
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Greenville Elementary School

729 SW OVERSTREET AVE, Greenville, FL 32331

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

Demographics

Principal: Wallace Selph

Start Date for this Principal: 7/6/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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)	Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: F (27%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	CSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Greenville Elementary School

729 SW OVERSTREET AVE, Greenville, FL 32331

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-6</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;">91%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Greenville Elementary School will be relentless in our dedication to lay a foundation for success in our students' future in college, in a career, and as community 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
Bridges, Kathryn	Principal	To provide leadership and managerial oversight to the instructional program and school operations. To promote the educational development of each student. Establish and maintain an effective learning climate in the school. Coordinate custodial, cafeteria, and other support services. Communicate information to parents and the community that is required by federal and state law, administrative rules, and Board policy and to act as a liaison between the school and the community, interpreting activities and policies of the school and encouraging community participation in school life. Schedule and coordinate all activities for day to day operations of school.
Hopkins, Mannika	Teacher, K-12	Develop and execute lesson plans that align with Florida standards. Implement and maintain expectations for a productive classroom environment. Sustain one-on-one attention to individual students, while maintaining focus of the entire class. Establish differentiated learning environment to meet the needs of all students. Encourage students to maintain an excellent work ethic, Incorporate technology within the classroom. Collaborate with other educators and maintain contact with parents and caregivers.
Killingsworth, Ben	Administrative Support	Assist Principal with scheduling, master scheduling, evaluations, securing instructional staff, and ensuring Principal is receiving adequate professional development. Also visits campus, conducts walk-throughs with Principal and will serve as Principal in absence of Principal

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/6/2022, Wallace Selph

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

7

Total number of students enrolled at the school

106

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

1

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

2

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	14	16	11	16	15	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	8	11	5	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	3	4	4	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	2	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	1	3	2	1	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	3	2	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/26/2022

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	29%	43%	56%				44%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	26%						41%	50%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								49%	53%
Math Achievement	25%	39%	50%				40%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	33%						31%	49%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								43%	51%
Science Achievement	20%	53%	59%				54%	56%	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	6%	40%	-34%	58%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	81%	50%	31%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	46%	-2%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

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	18%	45%	-27%	62%	-44%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	51%	-8%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
05	2022					
	2019	56%	44%	12%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	56%	42%	14%	53%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

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
BLK	21	19		19	28		18				
FRL	26	24		24	36		15				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
BLK	23			33							
FRL	21			33							
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
BLK	47	42		42	31		60				
WHT	30			30							
FRL	44	48		41	36		55				

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	27
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	133
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	21
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	25
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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?

Math achievement is declining across all grade levels. Science proficiency has increased significantly but we still need to improve. There were some gains in Proficiency in ELA from the 2020/2021 school year to the 2021/2022 school year, but we still do not have the proficiency rates we had in 2019/2020.

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

While Science is the content area in which our students scored the lowest proficiency (19%), we feel focusing on ELA and improving reading comprehension will simultaneously increase our Science scores. According to the Assessment data 29% of our students scored proficient on the FSA ELA which indicates most of our students are struggling in reading. We believe our students' lack of reading comprehension contributes to their inability to do well in other subjects.

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

In regards to our ELA proficiency, the lack of Reading Endorsed teachers may be a factor. In addition, our staff shortages have prevented us from implementing our ELA intervention curriculum, Level Literacy Instruction. We need to encourage all our teachers to get their Reading Endorsement. We can also develop a modified schedule that will allow us to utilize the LLI Reading Intervention.

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

Based on 2022 State assessments our most improved content area is Science. The proficiency increased from 7% to 19%. The ELA proficiency also increased from 21% to 29% on the FSA ELA assessment.

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

District Instructional Coaches in the area of Science and ELA were available to assist teachers with planning for instruction and other areas of concern noted by administration. Teachers met with the coaches and received support with lesson planning and modeling.

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

In the area of Science the District Coach will visit weekly to assist teachers. We will have a monthly Science project for students to complete and we will have a couple of STEM Science nights for parents and community members.

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.

Some of our teachers will have the opportunity to attend the ELA Literacy training. Teachers will receive ELA Best Standards training.

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

Teachers will have an opportunity to participate in PLCs during planning time to discuss data, progress, and plans for improvement.

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 ELA

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

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

Even though our ELA Proficiency school wide improved from the 2020/2021 school year (21%) to the 2021/2022 school year (37%) our ELA proficiency rate has not reached the levels we typically have on FSA ELA.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

We will increase ELA Proficiency for 3rd grade from (38%) to 45%.
 We will increase ELA Proficiency for 4th grade from (18%) to 25%.
 We will increase ELA Proficiency for 5th grade from (38%) to 45%.

Monitoring:

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

Lesson plan review, meeting weekly with District Literacy Coach, Classroom Walkthroughs, Data analysis and discussion during PLCs, data chats with teachers. We will also look at progress monitoring data from Edmentum or STAR.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathryn Bridges (kathryn.bridges@mcsbfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

ELA teachers will implement standard-based instruction and the use of Leveled Literacy Instruction for students requiring Tier 3 Interventions in ELA based on PM1 Data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Standards-based instruction allows teachers and students to be on the same page by specifying how teachers and students will meet their education goals, including specific concepts, order, or instructional materials. Standards-based instruction focuses on the mastery of skill and students are given multiple opportunities through various instructional techniques to master the skill. Leveled Literacy Instruction is an evidenced based curriculum that has been proven to improve student reading skills.

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.

District Literacy Coach will meet with Principal, Kathryn Bridges, to train her on the LLI curriculum and develop groups for LLI curriculum.

Person Responsible Kathryn Bridges (kathryn.bridges@mcsbfl.us)

Principal, Kathryn Bridges, will train teachers during their planning periods on the LLI curriculum and provide them with their student groups.

Person Responsible Kathryn Bridges (kathryn.bridges@mcsbfl.us)

Teachers that are not utilizing LLI curriculum for student groups during intervention time (50 minutes) will provide small group instruction in which they concentrate on standards students have not mastered; providing differentiated instruction to ensure mastery.

Person Responsible Kathryn Bridges (kathryn.bridges@mcsbfl.us)

#2. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

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

Transformational leaders have skills and abilities that equip him/her with the ability to help change schools around. The school is currently graded as an F school. In order for the school grade to improve change has to occur in all areas. The current principal, Kathryn Bridges, is currently a new Principal with minimal experience. Therefore, it's important develop her as a leader that can create change. It's important for the school Principal to have the proper training in order to lead school transformation.

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

Students will improve their academic performance from PM1 ELA and PM1 Math (August 2022) to PM 2 ELA and PM2 Math (December 2022).

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

District Mentor, Ben Killingsworth, will meet weekly with Ms. Bridges to determine progress on instructional leadership concerning student performance and teacher pedagogy, administrative duties, and other leadership responsibilities. Visits will be documented. The monitoring tool will be agenda or meetings notes, or logs from Ms. Bridges or Mr. Killingsworth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ben Killingsworth (ben.killingsworth@mcsbfl.us)

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

Mentorship by former transformational administrators (Ben Killingsworth and Michael Thompson).

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

Mentorships are evidenced based strategies for new principals. Ms. Bridges is a first year principal and new to the school. Ms. Bridges needs to develop more as an administrator. Mentorships provide individuals the opportunity to collaborate and learn from with an expert in the field. In addition, mentees receive feedback, and support that will help him/her grow as a leader.

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.

Madison County School District has assigned a district leader (Ben Killingsworth) with turnaround experience to assist Ms. Bridges concerning school operational aspects, personnel resources, procedures and routines, and etc.

Person Responsible Shirley Joseph (shirley.joseph@mcsbfl.us)

Madison County School District has assigned a PAEC mentor, Mr. Michael Thomas, who will mentor Ms. Bridges weekly and provide professional development or connect her to professional development opportunities for transformational leadership.

Person Responsible Shirley Joseph (shirley.joseph@mcsbfl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

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

Our Math Proficiency from the 2021-2022 FSA Math was 25% with 33% of our students making learning gains. Over the past years, our Math Proficiency has decreased significantly.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase our Math proficiency from 25% to 35% on the 3rd administration of the FAST Math Assessments in May 2022 by improving Core instructional strategies and providing students with interventions to address Mathematics skill deficits.

Monitoring:

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

The principal and administration team will conduct classroom observations specifically looking at core instructional practices, reviewing lesson plans, and assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathryn Bridges (kathryn.bridges@mcsbfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

We will use the Gradual Release Model instructional framework to deliver instruction during mathematics block. The instructional framework has four phases: I DO- where the teacher models the lesson objective in a focus lesson, WE DO- guided instruction with both input from the teacher and the students, YOU DO TOGETHER: Collaborative learning in small groups or partners and YOU DO ALONE- independent practice.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The Gradual Release Model is a best practice instructional model where teachers strategically transfer the responsibility in the learning process from the teacher to the students (Fisher & Frey). This model provides a structure for teachers to move from assuming “all the responsibility for performing a task . . . to a situation in which the students assume all of the responsibility” (Duke & Pearson, 2004, p. 211). We believe teaching our teachers how to shift ownership of learning our students will make the growth we expect.

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.

Teachers will be trained on Gradual Release Model

Person Responsible Kathryn Bridges (kathryn.bridges@mcsbfl.us)

Teachers will be monitored for implementation of Gradual Release Model

Person Responsible Ben Killingsworth (ben.killingsworth@mcsbfl.us)

Teachers will be provided with support throughout the year on implementation and consistent use of designing lessons using Gradual Release Model.

Person Responsible Kathryn Bridges (kathryn.bridges@mcsbfl.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

Gradual release model (I do, we do, you do). Explicit, standard-based instruction with differentiated instruction for interventions. LLI will be utilized for Tier 3 interventions, UFLy will be used as part of the core curriculum for Grades KG-2. MTSS process will be utilized to track student progress, additional paraprofessionals and tutors will be utilized for more effective small group instruction. Weekly meetings with district ELA coach to assist with planning and appropriate levels of rigor.

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

Gradual release model (I do, we do, you do). Explicit, standard-based instruction with differentiated instruction for interventions. Small group instruction with LLI for Tier 3 support. Read Naturally and other FCRR intervention strategies will be used for Tier 2 interventions. Additional tutors and paraprofessionals available for more effective small group instruction. Weekly meetings with district ELA coach to assist with planning and appropriate levels of rigor.

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)

According to 2021-2022 iReady Diagnostic 3, 20% of 1st Grade students were on pace to learn a year's material in a year's time, while 40% of them were scoring Level 1 or Level 2 on iReady were projected to make learning gains. Kindergarten: 88% were on pace to learn a year's material in a year's time. 2nd grade: 53% were on pace to learn a year's material in a year's time.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

According to 2021-2022 iReady Diagnostic 3, 88% of 3rd grade were on pace to learn a year's material in a year's time, 65% of 4th grade were on pace to learn a year's material in a year's time, and 94% of 5th grade were on pace to learn a year's material in a year's time.

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 area of focus for ELA proficiency will be monitored by analysis of Progress Monitoring (FAST), weekly meetings with district coaches, data chats during grade level meetings, walk-throughs by administration and by district coaches to monitor outcomes. These steps of monitoring will facilitate standards based instruction with fidelity and effectiveness of Tier interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bridges, Kathryn, kathryn.bridges@mcsbfl.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?

Our school will use a reading intervention curriculum called Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) in small groups during intervention time.

Use of the MTSS to analyze data and determine students who require additional assistance in area of ELA.

Instruction that is explicit and standard based will be properly aligned with the BEST standards and with the appropriate level of rigor.

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?

Leveled Literacy Intervention gives students the academic supports needed for reading proficiency which is done in small groups daily during the school's built in intervention time. It has been proven to work according to the What Work Clearinghouse in several studies that have been conducted on the supports. MTSS was chosen because students that are identified early are more likely to be able to overcome a reading deficiency. This is also a proven strategy according to the What Works Clearinghouse in the several studies that have been conducted on this way of work. Teaching explicit, standard-based instruction will facilitate all teachers teaching the required standards with a high level of fidelity and appropriate rigor.

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
Teachers will use LLI for tier 3 interventions and Read Naturally grades 4-6. Teachers in k-3 will use UFLy for interventions.	Bridges, Kathryn, kathryn.bridges@mcsbfl.us
Teachers will receive professional development with LLI, Edmentum and Exact Path	Bridges, Kathryn, kathryn.bridges@mcsbfl.us
School will provide additional tutors to assist with small group intervention instruction	Bridges, Kathryn, kathryn.bridges@mcsbfl.us
Teachers will utilize the gradual release method of explicit standards based instruction	Bridges, Kathryn, kathryn.bridges@mcsbfl.us

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 builds a positive school culture and environment by utilizing the PBIS system of positive incentive for students not only for behavior and academic progress, but also as an inclusive celebration of the student body monthly. Our school culture is positively affected as well through positive recognition of faculty and staff to promote a sense of community. We created the Colt Connection to welcome community members to volunteer at the school to provide encouragement and assistance to our students, as well as classroom volunteers. The school maintains an active PTO/SAC organization, meeting monthly with parents, teachers, and community members. Our school maintains a partnership with North Florida early learning and an after school Boys and Girls Clubs to maintain a sense of belonging and community among students. Our school collaborates regularly with school board representatives and district office representatives, as well as various community organizations. Additionally, the school will host events such as Grandparents Day, Pastries for Parents, Stem Science Parent Night, Literacy Parent Night, Conferencing Night after report cards for parents, etc. We implement PBIS at the school and look for good behavior in our students. Additionally, the school uses Class Dojo, an automated calling service, PeachJar to send home flyers electronically to parents on events and necessary community information as well as a Facebook page to help keep parents, families, students and the community up to date and informed of events, necessary information, community information

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

Faculty and staff are stakeholders that model and promote a positive school culture through utilizing the PBIS system, actively encouraging students, and modeling positivity among students. The Colt Connection volunteer group is comprised of local church members in the community that model community involvement in a positive manner and offer encouragement and assistance to the student body demonstrating the community cares about the students' success. Classroom volunteers provide a role of demonstrating community involvement and interest in student achievement as they assist the teacher and encourage students. PTO/SAC members provide an advisory role for the school and an opportunity for parental involvement in school activities. Community affiliation with 4-H and the Bovlin initiative provides opportunity to build a positive culture among students with educational projects and tobacco prevention awareness. Methodist Church of Madison promotes positive school culture by providing snacks for students monthly. Partnerships with early learning centers and after school Boys and Girls Clubs provide a role in promoting a positive culture by facilitating a sense of belonging and support of the students' classroom responsibilities. The Madison County Sheriff's office provides a positive culture by providing a school Resource Officer for safety and educating the students with the DARE program. School Board and District representatives have a role of promoting a positive environment by offering support and supporting community events, such as clean up days and student led programs.