Lake County Schools

Groveland Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Groveland Elementary School

930 PARKWOOD AVE, Groveland, FL 34736

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

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Sneed

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2011

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of Groveland Elementary School is to create a positive learning environment and to instill a desire for students to become lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision of Groveland Elementary School is to successfully educate all students through building authentic relationships, providing strong instruction, and participating in collaborative learning environments made up of rigorous and engaging curriculum to ensure all students are prepared for post secondary education or the workforce.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sneed, Kimberly	Principal	Each member of the school leadership team serves to provide support for best practices with instruction, monitor assess action steps towards SIP goals, and with the safe and efficient operation of the campus.
Boyd, Dawn	Instructional Coach	Each member of the school leadership team serves to provide support for best practices with instruction, monitor assess action steps towards SIP goals, and with the safe and efficient operation of the campus.
Elder, Doreen	Instructional Coach	Each member of the school leadership team serves to provide support for best practices with instruction, monitor assess action steps towards SIP goals, and with the safe and efficient operation of the campus.
Boardway, Reanna	Assistant Principal	Each member of the school leadership team serves to provide support for best practices with instruction, monitor assess action steps towards SIP goals, and with the safe and efficient operation of the campus.
Orsini, Ricardo	Dean	Each member of the school leadership team serves to provide support for best practices with instruction, monitor assess action steps towards SIP goals, and with the safe and efficient operation of the campus.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 8/12/2011, Kimberly Sneed

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
66

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	77	82	87	111	103	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	12	22	13	13	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	2	4	8	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	9	8	14	17	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in Math	9	8	14	17	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	54	52	91	90	74	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/26/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	108	111	124	133	107	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	719
Attendance below 90 percent	4	32	19	27	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	1	7	11	10	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	26	28	57	21	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	28	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	34	38	63	33	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	13	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	108	111	124	133	107	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	719
Attendance below 90 percent	4	32	19	27	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	1	7	11	10	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	26	28	57	21	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	28	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	34	38	63	33	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	13	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	49%	58%	57%	43%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	57%	58%	51%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	49%	53%	48%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	53%	60%	63%	59%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	54%	56%	62%	53%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	39%	51%	43%	41%	47%
Science Achievement	50%	54%	53%	54%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	48%	60%	-12%	58%	-10%
	2018	46%	61%	-15%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	60%	-12%	58%	-10%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	48%	59%	-11%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	43%	59%	-16%	56%	-13%
	2018	38%	55%	-17%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	45%	62%	-17%	62%	-17%
	2018	64%	65%	-1%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	61%	-3%	64%	-6%
	2018	51%	60%	-9%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	47%	57%	-10%	60%	-13%
	2018	51%	58%	-7%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	48%	56%	-8%	53%	-5%
	2018	54%	54%	0%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	21	26	16	28	37	25	19				
ELL	51	59	30	58	52		55				
ASN	82	64		82	82						
BLK	35	38	18	31	46	35	26				
HSP	53	55	46	56	53	40	61				
MUL	54			57	60						
WHT	46	47	50	60	56	29	48				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
FRL	51	49	33	53	53	37	47				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	20	28	18	40	53	44	25				
ELL	41	57		59	57						
ASN	75			83							
BLK	31	41	46	42	42	54	50				
HSP	46	51	37	62	57	38	54				
MUL	33			71	80						
WHT	44	56	67	59	51	45	58				
FRL	43	52	46	60	56	47	53				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	411
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The component that showed the lowest performance was the Math Lowest 25th Percentile at 38%. The low performance was due to a lack of purposeful math intervention during the intervention block and a lack of monitoring.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile going from 48% to 40%. We feel that the reason for this decline was a lack of small group, purposeful intervention during the remediation block.

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

There were two components that had equivalent gaps when compared to the state average. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile at 40% and Math Lowest 25th Percentile at 38%. We feel it was the inconsistent use of the intervention block that attributed to these gaps.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the ELA Achievement area going from 43% to 49% with a 6% gain. We focused heavily on reading with conferring as well as Reading, Writing, Thinking and Talking in every classroom everyday.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Upon reflection of the EWS data, the first concern is the number of students with attendance below 90%. The second area of concern in reflection of the EWS data is the large number of course failures in ELA or Math.

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

1. Focused Instruction
2. Course Failures
3. LLI Implementation
4. Math Intervention
5. Building Relationships

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The instructional area of focus for the 20-21 school year will be Focused Instruction. This area impacts student learning by preparing our students for learning by establishing purpose, modeling thinking, as well as thinking aloud. This area of focus was identified through classroom walk throughs, small group intervention interactions, as well as teacher input which correlates to the year over year decline in lowest quartile performance.
Measureable Outcome:	Based on the deliberate focus on Modeling Thinking we will achieve an increase of 10% for our lowest 25th percentile in ELA and Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Sneed (sneedk@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidenced based strategies are modeling thinking, establishing purpose and thinking aloud. Modeling thinking will explain expert thinking while demonstrating the task or strategy as well as alert learners about potential errors and show them the cognitive process of problem solving. Establishing purpose will set clear learning targets and make sure students know what is expected, as well as show them how to achieve success in increments which will motivate students to continue their pursuit of learning. (Frye) Thinking aloud will guide student in how to understand the content.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Modeling thinking, establishing purpose and thinking aloud were chosen as the instructional focus to move the achievement level of the lowest 25th percentile due to the research based texts of Doug Fisher and Nancy Frye. In this research, we recognized the similarities of our learners to the learners described in these texts. Students who understand the purpose of a new skill will grasp the details more thoroughly. Learners who experience expert thinking through modeling gain a deeper understanding for when to apply it, what to watch out for, and how to analyze their success. Students who experience think alouds learn how to understand the content.

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize the Better Learning Through Structured Teaching to guide professional development.

Person Responsible Reanna Boardway (boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Execute classroom walk throughs to identify teachers who are successfully demonstrating Modeling, Setting Purpose and Thinking Aloud.

Person Responsible Reanna Boardway (boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Organize instructional rounds, starting with new teachers, to observe exemplar demonstrations of Focused Instruction.

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

Schedule a debrief and develop individual plans for implementation with instructional support team follow ups.

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

Continue to monitor, support and provide additional training and coaching as needed. Continue debrief on observations and walk through data.

Person Responsible Kimberly Sneed (sneedk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Utilize PLC's to continue to drive the 4 questions that support Focused Instruction.

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

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Area of Focus specifically relating to Early Warning Systems is the course failures in ELA and Math. Course failures are tangible evidence that there is an external or internal factor affecting student success. This will help our team to identify the critical need of these students and intervene with necessary resources.
Measureable Outcome:	The measurable outcome for focusing on ELA and Math course failures is to decrease the number of students struggling with academic content evidenced by the course failures. In addition to a decrease in the number of course failures, we anticipate the following results in data: -Increase of 10% for ELA & Math Lowest 25th Percentile -Increase ELA Achievement from 49% to 54% -Increase Math Achievement from 53% to 58% -Increase in Science Achievement from 50% to 55% -Increase in the following Student ESSA Groups below 41%: -Students with Disabilities: 25% to 30% -Black/African American Students: 33% to 38%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Sneed (sneedk@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	For this area of focus, the evidence-based strategies that will be utilized are, data review to establish if the assessment directly measures the mastery of standards taught, ensure that student intervention to relearn content is established and is a cultural norm, be sure that opportunities are given for students to demonstrate understanding of the content. This will also lead to identification of additional interventions or programs, such as MTSS, that may be needed for students that are continuing to struggle with academic standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor and support data review of assessments, intervention, and opportunities to demonstrate mastery, we expect to see a decrease in course failures across grade levels and content areas per the performance matters platform. Monitoring our course failures will enable teachers and instructional support to intervene quickly to increase student success and mastery of standards and decrease the width of the achievement gap.

Action Steps to Implement	
Monitor course failures in biweekly EWS team meetings.	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Sneed (sneedk@lake.k12.fl.us)
Implement and Monitor LLI to address the lowest 25th percentile in ELA	
Person Responsible	Dawn Boyd (boydd@lake.k12.fl.us)
Utilize PLC's to ensure standards are being assessed, re-teaching is occurring and opportunities to demonstrate mastery are given.	
Person Responsible	Dawn Boyd (boydd@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the Federal Index data we will be focusing on the subgrougs that have fallen below the federal threshold of 41% which is the Students with Disabilities subgroup and the African American Subgroup, as well as a direct focus on our Lowest 25th Percentile in both Reading and Math. These areas have been identified as our most critical areas of focus because of the year over year declining trends in these specific areas.
Measureable Outcome:	By focusing on these areas, we expect to see an increase in the achievement level of our Lowest 25th percentile in ELA from 40% to 45% and an increase in our Math Lowest 25th percentile from 38% to 43%. We also expect to see an increase in our two Federal Index Subgroups that have fallen below the 41% from 25% to 30% for our SWD's and from 33% to 38% for the African American Subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Sneed (sneedk@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy that will be implemented for the aforementioned Area of Focus will be LLI for our lowest 25th percentile in ELA, Focused Instruction with specific attention to modeling thinking and setting a purpose for all areas of focus, and building relations with a focus on equity and access for all.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With the implementation, monitoring, and consistent use of the research based LLI program we anticipate an increase in our lowest 25th percentile in ELA. We also know that focusing on professional learning centered around Focused Instruction, with particular attention to Modeling Thinking and Setting a purpose, will increase instructional strength, which will lead to an increase in success of not only our focus subgroups, but our entire student body. Using the teachings of "Overcoming the Achievement Gap Trap" by Dr. Mohammad to educate and grow with our teachers will help to build relationships with students and ensure that there is equity and access for all students. This will promote an increase in a positive school culture and environment for both teachers and students.

Action Steps to Implement	
Implement LLI with fidelity and consistency	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Sneed (sneedk@lake.k12.fl.us)
Utilize LAFS & MAFS to address the needs of our students at level 1 & level 2	
Person Responsible	Doreen Elder (elderd@lake.k12.fl.us)
Professional Learning on Focused Instruction: Modeling Thinking and Setting a Purpose	
Person Responsible	Reanna Boardway (boardwayr@lake.k12.fl.us)
Book Study on "Overcoming the Achievement Gap Trap"	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Sneed (sneedk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Classroom walk through's to provide feedback, next steps and coaching

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

No additional areas of focus.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

In order to promote a positive school culture and environment that is based on support, learning, trust, respect and high expectations, GES will ensure that all faculty and staff are fully trained, equipped and aware of their role in the learning of our panthers. Continuous professional growth will be facilitated through professional learning in both instructional practices as well as through professional text with the use of "Overcoming the Achievement Gap Trap." It is a focus of GES to ensure that all faculty and staff feel invested in, cared for and respected, through high expectations of day to day processes, procedures and professional interactions. We will reach out to our community stakeholders through our Student Advisory Council to ensure that the various perspectives of our community members are heard and are involved in the decision making process regarding school performance, equity and improvement strategies.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems**	**$0.00**

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				$5,728.32
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	520-Textbooks	0382 - Groveland Elementary School	General Fund		$5,728.32
			Notes: The Curriculum and Associates materials which include Ready Florida Math and Ready Florida ELA will be used by 3rd-5th grade teachers in order to meet the needs of the students identified at Level 1 and Level 2. Teachers will utilize PLC's to identify standards of need for these Level 1 & Level 2 students and use the MAFS & LAFS material to intervene. Teachers will also be using the LAFS for enrichment and acceleration with the use of rigorous text and the MAFS for additional practice and acceleration with the use of application based problems. This will allow all levels of learners to get the benefits of the Curriculum and Associates materials.			
					Total:	**$5,728.32**