

Polk County Public Schools

Griffin Elementary 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 | 20 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 20 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 23 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 26 |

Griffin Elementary School

3315 KATHLEEN RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

<http://schools.polk-fl.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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, 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 |
|------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Stinson, Roberta | Principal | Principal: The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She leads and assists in setting up structures for high impact instruction, data-based decision-making, and a collaborative culture. She monitors the progress of intentional planning by attending weekly grade level collaborative planning sessions as well as PLCs. She also conducts daily walkthroughs, provides consistent formative feedback to support the professional growth of all teachers, and openly communicates with parents to build positive relationships. |
| Brown, Janel | Behavior Specialist | The Behavior Interventionist is responsible for teacher-to-teacher classroom support, modeling, mentoring, and collaborating to promote better behavior management strategies for teachers and students. Mrs. Brown is also responsible for supporting teachers in data collection, analysis, interpretation and usage; research-based behavior strategies and programs; and school improvement. Mrs. Brown works closely with the leadership team to review schoolwide data and plan, implement, and monitor strategies to teach schoolwide rules and expectations. |
| Brown, Alicia | Other | Provides individual and group counseling, case management, and crisis team support. She is available to provide training in threat management, mental health and wellness, and trauma-informed strategies. She serves on school-based threat management teams and work collaboratively with other mental health professionals to identify and provide interventions for high-risk students in need of mental health support. |
| Missouri, Dedra | Psychologist | Responsible for providing student evaluations to determine eligibility and services in ESE. She consults and collaborates with various teams to help schools implement MTSS. She also provides services and training in individual/group counseling, crisis intervention, behavior planning and interventions. |
| Hotwick, Lynsey | Curriculum Resource Teacher | To engage with teachers and provide support and resources across academic areas. To assess levels of student achievement, analyze test results, and prescribe actions for improvement. To plan, establish priorities and help implement activities for maximum effectiveness. Work effectively and collaboratively with colleagues, administration, and all other stakeholders. |
| White, Melissa | Curriculum Resource Teacher | To engage with teachers and provide support and resources across academic areas. To assess levels of student achievement, analyze test results, and prescribe actions for improvement. To plan, establish priorities and help implement activities for maximum effectiveness. Work effectively and collaboratively with colleagues, administration, and all other stakeholders. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Holbrook, Elizabeth | Assistant Principal | Supports the Principal in leading and assisting the setup of structures for high impact instruction, data-based decision-making, and a collaborative culture. She participates in the monitoring and progress of intentional planning by attending weekly grade level collaborative planning sessions as well as PLCs. She supports in conducting daily walkthroughs, providing consistent formative feedback to support the professional growth of all teachers, and communication with parents to build positive relationships. |
| Garcia, Melinda | Curriculum Resource Teacher | To engage with teachers and provide support and resources across academic areas. To assess levels of student achievement, analyze test results, and prescribe actions for improvement. To plan, establish priorities and help implement activities for maximum effectiveness. Work effectively and collaboratively with colleagues, administration, and all other stakeholders. |

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.

Leadership Team will be an integral part of developing the final draft based on each leader's area of focus. The Leadership Team meets weekly to discuss progress and goals across all academic settings, as well as, social-emotional. Quarterly, the School Advisory Council (SAC) are given updates on progress of each area of focus and progress monitoring data. The SAC are given opportunities for problem solving and ways to engage with staff and students. This plan is also available on the District website and school website.

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))

Leadership Team will monitor during weekly meetings paralleling the timeline of applicable assessments. If we find that the plan and strategies put in place are not meeting the needs of students, then we will meet as a Leadership Team to problem solve and plan to implement new strategies and/or interventions.

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) | Elementary School PK-5 |

| | |
|--|--|
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 77% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| 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) 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: D |
| 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 | 36 | 36 | 26 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 | |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | |
| Course failure in Math | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 4 | 38 | 52 | 21 | 12 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 57 | 50 | 61 | 26 | 21 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 240 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 17 | 12 | 16 | 18 | 14 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | |

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 | 14 | 8 | 6 | 27 | 21 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |

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 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 33 | 22 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 26 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 20 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 40 | 32 | 30 | 21 | 26 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173 |

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

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 | 33 | 22 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 | |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 26 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 20 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 40 | 32 | 30 | 21 | 26 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173 | |

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

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* | 33 | 45 | 53 | 39 | 47 | 56 | 33 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 51 | | | 30 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 40 | | | 30 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 41 | 49 | 59 | 42 | 42 | 50 | 30 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 58 | | | 40 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 43 | | | 60 | | |

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement* | 33 | 41 | 54 | 39 | 49 | 59 | 8 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 56 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 45 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 39 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 33 | 54 | 59 | 35 | | | 58 | | |

* 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) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 34 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 171 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 43 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 347 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| 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 | 20 | Yes | 4 | 2 |
| ELL | 24 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 16 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| HSP | 33 | Yes | 1 | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | | | |
| FRL | 34 | Yes | 1 | |

| 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 | 27 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| ELL | 43 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | Yes | 3 | |
| HSP | 49 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 46 | | | |
| FRL | 44 | | | |

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 | 33 | | | 41 | | | 33 | | | | | 33 |
| SWD | 15 | | | 27 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| ELL | 23 | | | 30 | | | 18 | | | | 5 | 33 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 14 | | | 25 | | | 15 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 38 | | | 40 | | | 27 | | | | 5 | 38 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 46 | | | 59 | | | 67 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 30 | | | 39 | | | 34 | | | | 5 | 35 |

| 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 | 39 | 51 | 40 | 42 | 58 | 43 | 39 | | | | | 35 |
| SWD | 17 | 40 | | 31 | 33 | | 13 | | | | | |
| ELL | 25 | 50 | | 44 | 60 | | | | | | | 35 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 35 | 20 | 28 | 50 | 50 | 40 | | | | | |
| HSP | 35 | 57 | | 49 | 67 | | 42 | | | | | 43 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 40 | 57 | | 48 | 55 | | 29 | | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 53 | 44 | 39 | 58 | 44 | 41 | | | | | 38 |

| 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 | 33 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 40 | 60 | 8 | | | | | 58 |
| SWD | 15 | | | 15 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 27 | | | 23 | | | | | | | | 58 |

| 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 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 31 | | 27 | 46 | | 0 | | | | | |
| HSP | 37 | 31 | | 37 | 38 | | 7 | | | | | 53 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 32 | | | 29 | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 24 | 27 | | 24 | 33 | | 3 | | | | | 50 |

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 |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 28% | 43% | -15% | 54% | -26% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 52% | 53% | -1% | 58% | -6% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 31% | 42% | -11% | 50% | -19% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 42% | 51% | -9% | 59% | -17% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 56% | -11% | 61% | -16% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 34% | 44% | -10% | 55% | -21% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 29% | 39% | -10% | 51% | -22% |

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.

Based on our two year comparison for matched data, science proficiency decreased from 39% to 31%. Overall, reading and math remained consistent. Fifth grade reading proficiency fell below 30% indicating a trend among the reading ability among those students. Griffin's matched students for fifth included a large percentage of students that were not enrolled during the 21-22 SY, so they did not receive the intensive intervention provided to those then 4th graders.

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

Third grade reading proficiency decreased from 39% to 32%, including fifteen retained students. Factors involved: second grade teachers not implementing the MTSS with fidelity. This was determined after doing an in-house guidance audit at the beginning of 22-23. Temporary break in intense PH instruction with the retirement of a teacher.

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.

Across tested areas, Griffin falls behind in all areas consistently when compared with the state.

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

Fourth Grade ELA increased from 36% to almost 60%. A change of teachers, putting an HE teacher in, and hiring an interventionist to support the work.

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

After reflecting on EWS data, two potential areas of concern include the lowest quartile in both reading and math and targeting student identified as having two or more early warning sign indicators.

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

1. Monitoring for understanding/planning-content expertise
2. Intervention programs
3. Third Grade (new Cell)
4. Culture and Climate
5. Sub-group awareness

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Teacher Retention (only 9/17 returning homeroom teachers)- left county, went to academies or closer to home. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students and staff need, to develop the positive culture they need to succeed in school and at work.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By improving school climate and culture, 85% of 2023-2024 certified teachers will return for the 2024-2025 school year.

Monitoring:

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

- Informal 'chats' with teachers by admin and leadership team members assigned to each grade level
- Anonymous surveys for staff

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Constant monitoring of staff morale with conversation, surveys, needs assessments and teacher check ins.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Maintaining a positive culture and climate increases teacher efficacy therefore improving student achievement.

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.

Increase teacher/staff morale with the implementation of staff spirit days, Friday Fun Days, and teacher PBIS incentives.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@polk-fl.net)

By When: Begin implementation by 10/31.

Build relationships with staff through team building exercises and through recognizing and rewarding effective instructional practice.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@polk-fl.net)

By When: 05/2024

Increase teacher support through visibility, transparency, and communication. Implementation of individualized support through leadership/staff assigned liaison.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@polk-fl.net)

By When: 05/2024

#2. 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.

With underperforming sub-groups and a total of 10 assignments that are either new to Griffin, the district or filled with Subs, Griffin's focus will be benchmark aligned instruction throughout planning, monitoring and collaboration among staff.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Walk-thru reports will be monitored bi-weekly and that evidence will measure the progress across individuals, grade levels and school.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will be tiered after the first month of school based on observational data. Consistent monitoring with this area of instructional focus will be implemented with admin and leadership team. Weekly LT meetings will include discussion of teachers and their progress. Monitoring of all assessment depending on timeline (bi-weekly, PM assessments) by leadership team and admin. Data chats with teachers and students. Each LT member will have assigned grade levels and focus groups for monitoring and reporting.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is a continuous implementation of district and school initiatives from 22-23

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.

Tiering teachers- admin
Use of walk thru tool- admin and coaches
scheduled visits and chats- LT members
Weekly LT meetings for feedback and monitoring- Admin

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

By When: Tiering (first month) All others on-going

Teachers will provide scaffolding for students with skills gaps on new content and plan instruction based on student needs.

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

By When: Monitored and adapted quarterly

ELL and ESE strategies will be embedded into the lesson plans and used with students to support learning.

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

By When: Monitored and adapted quarterly

Mini Professional Development/ Lunch and Learns on station rotation, strategic groupings, and instructional technology use during the first semester with follow up and side by side coaching and modeling.

Person Responsible: Melissa White (melissa.white@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monitored and Adapted at end of semester 12/2023.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

- Title I/UniSIG Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)
- Data Com
- Summer Leadership Academy/Retreat
- School Improvement Plan Meetings/Trainings
- PURE Process
- Regional and Office of School Transformation review SIP plans

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Based on PM 3 Early Lit STAR data, >90% of KG students were below the 50 percentile ranking.
 Based on PM 3 Early Lit STAR data, >90% of 1st grade students were below the 50 percentile ranking.
 Based on PM 3 Early Lit STAR data, >90% of 2nd grade students were below the 50 percentile ranking.
 Based on PM 3 STAR Reading data, 83% of 2nd grade students were below the 50 percentile ranking.

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

Based on PM 3 FAST Reading Data, 69% of students in grade 3 were below proficiency.
 Based on PM 3 FAST Reading Data, 48% of students in grade 4 were below proficiency.
 Based on PM 3 FAST Reading Data, 72% of students in grade 5 were below proficiency.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

PM 3 STAR Reading Measurable Outcome KG: 41%
 PM 3 STAR Reading Measurable Outcome 1st: 41%
 PM 3 STAR Reading Measurable Outcome 2nd: 41%

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

PM 3 FAST Reading Measurable Outcome 3rd Grade: 41%
 PM 3 FAST Reading Measurable Outcome 4th Grade: 41%
 PM 3 FAST Reading Measurable Outcome 5th Grade: 55%

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

The Area of Focus will be monitored through progress monitoring assessments, unit assessments, and during data diving discussions with grade level teams. Student achievement outcomes will be impacted through the use of data chats, flexible grouping and small group instruction for interventions.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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 evidence-based practices/programs being implemented include reading mastery, corrective reading, Americore, Istation, SmartyAnts, flexible grouping, small group instruction, and progress monitoring assessment.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Programs selected based on high yield results.

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 |
|--|--|
| Literacy Leadership: Conduct Walkthroughs to monitor for effective instructional practice Identify areas to target and address for professional growth | Stinson, Roberta, roberta.stinson@polk-fl.net |
| Literacy Coaching: Facilitate Data Dives/Discussions with grade level teams Provide mini professional development to facilitate professional development as needed Identify and flexibly group students in reading mastery and corrective reading interventions | Garcia, Melinda, melinda.garcia@polk-fl.net |
| Assessment Conduct District Unit Assessments Conduct FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments Conduct STAR Progress Monitoring Assessments | Holbrook, Elizabeth, elizabeth.holbrook@polk-fl.net |
| Professional Learning Team of teachers attended Corrective Reading training Team of teachers Reading Master training Teachers attend regular data dive plc's Teachers observe peer teachers to improve teaching practice | Stinson, Roberta, roberta.stinson@polk-fl.net |

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.

- School/District Webpage
- PEN Notebook

- Parent/Family/Community Input Meetings
- Annual Meeting

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))

- Building Capacity Events
- Staff Capacity Building Professional Development Conferencing
- family/school relationship
- Family/Community Input
- Data Chats/Conferences
- Webpage
- Annual Meeting
- Preventing Barriers

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))

- Supplemental Staff (academic coaches, interventionists, paraprofessionals)
- Supplemental Resources
- Extended Learning
- Professional Development
- Collaborative Planning
- RTD
- MOU Planning
- MTSS – Tier Support for Students

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))

- Data Com
- School Improvement Planning Trainings
- Regional (area) Meetings
- Summer Leadership Academy
- Title I Technical Assistance – Use of Funds, PFE Input, Back to School Mtg
- Comprehensive Needs Assessment Technical Assistance
- ESE, Migrant, Early Childhood, Cambridge/IB, Work Force

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))

- <https://polkschoolsfl.com/mentalhealth/>
- Individual Counseling
- Group Counseling
- School Consultations
- Drumbeats
- Collaboration with community providers – Peace River Center, Watson Clinic Behavioral Health, Sweet Center – Winter Haven Hospital
- Support Groups
- Grief Support
- Children's Home Society

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))

- Dual Enrollment
- IB/Cambridge
- Career Academies
- Vocational Schools
- Building Capacity of Events – Transition events

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).

- PBIS
- RTI
- MTSS
- Behavior Interventionist, Student Success Coaches, Mental Health Counselors, School Counselors, Deans

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))

- Professional Learning Communities to improve instruction and data
- Data Com
- RTD
- UniSIG Supplemental Teacher/Administrator Allocation
- Collective Bargaining Stipends – Title I, Critical Shortage Area, Highly Effective
- Recruitment and Educator Quality Department - PCPS Culture Ambassador Program

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))

- Early Childhood - <https://polkschoolsfl.com/earlychildhood/>
- Head Start
- VPK (Title I, ESE and non-Title I)
- Kindergarten Round Up
- Kindergarten Readiness Camps

- Books Bridge Bus
- Migrant Early Childhood Services

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|--------|--------|--|--------|
| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes