
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Franklin County School

1250 US HIGHWAY 98, Eastpoint, FL 32328

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Danielle Rosson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 is pending approval by the Franklin County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Franklin County School

1250 US HIGHWAY 98, Eastpoint, FL 32328

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Franklin County School will foster and cultivate an environment in which students develop trusting connections with one another (Relationship), develop a sense of purpose, promote self-determination (Relevance), and strive for excellence in academics by providing challenging curriculum in the classroom (Rigor).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Having All students Working towards Knowledge and Success.

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
Pender, Laurence	Principal	
Miedona, Shelly	Assistant Principal	
Copeland, Melanie	School Counselor	
Copley, Jaime	Assistant Principal	
Wheatley, Rob	Administrative Support	Safety Director
King, Laura	Instructional Coach	
Leach, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Danielle Rosson

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

75

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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	69	55	60	55	58	59	73	56	67	96	72	73	43	836
Attendance below 90 percent	47	19	21	17	26	34	23	13	26	49	32	30	13	350
One or more suspensions	3	1	1	0	1	1	12	2	7	4	5	2	2	41
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	6	3	6	9	10	12	13	6	11	79
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	7	6	6	2	4	10	16	12	7	73
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	21	29	18	29	33	23	20	8	188
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	15	29	22	25	23	22	12	5	158

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	1	1	2	13	21	35	18	28	36	34	20	14	225

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	3	1	2	3	0	3	5	8	6	15	8	6	2	62
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	8	8	9	6	6	1	49

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 10/14/2020

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	60	61	63	59	60	81	58	66	61	90	89	52	52	852
Attendance below 90 percent	16	12	1	12	17	12	16	12	20	25	27	11	21	202
One or more suspensions	1	1	5	3	9	7	6	14	11	15	7	2	1	82
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	25	41	30	36	38	43	31	18	12	281

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	0	3	3	11	9	13	16	17	23	11	5	8	120

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	3	2	0	6	0	1	0	1	1	6	9	6	1	36
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	2	2	4	4	7	4	11	11	3	3	52

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	60	61	63	59	60	81	58	66	61	90	89	52	52	852
Attendance below 90 percent	16	12	1	12	17	12	16	12	20	25	27	11	21	202
One or more suspensions	1	1	5	3	9	7	6	14	11	15	7	2	1	82
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	25	41	30	36	38	43	31	18	12	281

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	0	3	3	11	9	13	16	17	23	11	5	8	120

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	3	2	0	6	0	1	0	1	1	6	9	6	1	36
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	2	2	4	4	7	4	11	11	3	3	52

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	34%	47%	61%	35%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	41%	45%	59%	34%	49%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	42%	54%	26%	37%	51%
Math Achievement	31%	48%	62%	34%	51%	58%
Math Learning Gains	44%	48%	59%	38%	51%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	45%	52%	40%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	34%	47%	56%	38%	51%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	42%	63%	78%	54%	69%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	37%	50%	-13%	58%	-21%
	2018	35%	44%	-9%	57%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	32%	41%	-9%	58%	-26%
	2018	41%	48%	-7%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	41%	49%	-8%	56%	-15%
	2018	25%	28%	-3%	55%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	25%	33%	-8%	54%	-29%
	2018	19%	36%	-17%	52%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	20%	38%	-18%	52%	-32%
	2018	23%	40%	-17%	51%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	33%	43%	-10%	56%	-23%
	2018	44%	48%	-4%	58%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
09	2019	42%	39%	3%	55%	-13%
	2018	38%	37%	1%	53%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
10	2019	28%	29%	-1%	53%	-25%
	2018	36%	34%	2%	53%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	37%	52%	-15%	62%	-25%
	2018	41%	50%	-9%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	40%	-5%	64%	-29%
	2018	35%	51%	-16%	62%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	22%	40%	-18%	60%	-38%
	2018	15%	32%	-17%	61%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
06	2019	25%	39%	-14%	55%	-30%
	2018	21%	42%	-21%	52%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
07	2019	34%	46%	-12%	54%	-20%
	2018	37%	46%	-9%	54%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	0%	0%	0%	46%	-46%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	33%	45%	-12%	53%	-20%
	2018	25%	35%	-10%	55%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	32%	33%	-1%	67%	-35%
2018	34%	33%	1%	65%	-31%
Compare		-2%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	30%	48%	-18%	71%	-41%
2018	35%	56%	-21%	71%	-36%
Compare		-5%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	59%	-2%	70%	-13%
2018	59%	57%	2%	68%	-9%
Compare		-2%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	25%	36%	-11%	61%	-36%
2018	39%	50%	-11%	62%	-23%
Compare		-14%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	38%	40%	-2%	57%	-19%
2018	45%	44%	1%	56%	-11%
Compare		-7%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	25	37	37	24	42	47	30	37			
ELL	18	27	20	5	31						
BLK	20	23	19	26	32	38	6	7			
HSP	23	27	20	16	35	55	17				
MUL	45	43		41	43						
WHT	36	45	44	33	47	48	41	51	44	77	44
FRL	31	41	37	30	45	45	33	31	39	73	13
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	28	42	37	19	37	30	29	32			
ELL	9			18							
BLK	24	46	56	22	32	38	14	36			
HSP	27	61	50	24	65			40			
MUL	40	40		45	43						

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
WHT	37	46	43	37	46	40	35	54	39	75	59
FRL	30	45	44	31	43	43	29	42	32	81	61
2017 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	8	13	10	12	30	30	10	25		75	
BLK	18	14	11	24	37	38	20	33			
HSP	52	47		33	55						
MUL	57	53		33	45		50				
WHT	35	35	27	35	37	40	39	57	57	73	37
FRL	30	31	24	28	34	36	35	47	50	74	39

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	534
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	2

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	21
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	33
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	43
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	46
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

2018-2019 school data shows math achievement being the lowest performance at 31% proficiency. One contributing factor was the Tier 1 curriculum used. This curriculum did not meet the rigor of Florida State Standards. In 2018-2019, the 8th grade students were scheduled in Algebra IA and not an 8th grade math class. Therefore, these students were not exposed to the 8th grade Florida standards.

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

2018-2019 data shows that Social Studies dropped 10% from 52% proficiency to 42% proficient. The school was on a rotational block schedule that year. Students were not exposed to all of the standards. In addition a new teacher was teaching Civics who had not taught Civics prior to this school year.

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.

2018 -2019 data shows the greatest gap in Social Studies with 36%. Middle school and high school were on a rotational block schedule which prevented time to teach all standards. The Civics teacher that year had never taught Civics before.

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

In 2018-2019, the greatest improvement was in Math lowest 25%. This area increased by 5 points. Grades 3-6 were utilizing small group differentiated instruction. The students who scored a level 1 on the 2018 FSA were placed in intensive math classes last school year as well as this school year.

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

In 2018-2019, the number of students scoring a Level 1 and attendance below 90% were the major areas of concern and remain at the top this school year as well.

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

1. Tracking the lowest 25%
2. Attendance
3. Proficiency in all content areas - Tier 1 instruction
4. Provide adequate instruction for ESE students
5. Discipline

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

The area of focus for the 2020-2021 school year will be on reading proficiency and Tier 1 instruction. 2018-2019 school data shows ELA proficiency 27 percentage points less than the state average. Only 34% of students in grades 3-10 were proficient on the 2018-2019 FSA. For the past 5 years, 60 - 75% of our 3rd - 10th grade students were not proficient in Reading. Focusing on Tier 1 reading strategies will positively impact overall reading proficiency of students.

Measurable Outcome: 3rd through 10th grade Reading proficiency will increase by 20% to overall 40% proficiency during the 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laurence Pender (lpender@franklincountyschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Close Reading Strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Close reading is a strategy used in complex texts across all content areas. It is text specific and content dynamic. Students will use this strategy in all content areas, not just the reading classroom. Using this strategy will increase comprehension in all content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Employing certified reading endorsed teachers.
2. Monitoring instruction using Close Reading in the classroom via daily walk throughs.
3. Provide additional professional development as follow up from last year's PDs and provide Close Reading trainings to all new teachers during grade level PLCs.
4. Continue to use a core curriculum with a focus on complex texts.

Person Responsible

Laurence Pender (lpender@franklincountyschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus for the 2020-2021 school year will be increasing the graduation rate. 2018-2019 school data shows an 81% graduation rate. State graduation rate was 86.9%. For the past 3 years, the graduation rate has slowly increased. At the start of this school year, 23% of the current seniors are not on track to graduate.

Measurable Outcome: 2021 graduation rate will increase by 2 percentage points to 83% by May 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Laurence Pender (lpender@franklincountyschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Seniors and Juniors who have opted for the 18 credit track are meeting with the administrative team. At these meetings, students are looking at their grades, state test scores, courses needed to graduate and discussing plans and options after graduation. The administrative team is following up with these students regularly looking at grades, and the state test requirements needed for graduation. We are also discussion concordance score options with these students. Students who have not passed the ELA and Algebra I EOC are being mentored by teachers and working with peers who have been successful in previous tests to receive tutoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy personalizes each child's education. Previous experiences in other schools with similar challenging situations.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Look at senior and 18 credit option junior's grades, credits, FSA and EOC scores.
2. Examine FSA and EOC data to see how many points are needed to pass.
3. Students individually meet with administration and guidance to discuss their data and next steps.
4. Students who are not passing with 18 credit option are encouraged to return to 24 credit option.
5. Students connected with a mentor.
6. Students connected with a tutor to help them pass required classes and FSA assessments.
7. Students regularly meet with principal to discuss his/her progress and growth toward meeting goals.
8. Students track their own progress by meeting with principal to discuss monthly progress reports and quarterly report cards.

Person Responsible Laurence Pender (lpender@franklincountyschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

2020-2021 area of focus is behavior, discipline and attendance. Current school year data shows 350 students with attendance below 90%. At this time in 2019 there were 202 students with attendance below 90%. Currently there are 41 students with 1 or more suspensions. At this time last year there were 82 students with 1 or more suspensions. Improving attendance will impact student learning. Research shows that students who attend school regularly have better grades and a higher graduation rate. 10,469 minutes were missed due to attendance and out of school suspensions in the 2019-2020 school year. 32% of our students were absent 10% of days or more.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of students absent 10% of days or more will be reduced to 25% by the end of the 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laurence Pender (lpender@franklincountyschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Franklin County School is introducing a Positive Behavior Intervention Support System for the 2020-2021 school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

PBIS was selected due to the high number of absences and discipline occurrences during the 2019-2020 school year. Past experiences in similar challenging situations have shown success with PBIS.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a PBIS team with the support of Florida PBIS.
2. Team will complete an 18 hour training with Florida PBIS.
3. Team and Florida PBIS will then train the faculty and staff.
4. Administrative team conducts regular walk throughs throughout the day to ensure students are on task and behaving.
5. Administrative team will meet regularly to discuss walk through observations and student behavior.
6. Positive encouragement is given to students on a regular basis when they are choosing to behave appropriately.

Person Responsible

Laurence Pender (lpender@franklincountyschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Tracking the lowest 25% is another focus. The leadership team will have PLC meetings with teachers. MTSS meetings will be held with teachers concerning these students. Meetings will be held with students to discuss their grades, MAP data and previous FSA scores. Students will track their own progress using monthly progress reports, quarterly report cards and MAP goal setting sheets as well as regular conversations with principal.

2. Provide adequate instruction for ESE students is another area of focus. A middle school ESE teacher was hired for the 2020-2021 school year. Created a new school leadership team with priorities on ESE instruction. We have increased the least restrictive environment to be higher than the state average. This will expose more students to grade level instruction and content.

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.

The school has a family engagement calendar for the 2020-2021 school year that lists monthly events that will take place on campus and/or virtually, including an Open House, community events, family ELA and Math nights and book give aways provided by PAEC and the Read With Me grant. We also have a college FAFSA night hosted by Gulf Coast State College. We utilize the marquee in front of school, the local radio and newspaper as well as Facebook to share events and activities both on campus and virtually. The school holds regular District Advisory Council and PTO meetings to elicit input from families and community members.

Throughout the year, seniors have the opportunity to attend college and career events. We have an articulation agreement with Gulf Coast State College. Students have the opportunity to obtain certifications in welding, culinary arts, CNA, CPR and AED, Quickbooks and aerospace. We partner with the local, health department, hospital, nursing home, Lively Tech and Embry Riddle. We have received support from the Sherriff's Office, Dollar General, Centennial Bank and many local church groups.

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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00