Graceville Elementary School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Graceville Elementary School

5331 ALABAMA ST, Graceville, FL 32440

http://ges.jcsb.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	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	61%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	B	D	B*

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 9/18/2018.

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.

Motto: Achieving Excellence Together

Our purpose is to achieve excellence by working together to build foundational skills for lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

see above

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Coates, Kelsey	Teacher, K-12
Kent, Laura	Principal
Tucker, Amber	Administrative Support
Wertenberger, Todd	Instructional Media
Parrish, Melody	Teacher, K-12

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Specific SST Roles/functions (one person may serve more than one role)
• Instruction Leader – (Administrator) - Ensures fidelity of the process, sets regularly scheduled times for the SST to convene, makes decisions on how T2 and T3 services will be delivered
• Team Leader – Directs team activities, receives referrals for the SST, informs staff/parents, sets meeting times, ensures the proper documentation is maintained, and sets dates/times for follow-up meetings

• Data Mentor – Assists in collecting, organizing, visually displaying, analyzing and interpreting data

• Staff Liaison – Key communicator with staff, establishes procedures to gain staff input and collaboration with other school initiatives

• Content Specialist – Assists in making key decisions about instructional needs of struggling students, identifies evidenced-based interventions most likely to be effective in addressing the area of concern, and provides training/consultation as needed

• Record Keeper – Documents/completes required paperwork in the meetings, serves as timekeeper, and informs team when time is running short.

• Behavior Specialist – Assists in identifying function of problem behaviors and developing Behavior Intervention Plans, collaborates and provides training as needed

• Teacher – of the student whose needs are being addressed

• Parent/Guardian – of the student whose needs are being addressed

• Speech/Language Pathologist –as needed–assists in developing interventions for speech/language concerns-provides training as needed to interventionists

The SST collaborates with other school-based teams such as SAC, literacy leadership team, grade group teams, the positive behavior support team, and other professional learning teams to analyze strengths and weaknesses in academic/behavioral domains, and to initiate instructional modifications needed to increase student achievement for all students, and to meet SIP goals.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	12	7	3	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	4	1	3	40	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	9	3	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	5	9	9	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

Date this data was collected
Tuesday 7/24/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	11	7	4	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	4	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	3	2	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	11	7	4	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	4	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	3	2	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Lowest 25% in ELA and Math
Math Achievement

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

5th grade math achievement (-23%)
Math Learning Gains (-28%)

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Math Lowest 25%

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

ELA achievement (+3%)

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

use of i-Ready
Remediation teacher second semester
Lexonik Sound Training
Write Score
Lexia

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	63%	67%	56%	53%	58%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	59%	55%	53%	54%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	50%	48%	42%	48%	46%
Math Achievement	52%	70%	62%	50%	63%	58%
Math Learning Gains	41%	58%	59%	40%	52%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	22%	40%	47%	14%	41%	46%
Science Achievement	45%	56%	55%	31%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	12 (8)	7 (11)	3 (7)	7 (4)	4 (6)	2 (5)	35 (41)
One or more suspensions	4 (1)	1 (1)	3 (3)	40 (4)	1 (14)	0 (3)	49 (26)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	2 (2)	1 (3)	2 (2)	1 (1)	2 (0)	8 (8)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (8)	16 (10)	15 (10)	36 (28)

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	2018	75%	66%	9%	57%	18%
	2017	59%	67%	-8%	58%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
Cohort Comparison							
04	2018	69%	66%	3%	56%	13%	
	2017	50%	59%	-9%	56%	-6%	
Same Grade Comparison		19%					
Cohort Comparison		10%					
05	2018	41%	54%	-13%	55%	-14%	
	2017	63%	61%	2%	53%	10%	
Same Grade Comparison		-22%					
Cohort Comparison		-9%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2018	71%	72%	-1%	62%	9%	
	2017	59%	75%	-16%	62%	-3%	
Same Grade Comparison		12%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2018	44%	72%	-28%	62%	-18%	
	2017	53%	73%	-20%	64%	-11%	
Same Grade Comparison		-9%					
Cohort Comparison		-15%					
05	2018	38%	62%	-24%	61%	-23%	
	2017	51%	58%	-7%	57%	-6%	
Same Grade Comparison		-13%					
Cohort Comparison		-15%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2018	34%	54%	-20%	55%	-21%	
	2017						
Cohort Comparison							

Subgroup Data

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	45	29		38	36		42				
BLK	55	60	54	41	40	30	20				
MUL	75	40		42	40						
WHT	71	53		64	39		82				
FRL	58	50	44	45	36	14	41				

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	35	43		39	40						
BLK	45	54	64	36	43	38	24				
MUL	50			40							
WHT	73	74		73	77		50				
FRL	55	60	65	52	57	47	44				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title	ELA and Math Learning Gains
Rationale	ELA Learning Gains dropped from 63% to 55%. Math Learning Gains dropped from 60% to 41%.
Intended Outcome	Increase math fluency to increase math learning gains by 21%. Target vocabulary to increase ELA learning gains by 7%.
Point Person	Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

Action Step

Description	Cross curricular activities to infuse the student day with math fluency and academic vocabulary. i-Ready math and reading Sound Training - Lexonik Accelerated Reader- 100 minutes a week for AR reading to improve ELA skills Open Court Phonics supplement Lexia Core5 intensive ELA support Access Elementary Math and ELA Resource Teachers Coach ELA and math supplements
Person Responsible	Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	Formative assessment documentation Standards Assessments from i-Ready Vocabulary Quizzes from the Accelerated Reader Program STAR level results Math fluency checks Lexonik reports
Person Responsible	Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

Activity #2	
Title	Lowest 25% Math & ELA
Rationale	The lowest 25% fell from 50% to 22% in math. The lowest 25% fell from 67% to 44% in ELA.
Intended Outcome	Target math fluency to increase the lowest 25% from 22% to 62%. Target academic vocabulary to increase the lowest 25% from 44% to 62%.
Point Person	Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)
Action Step	
Description	Year-long targeted remediation for all students in the lowest 25% subgroup. Cross curricular activities to infuse the student day with math fluency and academic vocabulary. i-Ready toolkit and direct instruction in Math and ELA. Lexonik sound training Accelerated Reader support and involvement. Open Court Phonics supplement Lexia Core5 intensive ELA support Access Elementary Math and ELA Resource Teachers Coach ELA and math supplements
Person Responsible	Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Formative assessment documentation Standards Assessments from i-Ready Vocabulary Quizzes from the Accelerated Reader Program STAR level results Math fluency checks Lexonik reports
Person Responsible	Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

Activity #3	
Title	Science Achievement Gap
Rationale	There is a 62% gap in science achievement between white and black subgroups.
Intended Outcome	Close the gap by increasing the black subgroup science achievement by at least 20%.
Point Person	Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)
Action Step	
Description	Target academic vocabulary using Lexonik. Increase exposure to non-fiction text and media.
Person Responsible	Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Use Accelerated Reading program to ensure all students are reading and testing on non-fiction text. Use Accelerated Reading program to test vocabulary on each book read/tested. Monitor Lexonic reports.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Part IV: Title I Requirements

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

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

Improve school to home communication by 50% by responding to parent inquiries via phone or email as measured by the Spring 2014 Title I Parent Survey.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

GES has an environment that allows students to be comfortable in receiving on campus counseling, outside counseling services, mentoring, support, and encouragement. Teachers, as well as all faculty, may refer students to reliable community counseling resources as needs arise. GES confers and collaborates weekly with these community counseling resources. Jackson County School District also has a backpack food program. Eligible students receive a backpack with non-perishable food items to take home each weekend. The behavior specialist from our district's ESE department offers assistance in classroom strategies and referrals. She conducted an inservice for our teachers on "Strategies to Deal with Difficult Children."

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Early childhood programs take multiple measures to assist children in transition from the PreK program to elementary school. They conduct a spring and fall home visit, parent conferences, parent involvement and education meetings, school orientation, and participation in many school activities. Parents are encouraged to get involved in their child's education and early childhood experience. Our graduating 5th graders look forward to visiting the Middle School each spring. This visit helps have their questions answered and makes the transition less stressful.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

A school-based Student Support Team (SST) has been identified for the purpose of implementing a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for all students. Universal screening data at the grade level, classroom level and subgroup level is analyzed to evaluate the effectiveness and needs of core instruction. The SST meets regularly on students identified as needing supplemental instruction beyond core (T2), and those needing more intensive/ individualized (T3) instruction. The SST reviews multiple data sources and engages in a 4 step data-based problem solving method to design and evaluate intervention plans that are targeted to student needs. Resources and service delivery are allocated according to the level of student need.

The federally funded programs used at Graceville Elementary School include Lexia and I-Ready. Lexia is used by our Kindergarten to assess and teach specific language and reading skills of struggling readers. I-Ready is used by teachers from each grade level to provide supplemental remediation for reading and mathematics skills. Title I funds and Project 9508 funds are used to secure a remediation teacher who works with identified students on specific skills noted by the classroom teacher. Title I funds are also used for classroom materials, most recently Open Court curriculum for grades K-2.

The locally funded programs used at GES include Renaissance Learning (Accelerated Reader-AR Program). Classroom teachers with the media / curriculum specialist use AR to assess appropriate reading levels for students. This determines a reading range or level of book most appropriate for library check out. Classroom teachers develop goals in an attempt to increase reading level and comprehension.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

GES encourages students to advance to college and career by making students aware of opportunity. Students at all grade levels are asked what they want to do or be when they grow up. This conversation starter allows teachers the opportunity to share with students what may be required to achieve that goal.

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$39,617.70**