

Jackson County School Board

Graceville Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 12 |
| Title I Requirements | 15 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 12 |
| Title I Requirements | 15 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

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 | 4 | 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 | <p>2019 Mathematics Proficiency for grades 3-5 fell to 46% (17% points below the state average; 20% points below the district average).</p> <p>2019 Mathematics Learning Gains for grades 3-5 increased to 48% (14% points below the state average; 10% points below the district average).</p> <p>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).</p> |
| 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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | <p>2019 ELA proficiency for grades 3-5 fell to 61% (14% above state average; 2% below district average)</p> <p>2019 ELA Learning Gains for grades 3-5 increased to 61% (3% above state and district average)</p> <p>2019 ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains for grades 3-5 increased to 50% (3% below state average and 1% above district average).</p> |
| 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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I-Ready pathways, tool-kit, diagnostics 2. Coach supplemental materials 3. Accelerated Reader 4. Lexia |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use of Science Lab 2. Coach supplemental materials 3. Increase the use of academic vocabulary |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 |