

Jackson County School Board

Grand Ridge School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Grand Ridge School

6925 FLORIDA ST, Grand Ridge, FL 32442

<http://grs.jcsb.org>

Demographics

Principal: Becky Hart

Start Date for this Principal: 9/6/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 5-8
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)	85%
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: A (64%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (48%) 2014-15: B (54%)
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	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Grand Ridge School

6925 FLORIDA ST, Grand Ridge, FL 32442

<http://grs.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)
Middle School 5-8	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	29%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	C	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.

The mission of Grand Ridge School is Prepare to Soar: Middle School Academics for High School Success!

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Grand Ridge School is to prepare all students for success as educated and caring citizens by inspiring and building good character and a passion for lifelong learning.

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
Pender, Laurence	Principal	
Melvin, Barbara	School Counselor	
Baggett, Tim	Assistant Principal	
Hart, Becky	Teacher, K-12	
Lawrence, Casey	Administrative Support	
Tsukuda, Stephen	SAC Member	

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	87	106	106	113	0	0	0	0	412	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/6/2019

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	19	12	52	49	53	0	0	0	0	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	7	2	17	16	11	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	14	11	35	50	21	0	0	0	0	131

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	10	6	26	30	19	0	0	0	0	91

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	19	12	52	49	53	0	0	0	0	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	7	2	17	16	11	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	14	11	35	50	21	0	0	0	0	131

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	10	6	26	30	19	0	0	0	0	91

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	64%	55%	54%	52%	56%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	55%	54%	48%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	43%	47%	39%	46%	44%
Math Achievement	69%	47%	58%	54%	51%	56%
Math Learning Gains	69%	41%	57%	46%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	34%	51%	43%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	48%	32%	51%	50%	48%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	77%	72%	61%	69%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	87 (0)	106 (0)	106 (0)	113 (0)	412 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (12)	0 (52)	0 (49)	0 (53)	0 (166)
One or more suspensions	0 (6)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (7)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (2)	0 (17)	0 (16)	0 (11)	0 (46)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (11)	0 (35)	0 (50)	0 (21)	0 (117)

Grade Level Data

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

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
05	2019	71%	60%	11%	56%	15%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
06	2019	55%	55%	0%	54%	1%
	2018	59%	58%	1%	52%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
07	2019	60%	56%	4%	52%	8%
	2018	45%	45%	0%	51%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	68%	57%	11%	56%	12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	54%	59%	-5%	58%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		23%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	75%	58%	17%	60%	15%
	2018	71%	62%	9%	61%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
06	2019	74%	56%	18%	55%	19%
	2018	51%	52%	-1%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
07	2019	62%	55%	7%	54%	8%
	2018	45%	49%	-4%	54%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	46%	30%	16%	46%	0%
	2018	40%	45%	-5%	45%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	52%	7%	53%	6%
	2018	62%	54%	8%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	36%	28%	8%	48%	-12%
	2018	52%	45%	7%	50%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	71%	-4%	71%	-4%
2018	49%	57%	-8%	71%	-22%
Compare		18%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	91%	50%	41%	61%	30%
2018	73%	61%	12%	62%	11%
Compare		18%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	57%	-57%	56%	-56%

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	44	52	40	44	58	50	48	33			
BLK	51	45	52	60	61	52	20	67	83		
HSP	47	56		44	61		25				
MUL	62	81		57	90		36				
WHT	69	60	54	73	69	59	57	68	81		
FRL	60	53	51	66	66	64	47	60	79		
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	35	46	46	34	33	18	45	53			
BLK	37	53	52	46	42	43	38	22			
HSP	50	50		44	47						
MUL	39	40		32	40	42		17			
WHT	57	56	49	57	46	44	58	60	61		
FRL	47	54	52	49	46	50	40	39	50		

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	31	38	40	33	59	63	19	27			
BLK	35	43	27	37	45	55	21	41			
HSP	50	50		50	54						
MUL	46	55		39	27						
WHT	58	49	44	59	47	41	58	67	33		
FRL	46	44	40	48	46	44	41	56	26		

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	64
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	573
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	55
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	47
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	65
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	66
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	61
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.

Science achievement for 5th and 8th grade were the lowest performing. Instructional practices and impacts of Hurricane Michael contributed to the low performance.

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

Science achievement had a 5% decline from the prior year. Instructional practices and impacts of Hurricane Michael contributed to the decline in performance.

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.

Social Studies (Civics) had a 5% gap compared to the state average.

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

Math learning gains went up 24%. The school utilized i-Ready instructional support and Imagine Math instructional support for students through dedicated remediation and enrichment time.

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

Attendance is our greatest EWS concern.

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

1. Maintain increased proficiency rates.
2. Continue to make learning gains.
3. Improve science achievement.
4. Improve Civics achievement.
5. Improve student attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA performance and learning gains.
Rationale	Ensure performance remains at current levels or improves.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Reduce non-proficient students by 10% on the 2020 FSA. 62% of total students and 62% of lowest 25% students will make learning gains on the 2020 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laurence Pender (laurence.pender@hdsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Differentiate Instruction 2. Provide supplemental Curriculum. 3. Implement the MTSS process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access to multiple methods of instruction, small learning groups, and individual learning groups is evident from studies completed and found under IES's What Works. 2. i-Ready has a white paper showing evidence of improved student performance. 3. MTSS is supported by the Florida Department of Education as an evidence-based strategy.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitor implementation of small group and individual instructional practices. 2. Implement i-Ready, Coachbooks, and other supplemental resources for classroom instruction. 3. Establish remediation/enrichment time in schedule. 4. Hire additional staff to support remediation/enrichment. 5. Monitor and implement MTSS process.
Person Responsible	Laurence Pender (laurence.pender@hdsb.org)

#2	
Title	Math performance and learning gains.
Rationale	Support continued improvement in proficiency and learning gains for students. Supports middle school acceleration outcomes.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Decrease non-proficient by 10% on the 2020 FSA. Ensure that at least 62% of all students make learning gains and at least 62% of the lowest 25% make learning gains. Ensure that Algebra 1 EOC pass rate is at least 90%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laurence Pender (laurence.pender@hdsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Differentiate Instruction 2. Provide supplemental Curriculum. 3. Implement the MTSS process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access to multiple methods of instruction, small learning groups, and individual learning groups is evident from studies completed and found under IES's What Works. 2. i-Ready and Imagine Math have a white papers showing evidence of improved student performance. 3. MTSS is supported by the Florida Department of Education as an evidence-based strategy.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitor implementation of small group and individual instructional practices. 2. Implement i-Ready, Imagine Math, Coachbooks, and other supplemental resources for classroom instruction. 3. Establish remediation/enrichment time in schedule. 4. Hire additional staff to support remediation/enrichment. 5. Monitor and implement MTSS process.
Person Responsible	Laurence Pender (laurence.pender@hdsb.org)

#3	
Title	Science performance
Rationale	Improve our lowest performing school grade category.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Improve student performance to 62% on the 2020 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Laurence Pender (laurence.pender@hdsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Curriculum mapping and teacher training.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence of effectiveness in developing/updating/utilization of curriculum maps can be found at: http://www.curriculumdecisions.com/curriculum-mapping-research/ Usage of teacher training to effective implementation can be found at: https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Effective_Teacher_Professional_Development_BRIEF.pdf
Action Step	
Description	1. Science teachers developed curriculum maps in June and July of 2019. 2. Teachers were trained on the new resources and curriculum map July and August 2019. 3. Secure supplemental resources requested by teachers,
Person Responsible	Laurence Pender (laurence.pender@hdsb.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 is monitoring attendance through EWS and is supporting students through established district procedures.

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.

The school utilizes the Title I Parent and Family Engagement Plan to provide the support of family involvement to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

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.

Sneads High School invites GRS students to tour the campus near the end of the school year and the guidance department gives materials and information to students as well as assisting in creating schedules for their upcoming 9th grade year. Grand Ridge School also hosts an Open House for grades 5-8. At the beginning of the school year students and parents have a grade level parent orientation night to answer any questions that parents might have and teachers explain procedures and expectations for each class.

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

Using data measured from formative, progressive, diagnostic and summative assessments the school makes meaningful decisions to assist students with a continuum of educational needs. As deficiencies are noted the SIP team discusses these issues with the SAC where recommendations for changes can be made.

Title I, Part A - Title 1 funds are being used to supplement math and reading programs in the school, math instruction will be in blocks.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)- Supplemental Academic Instruction is being provided to assist students who are not meeting grade level expectations. WriteScore has been purchased for all students in grades 5-8 with three diagnostics as well as extra math blocks.

Violence prevention program- The school introduces the students to anti bullying instruction throughout the year. Banners are posted throughout the school along with instruction in the classroom. Students are rewarded for appropriate behavior.

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.

Sneads High School guidance department meets with eighth grade students near the end of the school year to discuss scheduling options as well as courses that will be needed in order to graduate. Students are given forms to take home and discuss with parents/ guardian which helps in planning their freshmen year. GRS guidance also help students in planning their ninth grade year. Parents/ Guardians are given information so that they are aware of which classes their child will need in order to graduate. Grand Ridge School also offers middle school acceleration industry certifications in agriculture and business education. Students in FBLA and FFA compete in district, region and state level competitions with multiple disciplines.

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

The school works with the community and CTE programs to advance college and career readiness.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA performance and learning gains.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math performance and learning gains.	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science performance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00