorrow's leaders

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
Moses, Nichole	Principal	Oversees all administrators and leadership teams. Creates, maintains and monitor systems in instructional and operational management. Review and use student learning results to create an instructional implementation plan that includes faculty development, monitoring of learning environment, leadership development, communication, and professional and ethical behaviors.
Elder, Doreen	Assistant Principal	Oversees our students services, exceptional student education, and grades K -2. With an instructional focus on math curriculum. Review and use student learning results to create an instructional implementation plan that includes faculty development, monitoring of learning environment, leadership development, communication, and professional and ethical behaviors.
Harris, Faith	Assistant Principal	Oversees our academic, voluntary prekindergaten and grades 3 -5. With an instructional focus on literacy. Review and use student learning results to create an instructional implementation plan that includes faculty development, monitoring of learning environment, leadership development, communication, and professional and ethical behaviors.
Boyd, Dawn	Instructional Coach	<p>Conduct Mini Coaching Cycles with teachers (observe, collaborate, model) quarterly with 6-9 teachers</p> <p>Conduct Classroom Walkthrough Teacher Feedback based on school and district goals and framework.</p> <p>Models, demonstrates, and provides professional development on evidence-based literacy strategies.</p> <p>Models, demonstrates, support and provide professional development on district curriculum</p> <p>Train teachers to administer assessments, analyze data, scaffold instruction, and use data to differentiate instruction.</p> <p>Provide training on ELA interventions Tier 1, Tier 2, & Tier 3</p>
Petit-Phare, Vanessa	Instructional Coach	<p>Conduct Mini Coaching Cycles with teachers (observe, collaborate, model) quarterly with 6-9 teachers</p> <p>Conduct Classroom Walkthrough Teacher Feedback based on school and district goals and framework.</p> <p>Models, demonstrates, and provides professional development on evidence-based math and science strategies.</p> <p>Models, demonstrates, support and provide professional development on district curriculum</p> <p>Train teachers to administer assessments, analyze data, scaffold instruction, and use data to differentiate instruction.</p> <p>Provide training on Math/science interventions Tier 1, Tier 2, & Tier 3</p>
Stiller, Natasha	Instructional Coach	<p>Conduct Mini Coaching Cycles with teachers (observe, collaborate, model) quarterly with 2-3 teachers</p> <p>Conduct Classroom Walkthrough Teacher Feedback based off school and district goals and framework.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rodgers, Pamela	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<p>Develops, plans, and trains in the use of reliable, valid, and instructional relevant assessments</p> <p>Develops, plans, and implements the use of data collection to guide interventions for instructional/behavioral decisions</p> <p>Develops knowledge of the district’s recommended Tiers I, II, III behavioral system and assists in its implementation and training needs</p> <p>Develops teamwork across multiple groups/departments/schools to ensure successful performance of key operation tasks and achievement of district MTSS plan.</p> <p>Develops and implements a system to track key performance indicators in the MTSS plan including approval of individual MTSS processes for students requiring an evaluation to determine disability eligibility</p> <p>Report out the progress of intervention students moving in and out of various tiers of support</p> <p>Facilitate and organize Problem Solving Team meetings.</p> <p>Communicate results of the Problem Solving team meetings to appropriate personnel and parents</p>
Thomas, Simon	Other	<p>Creates, maintains, and monitors restorative plan for students that are coming back from alternative settings. Provides support in the areas of behavior, restorative practices, de-escalation, and parent contact. Assists with processing discipline referrals in a timely manner. Provides training for teachers on behavior intervention for Tiers 1, 2, & 3.</p>
Prather, Joseph	Dean	<p>Oversees student discipline, investigations, reports, and parent communication. Process discipline referrals in a timely manner. Provide training for teachers on behavior intervention for Tiers 1, 2, & 3. Conduct periodic campus tours to ensure campus safety in compliance with school board policy.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Nichole Moses

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.*

1

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

69

Total number of students enrolled at the school

700

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

28

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

32

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	73	117	97	126	126	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	655
Attendance below 90 percent	20	65	36	47	41	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	251
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	19	10	35	23	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
Course failure in Math	0	19	10	35	23	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	52	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	63	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	14	46	52	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172

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	77	107	93	113	99	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	600

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	1	3	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	1	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/19/2022

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	14	29	21	88	90	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	338

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	14	29	21	88	90	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	338

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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%	50%	56%				49%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	42%						50%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						40%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	24%	46%	50%				53%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	34%						54%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	25%						38%	39%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	52%	59%				50%	54%	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	48%	60%	-12%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	48%	60%	-12%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2022					
	2019	43%	59%	-16%	56%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

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	45%	62%	-17%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	61%	-3%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	48%	56%	-8%	53%	-5%

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	13	32	39	13	29	16	7				
ELL	15	47	50	17	35	25	20				
BLK	19	39	54	11	22	14	12				
HSP	28	42	50	23	33	32	36				
MUL	28			22							
WHT	32	46	53	35	45	18	38				
FRL	24	38	49	21	28	20	26				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	10	26	35	11	22	29	12				
ELL	17	33		24	39		32				
BLK	24	29	30	18	19	10	22				
HSP	30	38	50	31	42	25	42				
WHT	36	45		41	42		45				
FRL	23	31	45	23	30	17	31				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	26	16	28	37	25	19				
ELL	51	59	30	58	52		55				
ASN	82	64		82	82						
BLK	35	38	18	31	46	35	26				
HSP	53	55	46	56	53	40	61				
MUL	54			57	60						
WHT	46	47	50	60	56	29	48				
FRL	51	49	33	53	53	37	47				

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	38

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	303
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	24
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	25
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	38
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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 the most recent i-Ready progress monitoring data, continued phonics, vocabulary, and reading comprehension instruction is needed in grades three to five for all students. In addition, ELL students demonstrate the need for additional explicit interventions.

Based on the most recent FSA data, explicit instruction is needed for 76% of the fourth-grade students scoring a Level 1 on Integration of Knowledge and Ideas and 81% scoring a Level 1 on the Key Ideas and Details strand.

Based on the most recent FSA data, explicit instruction is needed for 67% of the fifth-grade students scoring a Level 1 on Integration of Knowledge and Ideas and 67% scoring a Level 1 on the Key Ideas and Details strand.

Of our current fourth and fifth-grade students, 24% demonstrated proficiency on the state assessment on math. Based on the 21-22 progress monitoring data 19% of students demonstrated proficiency in math. According to the end-of-year iReady data, 12% of our students are three or more grade levels behind in geometry.

Based on the 21-22 i-Ready progress monitoring data, the area in math that showed the greatest need for improvement is geometry. Based on the 21-22 state assessment data, the area in math that showed the greatest need for improvement is the measurement, data, and geometry strand.

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

Based on i-Ready progress monitoring data, the areas that show the greatest need for improvement are phonics and reading comprehension in grades K-5.

Based on the most recent FSA data, the areas that show the greatest need for improvement are Integration of Knowledge and Ideas and Key Ideas and Details.

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

Planning sessions were happening, however, implementation of aligned instruction was not consistent. Leadership will lead coaches and teachers through the knowledge of the BEST standards for ELA. Coaches will lead the teachers through the selection of essential benchmarks for each grade level and create focus questions to assess benchmarks.

The school's Instructional Focus Plan will ensure that teachers are delivering explicit instruction in each grade level's area of need.

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

Based on the school's progress monitoring data, students showed the most improvement in the area of phonics. Based on the school's state assessment data, students showed the most improvement in the area of language and editing.

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

The contributing factors for this improvement was school delivery of explicit phonics instruction using the Foundations curriculum and Wit & Wisdom ELA curriculum. The new actions were the use of monitoring systems and implementation of small group instruction.

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

The strategies that will be implemented to accelerate learning is the use of modeling expectations with professional development, and data-based instructional decisions.

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.

Professional development opportunities will include engaging in content area professional learning using the new Great Minds, Wit & Wisdom K-5 curriculum and demonstration of modeling by instructional coaches.

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

Additional services will include instructional classroom walkthroughs to identify areas of need to drive our focus with feedback and coaching cycles. This data will be used to select professional development from

consulting services. Increase of instructional systems and progress monitoring systems through our Instructional Focus Plan. Wit & Wisdom will be utilized in all grade levels and Foundations (for foundational skills) in grades K-2.

We will continue to utilize small group interventions and remediation times. Students will be offered additional after school tutoring.

Teachers will participate in the initial onboarding professional learning for Realize Math, the new adopted math curriculum. Professional learning will be provided by the publisher, McGraw-Hill. Teachers will become familiar with the curriculum and the newly adopted B.E.S.T. Standards.

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. Based on the 2022 FSA scores for ELA and Math at Groveland Elementary indicate a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark. The FSA scores for grades 3-5 in ELA (28%) and Math (22%) proficiency are below the district and state averages. Planning sessions did not have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and transfer to instruction.

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

By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in 70% of our scholars' i-Ready data for the middle of the year for Kindergarten through fifth with them showing at least 50% growth. We also expect to see an increase in i-Ready data for students on grade level from 39% to 50% by the middle of the year for third through fifth grade. By January of 2023, using the district learning walk tool to collect trends, administration and instructional coaches will walk classrooms daily for the transference of common planning to instruction (looking at the purpose and instructional moves), then analyze and share trends weekly. Our goal is that 70% of our classroom teachers will transfer the information created during grade level common planning around benchmark-aligned tasks to the classroom for student learning.

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

The Leadership Team will use the district learning walk tool weekly to capture quantitative data on purpose and instructional moves to ensure that teachers are implementing benchmarks. Spotlight Walk document to capture qualitative data (a chart designed to capture practices in instruction and provide immediate feedback to strengthen instruction) to determine the next steps for coaching conversations. Feedback will be provided to enhance instructional delivery. Instructional coaches will conduct coaching cycles as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Evidence-based strategy to ensure explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark will be modeling with implementation of the coaching cycle.

implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rationale for Evidence-based strategy is the demonstration of modeling expectations will ensure that teachers understand what effective implementation looks like.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

During collaborative planning for the first quarter teachers, administration, and coaches will collaborate to determine focus standards based off on data from FSA 2022. The selected focus standards will be placed in the instructional focus plan for each grade level. An SOP will be created for before, during, and after for all stakeholders to ensure effective use and product completion during collaborative planning time. During collaborative planning, teachers will discuss the intent and rigor of the standards, select tasks aligned to the benchmarks, and review student work samples.

Person Responsible Faith Harris (harrisl2@lake.k12.fl.us)

During Literacy Leadership Team meetings, administrators and instructional coaches will analyze teacher's instructional focus plan data weekly and discuss: students' demonstration of mastery of focus standards, students not demonstrating mastery of focus standards, and the best instructional practices to help students demonstrate mastery of focus standards.

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

A walkthrough schedule will be created to monitor the transfer of common planning to instruction. With a weekly standard focus calendar for each grade level which details out standard focus and task for the week.

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

Provide afterschool academic tutoring weekly for students based on iReady progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible Faith Harris (harrisl2@lake.k12.fl.us)

Purchase standards-aligned curriculum and supplies to support teacher planning and academic tutoring. The Florida's Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) instructional guide for ELA and Math will be purchased and provided for teachers.

Person Responsible Faith Harris (harrisl2@lake.k12.fl.us)

During Collaborative Planning Time, teachers will have opportunities to observe the modeling of lessons with instructional moves and tasks aligned to grade-level benchmarks. Opportunities will be provided to discuss implications for student learning. The walkthrough schedule will be followed to monitor the improvement of teacher modeling. The appropriate feedback will be provided during Collaborative Planning Time. Additional professional learning opportunities will be funded to support teachers with the alignment and implementation of the B.E.S.T standards.

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

Provide time for grade-level Writing Teams collaboration and instructional planning.

Person Responsible Faith Harris (harrisl2@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Development

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Based on EWS data, social development is one of our most critical areas of focus. Social development was identified as a critical area of focus because 51% of our discipline infractions involve physical aggression or contact with another individual. This area of focus will improve learning and success by ensuring a decrease in behaviors and an increase in instructional time. This, in turn, will lead to improved school climate, relationships, and attitudes.

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

By focusing on this area we expect to see a decrease in physical aggression by 25% in our EWS data, classroom walkthrough data both qualitative and quantitative from 51% to 25%.

Monitoring:

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

We will conduct walkthroughs using the Spotlight Communication Document to ensure that teachers are implementing Sanford Harmony and building relationships. We will also track early warning signs, and EWS data based on the number of calls that come in for each teacher/student as well as the number/type of infraction reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is Sanford Harmony and CHAMPS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The implementation of CHAMPS, a school wide behavior plan, has been found to reduce misbehaviors and increase instructional time. This also leads to improved school climate, relationships and attitudes.

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.

Provide CHAMPS professional development, support, and training by consultant. The consultant will meet with grade level PLCs and build on their training by going deeper with the Teach-Model-Feedback cycle. The consultant will meet with leadership team and coaches to provide supports from the book, "Coaching Classroom Management" (also by Safe & Civil Schools).

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

Provide Sanford Harmony professional development, support, and training for teachers to help children develop better relationship skills, reduce conflict and problematic behavior in the classroom, and promote harmonious relationships.

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

Create a fidelity tracking tool to monitor the number and type of discipline infractions for each teacher/student using EWS data with the desired outcome of decreasing physical aggression codes by 25%.

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

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

Systematic explicit instruction around the foundational skills students need to be strong readers. If we provide a standards-aligned ELA authentic literacy block, students will receive targeted core instruction in the 6 components of literacy (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension, and Writing).

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

If students receive targeted intervention in Phonics, then they will become more fluent readers and increase their reading achievement. If students receive targeted instruction in Comprehension and Vocabulary, then they will increase their vocabulary and comprehension skills, resulting in increased reading achievement. If we utilize core and intervention protocols and resources with fidelity and assess, monitor, and reteach, then students will increase achievement in literacy and reading proficiency. If we provide a standards-aligned ELA authentic literacy block, students will receive targeted core instruction in the 6 components of literacy (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension, and Writing).

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)

By January of 2023, 70% of our scholars in grades Kindergarten through second will show 50% or more growth from Progress Monitoring 1 to Progress Monitoring 2 on STAR Literacy Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By January of 2023, 70% of our scholars in grades third to fifth will show 50% or more growth from Progress Monitoring 1 to Progress Monitoring 2 on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

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.

The Foundations Unit tracker and the formative assessment data will be utilized to monitor progress toward the goal of achieving 50% or more at mid-year and 100% or more at end of the year. Three times a year data chats will be conducted to review Foundations, i-Ready, and/or the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Boyd, Dawn, boydd@lake.k12.fl.us

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?

The curriculum chosen by the district, Foundations for phonics, Geodes, and Wit and Wisdom are all evidence-based programs that match the BEST Standards. Through progress monitoring and formative assessments we student growth will be monitored.

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?

This curriculum met the BEST standards and addresses the identified needs of students. This is a newly adopted curriculum and progress monitoring will be done to ensure record of effectiveness.

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
<p>The Literacy Leadership Team will review K-5 common formative assessments to ensure delivery of instruction in the area of phonics. Literacy coaches will provide feedback and coaching cycles based on the data.</p>	<p>Boyd, Dawn, boydd@lake.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Professional learning will be provided to equip teachers with instructional strategies in the areas of phonics and vocabulary to support grade-level phonics and word-analysis skills to decode words.</p>	

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.

Groveland Elementary School will cultivate a positive school culture and environment by implementing practices and systems school-wide that build strong relationships, reinforce positive behaviors, and provide a sense of safety. Students will engage in Restorative Practices to encourage a respectful way of thinking about, talking about, and responding to issues or problems. The Positive Behavior and Support (PBIS) plan will reward students with Panther bucks that students can use to purchase items at the Panther Store, or VIP lunches. The implementation of CHAMPS will set consistent rules and expectations throughout all classrooms. Finally, Sanford Harmony will focus on character development and emotional regulation. We also will recognize teachers improvement in our PRIDE as well as out our area of focus as a team or individually.

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

All stakeholders will play a role in promoting a positive school culture and the environment through the implementation of Restorative Practices, Positive Behavior and Support (PBIS), CHAMPS, and Sanford Harmony areas.

The following stakeholders are the leaders of this process:

- Restorative Practices, Allison Jones, Mental Health Liaison
- Positive Behavior and Support (PBIS), Emily O'Neill, Art Teacher
- CHAMPS, Amanda French, 1st Grade Teacher
- Sanford Harmony, Simon Thomas, Potential Specialist