Walton County School District

Paxton School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Paxton School

21893 US HIGHWAY 331 N, Paxton, FL 32538

http://pax.walton.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Brent Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	61%
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: B (61%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (57%) 2014-15: B (60%)
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 Walton County School Board on 9/17/2019.

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

Paxton School

21893 US HIGHWAY 331 N, Paxton, FL 32538

http://pax.walton.k12.fl.us/

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	No	61%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	12%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Walton County School Board on 9/17/2019.

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.

Paxton School enables student achievement with dynamic faculty devoted to high academic standards and commitment to continuous improvement and success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Paxton Faculty and Staff will bring our BEST effort, attitude, and skillset to inspire, motivate, and educate every student to bring their best everyday to become life long learners and productive citizens in our society.

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
Jones, Brent	Principal	The principal is an integral part of SAC and gives input based on feedback from faculty, staff and community members to the creation and implementation of the SIP.
Jackson, Mitch	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is in charge of discipline.
Rockman, Susan	Teacher, K-12	The SAC chairs oversee inputting of SIP information, SAC meetings, and disbursement of school improvement funds through the SAC.
Radney, Laura	Teacher, K-12	The SAC chairs oversee inputting of SIP information, SAC meetings, and disbursement of school improvement funds through the SAC.

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	51	56	49	63	59	68	60	65	81	61	55	51	44	763
Attendance below 90 percent	13	9	9	7	7	10	4	6	5	15	7	9	14	115
One or more suspensions	0	4	4	7	1	9	9	21	17	12	2	6	5	97
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	1	3	3	4	4	5	5	1	9	7	16	10	70
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	16	15	17	20	21	14	13	15	13	150

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	1	2	5	5	10	7	14	9	13	7	13	12	98

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	2	2	2	2	4	2	1	1	2	3	0	3	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	7

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/17/2019

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	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	

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	6	12	6	7	5	13	5	5	2	5	7	4	9	86
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	3	4	6	3	8	21	2	6	4	5	65
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	3	2	3	1	0	4	1	2	0	3	10	31
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	16	15	17	20	21	14	13	15	13	150

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	1	2	8	7	2	9	7	6	5	5	9	61

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	56%	70%	61%	55%	69%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	60%	59%	54%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	53%	54%	55%	54%	51%
Math Achievement	68%	74%	62%	66%	75%	58%
Math Learning Gains	57%	65%	59%	64%	68%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	59%	52%	59%	62%	50%
Science Achievement	66%	70%	56%	65%	70%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	85%	78%	83%	86%	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	51 (0)	56 (0)	49 (0)	63 (0)	59 (0)	68 (0)	60 (0)	65 (0)	81 (0)	61 (0)	55 (0)	51 (0)	44 (0)	763 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	13 (0)	9 (0)	9 (0)	7 (0)	7 (0)	10 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)	5 (0)	15 (0)	7 (0)	9 (0)	14 (0)	115 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	7 (0)	1 (0)	9 (0)	9 (0)	21 (0)	17 (0)	12 (0)	2 (0)	6 (0)	5 (0)	97 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	1 (0)	9 (0)	7 (0)	16 (0)	10 (0)	70 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	16 (0)	15 (0)	17 (0)	20 (0)	21 (0)	14 (0)	13 (0)	15 (0)	13 (0)	150 (0)

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	73%	66%	7%	58%	15%
	2018	72%	66%	6%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	64%	-10%	58%	-4%
	2018	68%	64%	4%	56%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
05	2019	65%	64%	1%	56%	9%
	2018	50%	60%	-10%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	42%	55%	-13%	54%	-12%
	2018	50%	62%	-12%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
07	2019	57%	64%	-7%	52%	5%
	2018	48%	57%	-9%	51%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	52%	60%	-8%	56%	-4%
	2018	56%	62%	-6%	58%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
09	2019	54%	64%	-10%	55%	-1%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	53%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
10	2019	44%	59%	-15%	53%	-9%
	2018	52%	58%	-6%	53%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	90%	65%	25%	62%	28%
	2018	84%	68%	16%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	65%	-10%	64%	-9%
	2018	77%	66%	11%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-22%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2019	64%	55%	9%	60%	4%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	73%	58%	15%	61%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
06	2019	55%	60%	-5%	55%	0%
	2018	58%	63%	-5%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
07	2019	36%	62%	-26%	54%	-18%
	2018	32%	55%	-23%	54%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
08	2019	69%	63%	6%	46%	23%
	2018	55%	62%	-7%	45%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	60%	61%	-1%	53%	7%
	2018	55%	63%	-8%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	56%	58%	-2%	48%	8%
	2018	59%	62%	-3%	50%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	79%	79%	0%	67%	12%
2018	79%	73%	6%	65%	14%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	76%	82%	-6%	71%	5%
2018	73%	79%	-6%	71%	2%
Compare		3%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	77%	-7%	70%	0%
2018	64%	75%	-11%	68%	-4%
Compare		6%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	86%	72%	14%	61%	25%
2018	65%	80%	-15%	62%	3%
Compare		21%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	72%	-10%	57%	5%
2018	60%	70%	-10%	56%	4%
Compare		2%			

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	26	35	30	39	48	45	35	36			
BLK	30	32	30	41	53	30	33				
HSP	50										
MUL	50	40									
WHT	58	51	42	70	57	49	69	74	77	98	41
FRL	54	49	39	63	55	42	63	75	65	100	32

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	31	45	35	51	59	45	50	38			
BLK	36	50	50	25	41						
HSP	38	18		55	50						
MUL	64	55		38							
WHT	58	47	36	68	47	51	66	75	70	81	52
FRL	51	45	34	59	42	41	61	64	67	79	27

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	21	39	41	48	47	43	30				
BLK	38	47		57	65						
HSP	54			54							

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
MUL	36	45		53	50						
WHT	57	55	52	68	65	62	68	82	94	95	32
FRL	49	54	62	63	67	63	60	82	92	93	23

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	676
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	45
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	62
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	58
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 performed the lowest with 41% of students making gains. Yes, this is a trend as it was also the lowest for SY 2018-2019 with 36% making gains . Contributing factor(s) include increased number of SWD.

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

Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed the greatest decline with 48% in 2018 and 45% in 2019. Contributing factor(s) for math also include an increased number of SWD.

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.

According to Grade Level Data, grade 7 math is 36% and the state is 54% which is an 18% gap. The prior year there was a 22% gap. Our percentage did increase 4% in the past year. Contribution factor(s) for the continued gap is an increased number of SWD.

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

Math Learning Gains showed the most improvement going from 47% in 2018 to 57% in 2019. The new actions the school took were:
Fourth - Fifth grades participated in Walk-to-Math, daily spiral reviews, various computer programs
Sixth through twelfth utilized interactive notebooks, math boot camp, computer-aided instruction

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

Attendance
Behavior
Students With Disabilities
Black/African American Students

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

1. Complex text daily
2. Vertical plan to writing
3. Math manipulatives
4. Math journals
5. AVID strategies such as WICOR

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math
Rationale	Currently, the following combined grade level sections have an average STAR Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for grades 1-3 and FSA Achievement for grades 4-10. * Grades 1-3 with an average SGP of 71% on STAR Math * Grades 4-10 68% of students made Achievement on FSA Math * Grades 3-8, 41% of the ESSA-identified subgroup of African American students and 26% SWD made achievement on FSA
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	* Students in Math for grades 1-3 will increase overall STAR Assessment Student Growth Percentile by 3% * Students in Math for grades 4-10 will increase Achievement by 3% on FSA * The achievement of the ESSA-identified subgroup of black students and SWD in grades 3-8, Algebra, and Geometry will increase by 4%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Math manipulatives daily Math journals and exit tickets to extend math instruction in whole group Daily spiral reviews Computer programs Interactive Notebooks Boot Camps
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiating student instruction will increase mastery of standards-based math skills. Math manipulatives are physical objects that are designed to represent explicitly and concretely mathematical ideas that are abstract (Moyer, 2001), Bruner (1960) explained how this was possible through the concept of the spiral curriculum. This involved information being structured so that complex ideas can be taught at a simplified level first, and then re-visited at more complex levels later on.
Action Step	
Description	1. Objective 1: Through differentiating instruction, students in grades kindergarten through second grade will increase mastery of standards-based math skills. Tier 1 - Kindergarten teachers will incorporate math manipulatives daily during math lessons. Tier 1 - First grade students will utilize math journals and exit tickets to extend math instruction in whole group Tier 1 - First and second grade will complete daily spiral reviews Tier II & III - Instruction and remediation will be skill specific through the use of various district approved computer programs. 2. Objective 2: Third -Fifth grades will increase the understanding of Florida Math Standards through critical thinking, problem-solving skills, and visual representations that are scaffolded throughout instruction. Tier I - Third-fifth grade students will introduce, review, and reinforce standards with the

use of interactive
notebooks and learning targets.
Tier II & III- Third-fifth grade students will review grade-level standards by utilizing spiral reviews and interactive notebooks that require the use of higher order thinking application.
Tier II & III- Instruction and remediation will be standard-based through use of various computer programs.
Tier I- Fourth-fifth grade students will participate in flexible tiered grouping.

3. Objective 3: Solving real-life mathematical problems will be a focus of sixth through twelfth grades through the use of district provided resource materials and modeling with mathematics.

Tier I- Sixth-eighth grade students will use interactive notebooks to reinforce state standards.
Tier II & III- Sixth grade students will participate in a district-coordinated 2-day math boot camp prior to FSA testing.
Tier II & III-Computer-aided instruction will be utilized to reinforce math concepts in grades 9-12.

Person Responsible	Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA
Rationale	Currently, the following combined grade level sections have an average Student Growth Percentile for grades K-3 and FSA Achievement for grades 4-10: * Grades K-3 with an average SGP of 62% on STAR Early Literacy and STAR Reading * Grades 4-10 with an average of 53% Achievement on FSA Reading. * Grades 3-10, 30% of the ESSA-identified African American subgroup made achievement on FSA ELA * Grades 3-10 26% of the ESSA-identified SWD subgroup made achievement on FSA ELA
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	* Students in Reading for grades K-3 will increase overall STAR Assessment Student Growth Percentile by 3%. * Students in Reading for grades 4-10 will increase FSA Achievement by 3% * The achievement of the ESSA-identified subgroup of African American students in grades 3-8, will increase by 4% * The achievement of the ESSA-identified subgroup of SED students in grades 3-8 will increase by 4%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Complex texts(s) Read-alouds AVID strategies Intentional questioning Vertical plan from grade level to grade level
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The underachieving students seem to be growing rapidly and with the number of students per elective class limited, the only way to effectively help all students is to utilize the AVID strategies throughout the school (Watt, Yanez, & Cossio, 2002). The Common Core State Standards have cast a renewed light on reading instruction, presenting teachers with the new requirements to teach close reading of complex texts.
Action Step	
Description	1. Objective 1: Paxton School will take specific action to ensure the implementation of literacy skills school-wide in all tiers through research-based strategies that are in alignment with the Florida Standards in order to increase reading comprehension. Tier I - In order to increase literacy skills across all grade levels, the teacher will (on a daily basis) use grade level, complex text(s) through read-alouds, close and careful reading, choral reading, incorporating WICOR strategies and intentional questioning, and the student will read complex text on a daily basis across all disciplines. Tier II and III - Tier I strategies will be differentiated to guide students through increasingly complex levels of text(s). 2. Objective 2: Student responses in the form of writing will be facilitated through a formalized approach to vertical planning across all grade levels. Tier I - Grade -level cohorts (grades K-10) will create a standards-based vertical plan to

writing that includes strategies with examples, implementation ideas, and a progress monitoring system from grade level to grade level.

Person Responsible Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Science
Rationale	* 66% of students scored at proficiency on the state science assessments in the 2018-2019 school year. * 33% of the ESSA-identified black subgroup and 35% of the SWD subgroup scored at proficiency on the state assessments.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	* Science students taking a state assessment in science will show a 3% increase. * Grades 5, 8, and Biology students identified on the ESSA-identified black subgroup and SWD will show a 4% increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Interactive Notebooks Scholastic Magazines Pacing Guide Data analysis practice Small Group and one-on-one instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The Common Core State Standards have cast a renewed light on reading instruction, presenting teachers with the new requirements to teach close reading of complex texts. Interactive notebooks are one tool for students to use keep their information and produced work organized (Walden & Crippen, 2009). It would also allow them to refer back to the contents and engage with new information and process it more thoroughly (Rheingold et al., 2013).
Action Step	
Description	1.Students will improve reading and writing skills in science content areas through exposure to a variety of informational sources and utilization of differentiated strategies. Kindergarten and 1st grade students will utilize an INB or journal with science-related topics to demonstrate understanding of non-fiction texts by using Science Spin and/or Scholastic News and other science non-fiction text. * 2nd and 3rd grade students will use INB or journals to write in response to science-related texts. * 4th and 5th grade science and reading teachers will create a pacing guide that will align reading and science curriculum. 4th and 5th grade will host a science fair. 5th grade students will utilize high interest nonfiction science texts to remediate specific cross curricular reading skills. * 6th -12th grade students will utilize interactive notebooks to organize notes and record new learning gained from various sources (such as experimentation, lecture, video, and written text) on the input page, and for subsequent practice with newly-learned information on the output page. 6th-12th grade students will be provided additional support in maintaining their interactive notebook. * 6th-10th grade students will participate in data analysis practice related to each unit of

	study throughout their science course. Students will receive peer and teacher support during practice of data analysis through small group and one-on-one instruction.
Person Responsible	Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

#4	
Title	Parent Involvement
Rationale	We had 65% parental involvement during the 2018-2019 school year. The goal for Paxton School parental involvement was 67%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Parental involvement will increase by 2% to make our goal for Paxton School Parental Involvement 67%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Paxton School believes parent involvement is a vital link to our student's success. We wish to involve parents in academic and non-academic aspects of the learning process noted in our vision and mission statements. Sign-in sheets for parent involvement activities for grades K-12 as well as parent participation in the school climate surveys will be used in determining the level of parental involvement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Regardless of family income or background, students whose parents are involved in their schooling are more likely to have higher grades and test scores, attend school regularly, have better social skills, show improved behavior, and adapt well to school. Henderson, A.T., and K.L. Mapp.
Action Step	
Description	Objective 1: Parents,students, and teachers will incorporate communication folders, student planners or apps for teacher-parent communication. Tier I, II, III * PreK - 4 will utilize a Communication Folder which include classroom newsletters, teacher notes, parent informational letters, school calendars, lunch menus, graded papers, etc. * Fifth through twelfth grades will utilize planners for all students for daily or weekly communication with parents. This will include, but not limited to, school events, assessment dates, and homework. * A third grade meeting will be conducted to communicate third grade expectations and to promote parental support for student success. *Grade six will conduct parent meeting for the purpose of communicating expectations that are relevant to transitioning from elementary to middle. The meeting for parents and students will provide information on the requirements, acceptance into clubs, graduation honors and potential scholarship opportunities. *Grades 8-12 - Guidance will conduct an informational meeting for parents and students to provide information of requirements for special designation, acceptance into clubs, graduation honors and potential scholarship opportunities. Objective 2: Paxton School will implement a variety of parent involvement opportunities to encourage connections between parents, students, faculty and staff. Tier I, II, III

* BRAG Mentoring Program will be utilized in grades six - twelve, including course selection conferences with students and parents.
* AP teachers will have a mandatory parent meeting.
* AVID Teachers and Counselors will invite students, parents, and community members to College/Career Event.
* Science Department will host a Science Night for grades K-12 to explore scientific investigations.
* K-12 students, parents and community members will be invited to an Evening Book Fair, Art Show, and Band performance in conjunction with Open House.
* K-12 students, parents, and community members will be invited to a high school band concert.
* K-12 students, parents, and community members will be invited to a High School Band Spring Concert.
* K-12 students, parents, and community will be invited to a Spring Chorus Performance.
* The Math Department will host a Math Night for 6th -12th grade students.
* The Parental Involvement Team will create a survey in an effort to evaluate parental involvement activities and get input for suggested activities from parents.

Professional Learning Goal- Remind/School Info App Training Grades K-12.

Person Responsible Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

#5	
Title	AVID
Rationale	Student progression of AVID strategies through multiple grade levels in support of all academic areas.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students in each grade level will be taught specific AVID strategies that will advance with them throughout their academic career and increase graduation rate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	K-2 - Interactive Notebooks or 2-Column Notes 3rd - One-Page 4th - Focused Notes 5th - Socratic Seminar, One-Pager, Planner, and Focused Note-Taking 6th - Tutorials, Socratic Seminar, One-Pager, Planner, and Focused Note-Taking 6th-12th - AVID students will complete a Tutorial Request Form weekly 7th - 12th - All previous strategies taught in grades 3-6 will be used 6th-12th - AVID Weekly will provide Critical Reading in Content Area
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The underachieving students seem to be growing rapidly and with the number of students per elective class limited, the only way to effectively help all students is to utilize the AVID strategies throughout the school (Watt, Yanez, & Cossio, 2002).
Action Step	
Description	Vertical alignment of AVID strategies will be implemented in grades K-12. Multiple grade level teachers and subject areas will be involved. The Paxton AVID School Coordinator will facilitate professional development as needed for the below listed strategies. K-2 - Interactive Notebooks or 2-Column Notes 3rd - One-Pager 4th - Focused Notes 5th - Socratic Seminar, One-Pager, Planner, and Focused Note-Taking 6th - Tutorials, Socratic Seminar, One-Pager, Planner, and Focused Note-Taking 6th-12th - AVID students will complete a Tutorial Request Form weekly 7th - 12th - All previous strategies taught in grades 3-6 will be used 6th-12th - AVID Weekly will provide Critical Reading in Content Area
Person Responsible	Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

#6	
Title	Behavior
Rationale	* 115 behavioral referrals for grades K-5 were made in the 2018-2019 school year * 118 behavioral referrals for grades 6-8 were made in the 2018-2019 school year * 59 behavioral referrals for grades 9-12 were made in the 2018-2019 school year * 292 Total Referrals for grades K-12 were made in the 2018-2019 school year
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Referrals for grades K-12 will be no more than 35% of the student enrollment which is a 2% decrease from 2018-2019 SY.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Paxton School will implement "The Positivity Project" Program. A positive behavioral intervention program that can be implemented school wide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The Positivity Project is the umbrella term for a series of positive education programs designed to teach and embed the skills of optimal functioning, well-being and flourishing. All programs within The Positivity Project are built upon evidence-based research in the field of positive psychology, mindfulness and best practice teaching methodology.
Action Step	
Description	1. Objective #1: Paxton School will utilize positive behavior support strategies to promote positive character traits in our (K-12) students to see a reduction in behavioral referrals. Tier I, II, III – Grades K-8 will participate in a Positive Behavior Support program to promote positive character traits and limit referrals. Tier I, II, III – Grades 6-12 will participate in quarterly meeting with principal to review behavioral expectations, positive character traits, and referral data. Tier I, II, III – K-8 teachers will explore the character education program “The Positivity Project” to empower students to build positive relationships. Tier I, II, III – 6-12 students will participate in a reward program through their BRAG class to decrease number of referrals.
Person Responsible	Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

#7	
Title	Professional Learning Communities
Rationale	During the 2018-2019 school year, 49% of teachers participated in a PLC at PHS and earned professional development points by completing a component in ePDC.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 2019-2020 school year, 54% of teachers will participate in a PLC at PHS, enroll in a component on ePDC, and complete the follow-up required to earn professional development points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	PLC participation
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Participation in professional learning communities is an evidence based strategy that has shown to improve student performance through continuous teacher collaboration.
Action Step	
Description	1. All teachers will participate in a PLC that is connected to the school improvement plan. 2. PLC facilitators will request a written component for their specific PLC. 3. Professional learning facilitators will write a component for each requested PLC.
Person Responsible	Brent Jones (james.jones@walton.k12.fl.us)

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).

NA

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math				$210.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0101 - Paxton School	School Improvement Funds		$210.00
			Notes: Math Night $210.00			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ELA**				**$1,093.60**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0101 - Paxton School	School Improvement Funds		$1,093.60

			Notes: Hearbuilder (k) $297.00 Art Scholastic $224.75 History/Int. Reading $189.80 Junior Scholastic $212.25 Scholastic Math $169.80			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Science**				**$50.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0101 - Paxton School	School Improvement Funds		$50.00
			Notes: Science Fair Medals $50.00			
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Parent Involvement**				**$3,554.84**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0101 - Paxton School	School Improvement Funds		$3,554.84
			Notes: Nicky Folders $690.00 Planners $2664.84 Science Night $200.00			
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: AVID**				**$3,969.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0101 - Paxton School	School Improvement Funds		$3,969.00
			Notes: Paper for TRF's $70.00 AVID 3899.00 (contract fees including AVID weekly			
6	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Behavior**				**$0.00**
7	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Professional Learning Communities**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$8,877.44**