

Jackson County School Board

Graceville School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	10
Title I Requirements	12
Budget to Support Goals	14

Graceville School

5539 BROWN ST, Graceville, FL 32440

<http://ghs.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)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	94%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

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

Small Town ... Big Thinkers!!!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Administrators are building a Safe Haven.
Faculty/Staff are building Expectations.
Students are building Imaginations.
Community Members are building Endless Opportunities.
Parents are building Tomorrow's Leaders.
We are Graceville High School

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Cox, Judy	Teacher, ESE
Britt, Amity	Teacher, K-12
Ellerbee, Haley	School Counselor
Clark, JaJuan	Principal
Wheatley, Richard	Assistant Principal
McDaniel, Teresa	Teacher, K-12
Franklin, Cindy	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 share 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 mtg 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, 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 teams, 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	6	5	6	16	12	56	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	7	5	4	3	27	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	7	15	15	10	5	69	

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	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	6	6	7	3	30	

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	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	6	
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	

Date this data was collected

Monday 7/23/2018

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	1	4	5	5	24	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	3	4	5	17	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	24	22	12	16	19	13	117	

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	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	3	4	4	18	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	1	4	5	5	24	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	3	4	5	17	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	24	22	12	16	19	13	117	

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	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	3	4	4	18	

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?

Science Achievement is the lowest and with 48% in 2016, 45% in 2017 and 40% in 2018. This data component shows a steady declining in student achievement.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Science Achievement with a 5% decline. 45% in 2017 and 40% in 2018.

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

Science Achievement with a 27% gap. 67% State and 40% GHS.

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

ELA Lowest 25 Percentile with a 14% growth. 33% in 2017 and 47% in 2018. This is not a trend because 37% in 2016.

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

The improvement in this area was due to the district wide curriculum for ELA. iReady is also used for differentiated instruction and progress monitoring.

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	44%	54%	60%	45%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	53%	57%	50%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	47%	52%	37%	39%	49%
Math Achievement	47%	55%	61%	44%	52%	56%
Math Learning Gains	52%	52%	58%	45%	49%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	50%	52%	33%	43%	48%
Science Achievement	40%	47%	57%	49%	48%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	69%	61%	77%	72%	66%	72%

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (2)	5 (4)	6 (3)	5 (1)	6 (4)	16 (5)	12 (5)	56 (24)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	4 (1)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	2 (1)	3 (3)	7 (1)	5 (3)	4 (4)	3 (5)	27 (17)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (11)	10 (24)	7 (22)	15 (12)	15 (16)	10 (19)	5 (13)	69 (117)

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					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2018	55%	58%	-3%	52%	3%
	2017	41%	50%	-9%	52%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		55%				
07	2018	38%	45%	-7%	51%	-13%
	2017	41%	51%	-10%	52%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2018	48%	59%	-11%	58%	-10%
	2017	49%	53%	-4%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
09	2018	44%	50%	-6%	53%	-9%
	2017	44%	51%	-7%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
10	2018	29%	55%	-26%	53%	-24%
	2017	43%	51%	-8%	50%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2018	37%	52%	-15%	52%	-15%
	2017	53%	50%	3%	51%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		37%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2018	32%	49%	-17%	54%	-22%
	2017	35%	49%	-14%	53%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
08	2018	50%	45%	5%	45%	5%
	2017	46%	50%	-4%	46%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	8%	45%	-37%	50%	-42%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		8%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	73%	82%	-9%	65%	8%
2017	77%	58%	19%	63%	14%
Compare		-4%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	76%	57%	19%	71%	5%
2017	78%	62%	16%	69%	9%
Compare		-2%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	70%	66%	4%	68%	2%
2017	51%	61%	-10%	67%	-16%
Compare		19%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	50%	61%	-11%	62%	-12%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2017	86%	67%	19%	60%	26%
Compare		-36%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	68%	57%	11%	56%	12%
2017	35%	46%	-11%	53%	-18%
Compare		33%			

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	15	32	27	29	43						
BLK	32	43	52	43	48	57	21	66		75	33
MUL	47	59		58	50						
WHT	51	46	33	48	56	43	54	77	75	87	65
FRL	40	47	46	46	49	48	30	66	63	76	32
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	6	24	27	7	54	50					
BLK	34	37	29	33	55	44	31	53		76	19
MUL	50	24		58	47						
WHT	51	53	43	55	54	50	53	77	54	100	42
FRL	39	40	30	41	51	43	39	63	50	80	21

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	Science Achievement
Rationale	This is the lowest data component.
Intended Outcome	To increase the science achievement level from 40% to 50% by 2019.
Point Person	Cindy Franklin (cindy.franklin@jcsb.org)
Action Step	
Description	Science teachers will unpack science standards and develop learning targets that align with the standards. Teachers will develop research-based lessons that will align with the learning targets. Teachers will develop formative assessments to monitor student achievement. Mr. Clark will coordinate with district staff to provide professional development to the teachers, and implement best instructional practices.
Person Responsible	JaJuan Clark (jajuan.clark@jcsb.org)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Oversee implementation of the lesson plans, formative assessment data meetings, and classroom observations.
Person Responsible	JaJuan Clark (jajuan.clark@jcsb.org)
Activity #2	
Title	ELA Learning Gains
Rationale	This is the second lowest data component and has shown a declining trend in the learning gains. 65% in 2015, 50% in 2016, 44% in 2017, and 47% in 2018.
Intended Outcome	To increase the ELA Learning Gains from 47% to 52% for 2019.
Point Person	JaJuan Clark (jajuan.clark@jcsb.org)
Action Step	
Description	ELA teachers will unpack the ELA standards and compare to the appropriate test item specifications in order to create effective lesson plans. ELA teachers will submit their lesson plans each week to Mr. Wheatley on Friday reflecting the following week's lessons. iReady will be used to differentiate instruction for the diverse learners. Performance Coach books will be used as supplemental intensive instructional resources. Hourly Title I paraprofessional will assist in small group pullout to differentiate instruction. Access to the Secondary ELA Resource Teacher.
Person Responsible	Richard Wheatley (richard.wheatley3@jcsb.org)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Ensure that lessons are implemented with fidelity. Use the iReady and embedded assessment to monitor for mastery of standards.
Person Responsible	JaJuan Clark (jajuan.clark@jcsb.org)

Activity #3	
Title	Math Learning Gains
Rationale	There was a decline in the Math Learning Gains from 54% in 2017 to 52% in 2018.
Intended Outcome	By focusing on improving the math learning gains, it will close the gap on student achievement by 10% in 2019.
Point Person	Teresa McDaniel (teresa.mcdaniel@jcsb.org)
Action Step	
Description	Teachers will be trained on how to unpack the math standards and identify and understand their test item specifications in order to create effective lessons. Teachers will develop learning targets that align with the standards. Teachers will develop formative assessments to monitor student mastery. Teachers will use Imagine Math to track student progress. Performance Coach books will be used as supplemental instructional material. Access to the Secondary Math Resource Teacher.
Person Responsible	Richard Wheatley (richard.wheatley3@jcsb.org)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Ensure that lessons are implemented with fidelity. Use the ThinkThroughMath and interim assessments to monitor for mastery of standards. Teachers will have ongoing data discussions and collaborate on ways to improve the learning gains.
Person Responsible	JaJuan Clark (jajuan.clark@jcsb.org)
Activity #4	
Title	Improve Student Attendance
Rationale	41% of our students were absent 10 or more days in 2017-18.
Intended Outcome	35% of students will accrue 10 days or more excused or unexcused absences per school year as evident by attendance records.
Point Person	Richard Wheatley (richard.wheatley3@jcsb.org)
Action Step	
Description	A reward system will be created and implemented to recognize those students who have no more than 3 excused or unexcused absences in a nine week grading period.
Person Responsible	Richard Wheatley (richard.wheatley3@jcsb.org)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Truancy officer will generate a weekly report to use to monitor absences. Letters of concern will be given to students once they have 3 absences. Child study team meetings will be conducted when a student has 5 excused or unexcused absences.
Person Responsible	Richard Wheatley (richard.wheatley3@jcsb.org)

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, Â§ 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.

Parents of athletes, band members, and choral members are encouraged to join these booster clubs.
Parents of students with IEP's are contacted and met with.
Teachers call and make contact with parents.
Progress reports and report cards are sent home to be signed.
PTO and SACs meetings.
Parent surveys are offered at open house for them to voice how they feel about the school and comments to improving it.
Four community nights per year to build and foster relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders.

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.

Instead of having teachers aids this year, we have placed older students with younger and/or struggling students to mentor them. There is a full time guidance counselor on duty to speak with any student as needed. All administrators and teachers have an open door policy for students to come discuss any problems or concerns they may have. We make every opportunity available to encourage students to be involved in a club and/or sport. We have a school psychologist and mental health counselor available for those students who need them. We continue to offer two clubs on campus due to high participation and success which are the Gentlemen and Princess Clubs.

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

We have an orientation for incoming 6th graders to inform them of the expectations we have for them and to give them a tour around the school so that the first day won't be a shock when they arrive. We have a middle/high combination school so the 8th graders are already acclimated as they enter the 9th grade. However, we do require the 8th grade students to take a career class to explore careers in their field of interest. We have an open house prior to school where parents and students are invited. We have a parent night for seniors within the first two weeks of school.

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. Intensive Reading courses are given to those students who are a Level 1 and 2 in ELA FSA Assessments. Intensive Math courses are given to those student who are a Level 1 on Math FSA and Algebra 1 EOC Assessments.

We are a Title 1 school-wide program.

Title 2 provides professional development

Violence prevention-SRO's

Nutrition Programs- Free breakfast and lunch for all students.

Job Training - Career Fairs

Back pack program

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

Every other year we have a college and career fair at GHS.

Seniors attend regional career fairs and shadow possible career choices.

Military recruiters and college admissions personnel come to GHS to speak to our students.

FFEC club visits local colleges and universities.

Guidance disperses college information on the school web site and school population.

Part V: Budget

Total:

\$45,632.69