

Jackson County School Board

Graceville School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	22

Graceville School

5539 BROWN ST, Graceville, FL 32440

<http://ghs.jcsb.org>

Demographics

Principal: Carlan Martin

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (51%) 2014-15: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan 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	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	22

Graceville School

5539 BROWN ST, Graceville, FL 32440

<http://ghs.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)
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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	B	C	C

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.

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Braybon, Savannah	Teacher, ESE	
Britt, Amity	Teacher, K-12	
Ellerbee, Haley	School Counselor	
Ellerbee, John	Principal	
Wheatley, Richard	Assistant Principal	
McDaniel, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	
Franklin, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	30	47	31	42	45	34	264	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	5	5	9	17	45	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	5	2	3	5	24	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	6	7	7	1	0	31	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	17	10	8	0	0	0	53	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	6	4	9	10	46

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	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	4	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	5	5	5	21	

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

17

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 4/1/2019

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

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

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	45%	58%	61%	44%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	54%	59%	44%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	23%	47%	54%	33%	41%	51%
Math Achievement	38%	55%	62%	46%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	47%	52%	59%	54%	54%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	46%	52%	44%	49%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	44%	56%	45%	51%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	69%	78%	66%	61%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	35 (0)	30 (0)	47 (0)	31 (0)	42 (0)	45 (0)	34 (0)	264 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (6)	1 (5)	5 (6)	5 (5)	5 (6)	9 (16)	17 (12)	45 (56)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	1 (0)	7 (1)	5 (0)	2 (1)	3 (0)	5 (0)	24 (4)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (3)	5 (2)	6 (3)	7 (7)	7 (5)	1 (4)	0 (3)	31 (27)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	18 (7)	17 (10)	10 (7)	8 (15)	0 (15)	0 (10)	0 (5)	53 (69)

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					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	39%	55%	-16%	54%	-15%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		39%				
07	2019	54%	56%	-2%	52%	2%
	2018	38%	45%	-7%	51%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	38%	57%	-19%	56%	-18%
	2018	48%	59%	-11%	58%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	50%	59%	-9%	55%	-5%
	2018	44%	50%	-6%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
10	2019	42%	49%	-7%	53%	-11%
	2018	29%	55%	-26%	53%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	39%	56%	-17%	55%	-16%
	2018	37%	52%	-15%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		39%				
07	2019	49%	55%	-6%	54%	-5%
	2018	32%	49%	-17%	54%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
08	2019	22%	30%	-8%	46%	-24%
	2018	50%	45%	5%	45%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-28%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	6%	28%	-22%	48%	-42%
	2018	8%	45%	-37%	50%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	54%	61%	-7%	67%	-13%
2018	73%	82%	-9%	65%	8%
Compare		-19%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	71%	14%	71%	14%
2018	76%	57%	19%	71%	5%
Compare		9%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	68%	65%	3%	70%	-2%
2018	70%	66%	4%	68%	2%
Compare		-2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	50%	-2%	61%	-13%
2018	50%	61%	-11%	62%	-12%
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	29%	44%	-15%	57%	-28%
2018	68%	57%	11%	56%	12%
Compare		-39%			

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	30	40	18	20	46			40			
BLK	33	33	19	30	41	38	26	67		89	42
HSP	70										
MUL	44	47		47	46						
WHT	57	51	27	45	54	55	63	78	73	67	63
FRL	44	43	23	35	44	41	41	72	79	78	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	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

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	560
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	42
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	70

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	46
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	50
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.

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the lowest performance of 23% compared to 47% in the prior year. The contributing factor for this decline was due to lack of strength by teacher in assigned subject area course. No trends identified.

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

The Lowest 25th Percentile in ELA showed the greatest decline of 24% in performance from the prior year. ELA 25th Percentile went from 47% to 23%. The contributing factor for this decline was due to lack of strength by teacher in assigned subject area course.

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.

Science Achievement had the greatest gap of 24% compared to the state average. State average 68% to School average 44%. The factors contributing to this gap because lack of engagement in complex tasks and ability to understand complex text in science.

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

Social Studies Achievement increased from 69% in the prior year to 73% in the current year. 73% State and 69% District. Social Studies teachers engage students in instructional activities that increase academic rigor and higher order thinking skills.

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

One potential area of concern is attendance. Last year, 22% of the student population had attendance below 90%. Another concern is 27% percent of students performed at Level 1 on statewide assessments. Based on 2018-19 data.

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

1. Increase performance of the Lowest 25th Percentile from 23% to 42% in ELA
2. Increase performance of the Lowest 25th Percentile from 43% to 54% in Math.
3. Increase ELA Achievement from 30% to 41% and Math Achievement from 20% to 41% for Students with Disabilities.
4. Increase Science Achievement from 44% to 60%.
5. Decrease from 43% in 2018-19 to 35% of students or less at Graceville High School will accrue 10 days or more absences as evidence by attendance records.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Learning Gains of Lowest 25%
Rationale	This is the lowest data component which had a 19% decline.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase the ELA learning gains for the Lowest 25% from 23% to 42% for 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	John Ellerbee (john.ellerbee@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	iReady
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This program can be used as a diagnostic tool to identify areas of weakness and create an individualized remediation pathway to improve student performance.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ELA and Reading teachers utilize data to differentiate and scaffold instruction to increase student performance. 2. Ensure that lesson plans and classroom assessments align with the Standards, cognitive complexity of models, examples, questions and tasks. 3. Administrators will monitor implementation of strategies and best practices in department meetings and during walkthroughs and classroom observations. 4. ELA monthly department meetings will serve as “mini” PD’s. Effective and proven reading and writing strategies will be shared at each meeting. The expectation will be that all Language Arts and Reading teachers will attempt shared strategies within their curriculum and share their successes as well as challenges at the following department meeting. 5. Hourly Title I paraprofessional will assist in small group pullout to differentiate instruction. 6. Performance Coach books will be used as supplemental intensive instructional resources.
Person Responsible	John Ellerbee (john.ellerbee@jcsb.org)

#2	
Title	Math Learning Gains of Lowest 25%
Rationale	This data component had a 11% decline.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase the Math Learning gains for the Lowest 25% from 43% to 54% for 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Teresa McDaniel (teresa.mcdaniel@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Imagine Math (Think Through Math)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This program can be used as a diagnostic tool to identify areas of weakness and create an individualized remediation pathway to improve student performance.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Math teachers will use collaborative structures and student-centered conversation in their lessons. 2. Math teachers will use Formative Assessments in the classroom to monitor student progress and to modify and inform instruction. 3. Math teachers utilize data to differentiate and scaffold instruction to increase student performance. 4. Ensure that lesson plans and classroom assessments align with the Standards, cognitive complexity of models, examples, questions and tasks. 5. Administrators will monitor implementation of strategies and best practices in department meetings and during walkthroughs and classroom observations. 6. Math monthly department meetings will serve as “mini” PD’s. Effective and proven reading and writing strategies will be shared at each meeting. The expectation will be that all Math teachers will attempt shared strategies within their curriculum and share their successes as well as challenges at the following department meeting. 7. Performance Coach books will be used as supplemental intensive instructional material. 8. Two Part-time paraprofessionals used in middle school math classes to assist in small group pullout to differentiate instruction.
Person Responsible	John Ellerbee (john.ellerbee@jcsb.org)

#3	
Title	ELA and Math Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities.
Rationale	This subgroup's achievement fell below the federal threshold of 40%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA Achievement from 30% to 41% for Students with Disabilities. Increase Math Achievement from 20% to 41% for Students with Disabilities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	John Ellerbee (john.ellerbee@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	iReady and Imagine Math (Think Through Math)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These programs can be used as a diagnostic tool to identify areas of weakness and create an individualized remediation pathway to improve student performance.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will share strategies and practices being used that are successful. 2. Teacher will differentiate instruction and provide supports for ESE students in General Education classes. 3. Teachers utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
Person Responsible	John Ellerbee (john.ellerbee@jcsb.org)

#4	
Title	Improve Student Attendance
Rationale	43% of our students were absent 10 or more days in 2018-19.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	35% of students will accrue 10 days or more excused or unexcused absences per school year as evident by attendance records.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Richard Wheatley (richard.wheatley3@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	District Attendance policy will be enforced as written with Child Study Team (CST) meetings as early as possible after 3 unexcused absences.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research shows that one of the most important factors in a child's success in school is good attendance. This will ensure that parents are aware of our attendance policy at an early stage and to inform them of the importance of students attending school.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review attendance taking process and school-wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff. 2. Develop and implement targeted attendance incentive programs and competitions. 3. Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis and reflects the appropriate entry codes. 4. Truancy officer will generate weekly report to use to monitor absences. 5. Letters of concern will be given to students once they have 3 absences. 6. Child Study Team meetings will be conducted when a student accrues 3 unexcused absences and will be referred to truancy after 5 unexcused absences in a 30-day period or 10 unexcused absences in a 90-day period..
Person Responsible	Richard Wheatley (richard.wheatley3@jcsb.org)

#5	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	This data component had the greatest gap of 24% compared to the state average.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase the Science Achievement level from 44% to 60% by 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cindy Franklin (cindy.franklin@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring assessments
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Progress monitoring is used to assess students' academic performance, to quantify a student rate of improvement or responsiveness to instruction, and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction and modify instruction accordingly.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Science teachers will unpack science standards, have a clear understanding of the test item specifications and develop learning targets that align with the standards. 2. Lesson plans and classroom assessments will align with the standards, cognitive complexity of models, examples, questions and tasks. 3. Teachers will use Student Data to intentionally plan and differentiate lessons with complex tasks. 4. Teachers will develop and use formative assessments to monitor student learning and achievement.
Person Responsible	John Ellerbee (john.ellerbee@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).

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.

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.

PFEF Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEF), 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.

There is a full time school 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 may need them.

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 students who are a Level 1 and 2 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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains of Lowest 25%	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains of Lowest 25%	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA and Math Learning Gains for Students with Disabilities.	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improve Student Attendance	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science Achievement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00