Graceville Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Graceville Elementary School

5331 ALABAMA ST, Graceville, FL 32440

http://ges.jcsb.org

Demographics

Principal: Laura Kent

Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2020-06-30
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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: D (40%) 2014-15: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 10/15/2019.

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

Graceville Elementary School

5331 ALABAMA ST, Graceville, FL 32440

http://ges.jcsb.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	B	D

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 10/15/2019.

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Achieving Excellence Together

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gilmore, Kerry	Assistant Principal	MTSS, RTI, analyzes data, monitors attendance, SAC
Kent, Laura	Principal	Analyzes data, holds data chats with students and teachers, monitors attendance, SAC
Tucker, Amber	Administrative Support	RTI, MTSS
Wertenberger, Todd	Instructional Media	Accelerated Reader, Reading, Social Studies, Science
Sutton, Sharese	Teacher, ESE	ESE Support

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	37	39	34	37	29	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	225
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	7	6	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	4	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	5	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	11	9	5	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	3	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
16

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/27/2019

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	
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 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	3	1	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	
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	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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 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	3	1	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	61%	63%	57%	60%	65%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	58%	58%	63%	63%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	49%	53%	67%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	46%	66%	63%	57%	71%	61%
Math Learning Gains	48%	58%	62%	60%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	45%	51%	50%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	54%	53%	43%	61%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	37 (0)	39 (0)	34 (0)	37 (0)	29 (0)	49 (0)	225 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	4 (12)	6 (7)	7 (3)	6 (7)	2 (4)	6 (2)	31 (35)
One or more suspensions	1 (4)	1 (1)	2 (3)	2 (40)	6 (1)	1 (0)	13 (49)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	1 (2)	4 (1)	3 (2)	3 (1)	6 (2)	17 (8)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (5)	5 (16)	20 (15)	28 (36)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	58%	2%	58%	2%
	2018	75%	66%	9%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	62%	-12%	58%	-8%
	2018	69%	66%	3%	56%	13%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
05	2019	67%	60%	7%	56%	11%
	2018	41%	54%	-13%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	70%	-23%	62%	-15%
	2018	71%	72%	-1%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	71%	-32%	64%	-25%
	2018	44%	72%	-28%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
05	2019	49%	58%	-9%	60%	-11%
	2018	38%	62%	-24%	61%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	52%	2%	53%	1%
	2018	34%	54%	-20%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	47	57		34	35						
BLK	57	58		37	42	20	47				
MUL	70			50							
WHT	63	65	70	49	53		50				
FRL	65	62	50	47	49	31	53				

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				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	351
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Mathematics achievement and learning gains were the lowest data components.
Math remediation teacher left and was not replaced.
Lack of small group instruction in the math class.

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

Mathematics achievement dropped 6% points from 2018 to 2019 FSA testing.
Math remediation teacher left and was not replaced.
Lack of small group instruction in the math class.

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.

Mathematics lowest 25% learning gains shows a 19% point gap when compared to the state average.
Math remediation teacher left and was not replaced.
Lack of small group instruction in the math class.

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

Mathematics lowest 25% learning gains increased by 10% points from 2018 to 2019 FSA testing.
Science proficiency increased 8% overall. However, the black student subgroup increased from 20% to 47%.
ELA learning gains showed improvement in three subgroups: SWD increased 28% points; WHT increased 12% points; and FRL increased 12% points.
GES focused on academic vocabulary and background knowledge in efforts to improve science scores. GES also utilized county level content specialist in Reading.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The number of students in 5th grade with Level 1 scores in ELA and/or Math from the 2019 Spring FSA.
The number of students in 5th and 1st grade with 2 or more EWS indicators.

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

1. Math Education - Lowest 25%
2. Math Education - Proficiency
3. ELA Education - Proficiency
4. Science Education - maintain or increase proficiency
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Mathematics Education
Rationale	2019 Mathematics Proficiency for grades 3-5 fell to 46% (17% points below the state average; 20% points below the district average). 2019 Mathematics Learning Gains for grades 3-5 increased to 48% (14% points below the state average; 10% points below the district average). 2019 Mathematics Lowest 25% Learning Gains for grades 3-5 increased to 32% (19% points below the state average; 13% points below the district average).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	As measured by FSA Math Spring 2020, GES will obtain 62% math proficiency (increase 16% points); obtain 62% learning gains (increase 14% points); and obtain 62% lowest 25% learning gains (increase 30% points).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. I-Ready pathways, tool-kit, diagnostics 2. Coach supplemental materials 3. Math Remediation (Title I para) 4. Manipulatives 5. Small-group instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	1. I-Ready is a vetted, research based program adopted by our district to support educational outcomes (http://i-readycentral.com/familycenter/what-is-i-ready/) 2. Coach materials published by Triumph Learning are vetted by county resources teachers. 3. Providing remediation and increased minutes for struggling students is proven to positively impact academic achievement. Reference Dr. T. Shanahan and apply to all academics.(https://shanahanonliteracy.com/blog/more-learning-time-for-some-kids) 4. Manipulatives are found to increase understanding in some students. They help students learn by allowing them to move from concrete experiences to abstract reasoning. 5. The use of small-group instruction reinforces or reteaches specific skills and concepts and provides a reduced student-teacher ratio.

Action Step	
Description	1. Hire a paraprofessional and create a schedule for math remediation and support 2. Plan a Family Math Night at Piggly Wiggly with a focus on fractions 3. Provide common planning for development of cross-curricular activities 4. Focus on academic vocabulary 5. Include FSA question types on each test 6. Use performance data to create small groups and remediation schedules 7. Focus on attendance by giving positive reinforcement to students who have 90% or higher 8. Provide Professional Development on Marzano Learning Strategies
Person Responsible	Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

#2	
Title	English and Language Arts Achievement
Rationale	2019 ELA proficiency for grades 3-5 fell to 61% (14% above state average; 2% below district average) 2019 ELA Learning Gains for grades 3-5 increased to 61% (3% above state and district average) 2019 ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains for grades 3-5 increased to 50% (3% below state average and 1% above district average.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	As measured by FSA ELA Spring 2020, GES will obtain 62% ELA proficiency (increase 1% point); obtain 62% learning gains (increase 1% point); and obtain 62% lowest 25% learning gains (increase 12% points).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. I-Ready pathways, tool-kit, diagnostics 2. Coach supplemental materials 3. Accelerated Reader 4. Lexia
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	1. I-Ready is a vetted program adopted by our district to support educational outcomes. (http://i-readycentral.com/familycenter/what-is-i-ready/) 2. Coach materials published by Triumph Learning are vetted by county resource teachers. 3. Accelerated Reader encourages and rewards students for reading. Time spent reading books—in other words, reading practice—is the best predictor of overall (https://www.renaissance.com/products/practice/accelerated-reader-360/) 4. Lexia is a vetted program used by our district to support educational outcomes (https://www.lexialearning.com/)

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide common planning for development of cross-curricular activities to infuse the student day with academic vocabulary and non-fiction text 2. Plan and host a Family Literacy Night that involves activities from the Read With Me Grant 3. Use Accelerated Reader for 100 minutes a week and include the vocabulary aspect of program 4. Use District Reading Coach to assist teachers in using data to create small groups for differentiated instruction and remediation 5. Use performance data to create small groups and remediation schedules. 6. Use Open Court phonics supplement 7. Unpack standards to focus on higher cognitively complex questions. (Marzano training) 8. Focus on attendance by giving positive reinforcement to students who have 90% or higher.
Person Responsible	Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science Education
Rationale	2019 Science Proficiency for grades 3-5 increased to 53% (equal to state average; 1% below district average)
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	As measured by FSA Science 2020, GES will obtain 62% science proficiency (increase 9% points).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Use of Science Lab 2. Coach supplemental materials 3. Increase the use of academic vocabulary
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	1. Hands on Learning in science lab (students who physically experience scientific concepts understand them more deeply and score better on science tests, according to a new UChicago-led study.) 2. Coach materials published by Triumph Learning are vetted by county resource teachers

Action Step	
Description	1. Increase the use of the science lab and incorporate hands on experiments 2. Increase the use of cognitively complex science questions and standards 3. Increase Accelerated Reader tests and vocabulary tests on science non-fiction text 5. Increase use of non-fiction articles that are science based during ELA 6. Provide a common planning for development of cross-curricular activities 7. Focus on attendance by giving positive reinforcement to students who have 90% or higher. 8. Host a Science Night where families are invited to participate in a hands-on learning experiences with their child 9. Provide Professional Development opportunity with District Reading Coach to implement academic vocabulary throughout grade groups
Person Responsible	Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

The school will be monitoring student attendance.

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.

Our purpose is to achieve excellence by working together to build foundational skills for lifelong learning. We can build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school mission and support the needs of students by hosting parent nights. GES will continue implementing annual math, science, and literacy nights where parents, families, and stakeholders are invited to participate in math, science, and reading activities with their child.

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.

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.
Mental health counseling is also offered from Jackson County School Board for any student in need.
Teachers are currently training with Sanford Harmony and will embed this curriculum during 2019-2020. Sanford Harmony is a social emotional learning program for Pre-K-6 grade students designed to foster communication, connection, and community both in and outside the classroom, and develop boys and girls into compassionate and caring adults (https://www.sanfordharmony.org/)

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

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 paraprofessional 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 access 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 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.

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.

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

GES participates in a 5th grade career fair hosted by the JCSB Director of Career and Technical Education.
Guest speakers from local businesses and banks.
Math Family Night is held at a local business (Piggly Wiggly)
Explore the possibility of utilizing My Career Shines as provided by FLDOE.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Mathematics Education	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: English and Language Arts Achievement	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Education	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**