

Leon County Schools

Griffin Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Griffin Middle School

800 ALABAMA ST, Tallahassee, FL 32304

<https://www.leonschools.net/griffin>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission at Griffin Middle School is to facilitate learning opportunities to empower students to recognize their potential by teaching rigorous and relevant skills that will equip students to be college and career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
O'Banner, Zelena	Principal	The principal oversees all procedures and processes at school site, conduct classroom walk-through's, hold data chats with teachers, oversee the budgets, recruit and hire qualified teachers/staff, engage the community stakeholders in school initiatives, and maintain ongoing communication with leadership team.
Pollitt, Brian	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will oversee the master schedule, analyze student data on a regular basis, facilitate MTSS meetings, conduct classroom walkthrough's, hold data chats with teachers, assist with common planning, plan and organize professional development opportunities for teachers, recruit and hire qualified teachers/staff, and provide ongoing communication with leadership team.
Wright, Patrick	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal will oversee student attendance and discipline, ensure facilities are safe and functioning, conduct classroom walk-through's, hold data chats with teachers, and maintain ongoing communication with leadership team.
Bryant, Ro'Tonda	Teacher, K-12	As the chair of English Language Arts Department, will facilitate common planning amongst department, ensure progress monitoring assessments are provided to students, review student data with department, and provide ongoing communication with leadership team
Claitt, Ravonda	Curriculum Resource Teacher	As our MTSS Interventionist, will make sure that students are receiving the correct levels of support within the classrooms, hold data chats with students, communicate with the leadership team, and actively participate in the MTSS meetings.
Feaster, Kenzay	Teacher, ESE	As the chair of ESE Department, will ensure progress monitoring assessments are provided to students, review student data with department, and provide ongoing communication with leadership team
Jefferson, Tarran	School Counselor	As the Testing Coordinator, Guidance Counselor, and 504 Coordinator, will coordinate all district and statewide assessments to ensure all students are assessed, facilitate the student academic recovery programs, and provide ongoing communication with the leadership team.
McClennan, Kristin	Reading Coach	As the Reading Coach, will ensure students are correctly placed into the correct tier of intensive reading, review data, provide ongoing support to the reading and ELA teachers, and communicate with the leadership team.
Laurie, Rodrick	Teacher, K-12	As the chair of Science Department, will facilitate common planning amongst department, ensure progress monitoring assessments are provided to

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		students, review student data with department, and provide ongoing communication with leadership team
Wilkerson, Sandra	Teacher, K-12	As the chair of Social Studies Department, will facilitate common planning amongst department, ensure progress monitoring assessments are provided to students, review student data with department, and provide ongoing communication with leadership team
Tyson, Angel	Teacher, K-12	As the chair of Math Department, will facilitate common planning amongst department, ensure progress monitoring assessments are provided to students, review student data with department, and provide ongoing communication with leadership team

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The leadership team initially met to review school data and to determine the goals for the 2023-2024 school year. After the leadership team identified the school goals, the goals were then shared with the faculty in our monthly faculty meeting and asked for any faculty feedback. Finally, the SIP was presented to our School Advisory Council, which includes teachers, leadership team members, business partners and community stakeholders. Again, the SIP was open for feedback from the members of SAC.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Each month, during the faculty meetings, data will be shared with the school in terms of how we are progressing towards meeting our school goals. In addition, all departments (ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies) meet a minimum of 3 days weekly for common planning. During the common planning process, standards are reviewed in depth and lessons are designed to ensure alignment to the standards. The common planning process is facilitated by administration and department leaders. The school leadership team meets monthly to provide updates as well as to make any necessary adjustments to ensure student continuous improvement. Any resulting adjustments are then shared at the faculty meeting as well as SAC meeting.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	94%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	35	41	118	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	8	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	1	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	83	78	224	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	82	71	223	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	34	33	121	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	33	30	98

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	14

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	98	104	277	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	77	65	208	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	6	29	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	102	115	305	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	110	102	319	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	75	95	242	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	113	105	304	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	12

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	98	104	277	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	77	65	208	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	6	29	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	102	115	305	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	110	102	319	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	75	95	242	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	113	105	304	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	17	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	12	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	28	52	49	28	53	50	26		
ELA Learning Gains				43			32		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			29		
Math Achievement*	29	58	56	27	34	36	17		
Math Learning Gains				55			18		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			20		
Science Achievement*	23	51	49	26	55	53	12		
Social Studies Achievement*	64	75	68	92	61	58	54		
Middle School Acceleration	77	67	73	57	47	49	33		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	39	42	40	27	73	76	29		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	260
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Graduation Rate

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	1	
ELL	25	Yes	3	3
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	30	Yes	1	1
MUL	36	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	39	Yes	1	
FRL	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	45			
ELL	30	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	44			
MUL	43			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	49			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	28			29			23	64	77			39
SWD	28			27			33	42			4	
ELL	9			13				40			4	39
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			28			24	64	78		5	
HSP	21			29			9	52			5	40
MUL	29			43							2	
PAC												
WHT	46			32							2	
FRL	29			29			28	67	76		6	50

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	28	43	48	27	55	64	26	92	57			27
SWD	25	44	39	28	53	63	17	91				
ELL	25	59		11	29							27
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	40	44	24	53	66	23	93	54			
HSP	23	55	70	23	48		45					
MUL	25	42		46	60							
PAC												
WHT	50	70		43	70		36	91				
FRL	27	43	49	25	53	68	24	96	60			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	26	32	29	17	18	20	12	54	33			29
SWD	22	34	29	20	30	24	10	48				
ELL	19	65	60	10	22							29
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	30	24	15	17	22	11	54	33			
HSP	22	35		21	22		10					
MUL	43			31								
PAC												
WHT	30	44		36	36			54				
FRL	25	31	28	14	17	21	11	50	29			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	25%	49%	-24%	47%	-22%
08	2023 - Spring	24%	49%	-25%	47%	-23%
06	2023 - Spring	26%	48%	-22%	47%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	28%	55%	-27%	54%	-26%
07	2023 - Spring	16%	51%	-35%	48%	-32%
08	2023 - Spring	36%	49%	-13%	55%	-19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	8%	38%	-30%	44%	-36%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	58%	26%	50%	34%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	58%	*	48%	*

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	65%	17%	63%	19%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	72%	-12%	66%	-6%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Looking at our overall school data, using state assessment results, Science was our lowest performance. For 2022-2023, we only showed 24% proficiency, which was a decrease of 2% from the previous year. Contributing factors to this decline included, new 8th grade science teachers, change in science department leader, limited hands-on lab activities, lack of deep understanding of standards.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component showing the greatest decline from 2021-2022 was Civics Proficiency. In 2021-2022, our overall civics proficiency score was 92%, which dropped to 64% in 2022-2023. The factors that contributed to this was having more students test in Civics in 2022-2023 than in 2021-2022. Griffin changed the social studies course offering progression to allow non-proficient readers a chance to learn civics over the course of 2 years, rather than just 1 year. As a result, in 2022-2023 we had all 7th graders plus the majority of 8th graders take the Civics EOC. Although the civics proficiency score dropped, it was still our highest level of proficiency in a core subject area.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap would be in Science. Consistently, Griffin has struggled with getting students proficient in the area of Science. Although we can say that reading is a factor, our science proficiency scores are always lower than our ELA proficiency scores which can negate the reading factor. Additional contributing factors will include high turnover rate of science teachers, change in department leader and limited knowledge of standards due to hiring teachers out of field to teach science.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our component that showed the most improvement was in our Middle School Acceleration. Griffin Middle School only placed students into accelerated courses (Algebra I and Biology) who demonstrated through data, they were ready for the course. As a result, Griffin increased the acceleration component from 57% to 94%.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

One area of concern is how many students have a substantial reading deficiency. Reading is required in all subject areas. If a student is showing substantial reading deficiencies, then it becomes more challenging for the teacher to determine if a student is not performing due to not understanding content or because of the reading deficiency. Griffin is working hard to reduce the number of students who demonstrate reading deficiencies.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Griffin is committed to student continuous improvement. The priorities for Griffin Middle School are:

- 1 - Increase Science Proficiency
- 2 - Recruit and Retain Highly Qualified Staff
- 3 - Reduce discipline referrals

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on historical trend data for Griffin Middle School, Science Proficiency has one of our lowest areas of proficiency.

22% - 2016-17

19% - 2017-18

21% - 2018-19

12% - 2020-21

26% - 2021-22

Griffin wants to focus on science achievement to bring the percentage of proficiency more into alignment with the other core subject areas of ELA, Math, and Social Studies.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 30% of all students enrolled in Comprehensive Science 3 and Biology will be considered proficient, as measured by the state assessment and EOC. This will be an increase of 6% and bring the science proficiency percentage into the same range as our ELA and Math proficiency numbers.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will meet three times a week in common planning, which is built into the school day. An administrator will be present during the common planning sessions. Each common planning session will focus on specific standards, essential questions, higher order questions, tasks/activities, as well as assessments to properly create "Standards-focused" lesson plans. During the common planning process, the information discussed will be shared as an entire department to receive valuable feedback on how to ensure all of the components are directly aligned to the standard. Lesson plans, based on the common planning discussions, will then be created and submitted for review. Administration will review lesson plans and provide feedback. Lastly, administration will do continuous classroom walk-throughs to ensure what is on the lesson plan is actually being implemented in the classroom. Data will be collected throughout the year to determine any needed adjustments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Common Planning/PLC is a well researched, evidence-based strategy to improve instructional practice. In common planning process, teachers will: identify specific standards to be taught; circle verbs/underline nouns within standard; develop an essential question with supporting higher order thinking questions; design tasks/activities that support the questions; create assessments to determine student level of mastery of the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By having common planning, teachers are able to dig deeper into standards and develop more meaningful and engaging instructional strategies. In addition, teachers are able to share out best practices and receive feedback from colleagues when a task/activity did not yield the desired assessment results.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Master Schedule needs to be created to allow for common planning.

Person Responsible: Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

By When: Before the start of the school year

Administration needs to facilitate common planning process, walking teachers through each step of how to properly identify required standards to teach, determine essential questions and higher order questions, designing tasks/activities, planning for assessments

Person Responsible: Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

By When: during each common planning session (3x weekly)

Teachers share out their standard(s) for the following week on anchor chart paper. Teachers list the questions (EQ and HOTQ); tasks/activities; and assessments. Department teachers do a gallery walk, reviewing information on anchor charts and provide meaningful feedback

Person Responsible: Rodrick Laurie (laurier@leonschools.net)

By When: 1x weekly

Lesson plans are submitted by teachers and reviewed by administration. Administration provides meaningful feedback to improve academic instruction.

Person Responsible: Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

By When: weekly

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Griffin Middle School has consistently had a high turnover in teachers due to teachers obtaining teaching positions in other schools, leaving the teaching profession, as well as administrative decision. Anytime a teacher leaves a school, a school is losing human capital. In order for a school to stay sustainable, human capital loss must be minimal. Griffin is still in the "re-building" stages and it is vital human capital be at an all time.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the conclusion of the 2023-2024 school year, 90% of the teachers who started the school year will remain in place for the 2024-2025 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Climate surveys will be used to keep an accurate pulse of teacher morale. Climate surveys will be issued three times: beginning of the year, middle of the year, end of the year. Data collected from the climate surveys will be used to help boost morale if there is a need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Zelena O'Banner (obannerz@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Climate surveys are used to measure teacher morale. The climate survey will be constructed using a rating scale of strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree. The survey will be provided to teachers electronically and anonymously. Data will be collected and administration will be able to use the data to determine if adjustments need to be made in the area of teacher morale.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research indicates that teachers leave the profession and/or school due to leadership. The time to fix teacher morale is earlier in the school year, rather than at the end. When teachers are not happy, their best work is not provided to the students. It is important teachers are feeling good so that they stay committed to their students and so that they stay committed to the school. In order for a school to stay sustainable, their needs to be continuous human capital.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Climate surveys need to be created and shared with teachers

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

By When: Climate survey needs to be completed before the end of the first quarter.

Results from the climate survey needs to be reviewed. The results will be shared with leadership team to determine what possible action steps are needed next.

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

By When: After each climate survey distribution.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Overall, the leadership team of Griffin Middle School has decided to focus on learning gains in both subject areas of Reading/ELA and Math. By focusing on learning gains, we can move more students closer to proficiency. Over 70% of the students at Griffin Middle School are considered non-proficient as measured by the state assessment from the previous school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, Griffin Middle School will show 60% learning gains in the areas of Reading/ELA, L25 Reading/ELA, Math, and L25 Math as measured by the state assessment. A learning gain is made when a student improves their achievement level from the previous year, or remain proficient and increase their overall scale score by 1 point. Movement consists of Level 1 Low to Level 1 Mid, Level 1 Mid to Level 1 High, Level 1 High to Level 2 Low, Level 2 Low to Level 2 High, Level 2 High to Level 3. Level 3, 4 and 5 remains at same level (or moves up) and improves by at least 1 scale score point.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be collected three times throughout the school year. Each time data is collected, it will be analyzed and shared with teachers and students. Teachers will move student data magnets after each analysis to provide a visual representation of how close we are to reaching our goal of 60% in each subject area.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Data analysis, student magnet moving.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By reviewing and analyzing the data, instructional decisions and adjustments can be made. The student magnets, which will be moved by teachers, will serve as visual representation of the learning gains being made.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Student data magnets need to be created based on 2022-2023 FAST PM3 assessments.

Person Responsible: Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

By When: Before the first wave of 2023-2024 FAST Progress Monitoring assessments.

Data needs to be analyzed and shared with teachers, following each FAST assessment.

Person Responsible: Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

By When: Immediately following each FAST PM Assessment.

Individual student data chats will be held with leadership.

Person Responsible: Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

By When: After each FAST PM Assessment.

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

When reviewing the ESSA data, the ELL subgroup fell below the 41% threshold. In addition, this subgroup has consistently been below the 41% threshold for more than 2 years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

60% of students who are in the Imagine Learning (English Language Development Course) and are matched/qualified will show gains on their end of year WIDA assessment as measured by the Overall Proficiency Level.

Monitoring:

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

The ELL students who are placed within the English Language Development Course will be exposed to the different activities found in the program "Imagine Learning". These activities will be selected based on student ability level, designed to purposefully challenge the student to make gains. The teacher of record will continuously monitor student development as well as choose the corresponding activities, with the assistance of our ELL coordinator.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The intervention is the district adopted program, Imagine Learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This program was chosen because it is provided by the district. In addition, the activities found within the program can be adjusted to meet the individual needs of students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

All ELL students need to have their WIDA scores reviewed to determine who is still significantly below proficiency. Based on the information, the students below proficiency will be scheduled in the a section of English Language Development.

Person Responsible: Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

By When: Before the start of the school year.

Throughout the school year, ELL students within the course, English Language Development, will receive activities through a program called "Imagine Learning". The teacher will choose the activities based on individual student needs. As activities are completed, data will be reviewed to determine level of progress being made.

Person Responsible: Brian Pollitt (pollittb@leonschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be shared with the school during a faculty meeting, distributed to the people in attendance at our SAC/PTO Meetings. In addition, the plan will always be available in the front office. E-mail notification (listserv) will be sent to all of our families to inform them of where they can find the plan online, as well as a link to our plan will be provided on our school website. Our social media contact will also share the link the SIP on the different social media platforms for our community members to view.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Griffin Middle School has developed several different committees in which all staff members are assigned. One committee is related to Parent Involvement. The committee is planning to host several events throughout the school year aimed to increasing out parent involvement at Griffin. In addition, we have a parent involvement specialist on campus who works to foster relationships with families as well as establish community partnerships. Griffin will continue to use FOCUS and Listserv to keep open communication with families in regards to upcoming events, progress report/report card dates, and updates regarding the school.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Griffin plans to strengthen the academic programs in the school with common planning, and more focus on the specific academic standards. This is our area of focus (Focus Area 1 and Focus Area 3). We will develop a master schedule to promote common planning. Common planning will be facilitated by administration. Standards will be examined closely and in depth to determine essential questions, higher order questions, tasks/activities and meaningful assessments. This planning will translate into more meaningful instruction taking place within the classrooms.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Griffin Middle School has two full-time guidance counselors and 1 full-time social worker. These staff members are available to meet with the students as needed. In addition, the social worker has designated groups of students she checks in with on a regular basis.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Griffin Middle School offers a few CTE programs. Students are able to take, as an elective, courses that are tied to entrepreneurship as well as computer application (digital tools). All students in middle school need to complete a career component, which is covered in our US History course. Lastly, students participate in CTE introductory program, which is hosted by our local CTE school (Lively).

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Griffin follows the Multi-Tiered System Support (MTSS). The problem-solving team, which consists of program specialist for ESE compliance, Behavior Specialist, Psychologist, Guidance Counselor/Referral Coordinator, Speech/Language Pathologist, and MTSS Interventionist meet weekly. Teachers are able to refer any students to team, based on academics and/or behavior. The team then reviews all of the information pertaining to the student and is able to offer possible interventions to help the student become successful.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

All teachers have access to the district online professional development system, LEON LEADS. Within the system, teachers can sign-up for a combination of face-to-face as well as online self-paced courses in various areas. In addition, Griffin has allocated pre-week and in-service days to provide professional development trainings to staff. Lastly, all new teachers on Griffin Campus participate in mini-professional development monthly.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A