

Jackson County School Board

Grand Ridge School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Grand Ridge School

6925 FLORIDA ST, Grand Ridge, FL 32442

<http://grs.jcsb.org>

Demographics

Principal: Becky Hart

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2019-20 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%)
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 10/20/2020.

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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Grand Ridge School

6925 FLORIDA ST, Grand Ridge, FL 32442

<http://grs.jcsb.org>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 5-8	Yes	89%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	31%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 10/20/2020.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Baggett, Tim	Principal	Instructional leader: provides a common vision for the use of data based decision; ensures the team is implementing RTI; ensures implementation of intervention as well as support and documentation; ensures professional activities to support RTI implementation and communicate with parents regarding school based RTI plans and activities.
Melvin, Barbara	School Counselor	Record Keeper- participates in the collection and analysis of data; documents and complete all paperwork required during meetings. Also serves as the time keeper.
Hart, Becky	Assistant Principal	Team Leader- participates in the collection and analysis of data; provides services and expertise on multiple issues that rang from educational programs/ assessments to interventions based on specific individual needs; directs activities and meetings of the leadership team.
Scott, Anna	SAC Member	Behavior Specialist- assists in student data collection, provides assistance in identifying functions of appropriate behavior and designing behavior plans as necessary.
Faircloth, Ann	Teacher, K-12	Content Specialist- provides guidance and technical assistance as needed to teachers; assist with intervention plans as needed.
Parmer, Jenny	Teacher, K-12	Content Specialist- provides guidance and technical assistance as needed to teachers; assist with intervention plans as needed.
Bannerman, Mendy	Teacher, K-12	Data Coach- provides expertise and knowledge necessary to interpret, manage and display data; provides support to teachers regarding data.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/10/2020, Becky Hart

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2019-20 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%)
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 .	

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	77	90	109	102	0	0	0	0	378
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4	20	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	10	17	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	16	0	0	0	0	34

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	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	15

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	23	25	32	29	0	0	0	0	109
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	9	8	0	0	0	0	28

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/24/2020

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	
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	

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	
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	

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

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%
	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		

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
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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was science achievement in the 5th and 8th grades. The contributing factors were instructional practices as well as impacts from Hurricane Michael.

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 previous year. Instructional practices and impacts from Hurricane Michael contributed to the decline.

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.

Math learning gains had the greatest gap in comparison to the state average. Instructional practices and the impacts of Hurricane Michael contributed to the gap in this area.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was math learning gains with 24%. Grand Ridge School utilized i-Ready to support students through dedicated enrichment and remediation.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

One potential area of concern is attendance for students. Attendance in the 20-21 school year will more than likely be a factor due to the number of students enrolled in iJackson.

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 in grades 5-8.
4. Improve achievement in civics.
5. Improve student attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Grand Ridge School would like to see overall ELA proficiency at 65%, ELA learning gains for all students at 59% proficiency and the lowest 25 percentile with 57% learning gains. Data was reviewed from the 2019 FSA.

Measurable Outcome: Grand Ridge School would like to see ELA achievement for all grades increase from 64% to 65%, ELA learning gains for all ELA students increase from 58% to 59% and the lowest 25th percentile increase from 56% to 57%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tim Baggett (tim.baggett@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Differentiate instruction based on student needs.
2. Provide supplemental curriculum such as ixl reading and coach books.
3. Critical thinking classes for levels 1 and 2.
4. Implement the MTSS/RTI process.
5. i-Ready instructional support and diagnostic assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Access to multiple methods of instruction, small learning groups as well as individual learning groups.
2. i-ready data.
3. MTSS supported by FLDOE as an evidenced based strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor implementation of small group and individual instructional practices.
2. Implement i-ready, coachbooks, ixl and other supplemental resources for classroom instruction.
3. Establish remediation time in the daily schedule.
4. Utilize staff to support enrichment and remediation.
5. Monitor and implement the MTSS process.

Person Responsible Tim Baggett (tim.baggett@jcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Grand Ridge School would like to see overall math proficiency maintain at 69%, math learning gains for all grades maintain at 59%, lowest 25th percentile maintain at 62% and Algebra 1 EOC results maintain at 91%. Data was reviewed from the 2019 FSA and EOC results.

Measurable Outcome: Grand Ridge School would like to see overall math proficiency maintain at 69% or higher, Overall math learning gains maintain at 69% or higher and the lowest 25th percentile at 62% or higher. Algebra 1 EOC results will maintain at 91% or higher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tim Baggett (tim.baggett@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Differentiate instruction.
2. Provide supplemental curriculum.
3. ixl math
4. Implement the MTSS/RTI process.
5. i-Ready instructional support and diagnostic assessments.
6. Imagine Math learning pathways for all students and Algebra 1 EOC students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Students will have access to multiple methods of instruction, small learning groups and individual learning groups.
2. iready data and ixl math.
3. MTSS that is supported by FLDOE as an evidence based strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor implementation of small group and individual instructional practices.
2. Implement iready, Imagin math, ixl math and the use of coach books as well as supplemental resources for classroom instruction.
3. Establish remediation time in the daily schedule.
4. Utilize staff to support remediation.
5. Monitor and implement the MTSS process.

Person Responsible Tim Baggett (tim.baggett@jcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improve student performance on FSA science assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	Student achievement performance will be at 51% or higher on the 2021 science achievement FSA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tim Baggett (tim.baggett@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Curriculum mapping and teacher training.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. District curriculum mapping and training for implementation. 2. Coach books 3. ixl science.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Science teachers developed curriculum maps in the summer of 2019.
2. Teachers received training on the new resources and curriculum in 2019.
3. ixl science.

Person Responsible Tim Baggett (tim.baggett@jcsb.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To maintain or increase student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Maintain at 67% or increase student performance on the 2021 Civics assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tim Baggett (tim.baggett@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Differentiate instruction. 2. ixl social studies. 3. Implement the MTSS process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Different methods of instruction such as small learning groups and individual learning groups. 2. iready and ixl. 3. MTSS that is supported by the FLDOE as an evidence based strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor implementation of small group and individual instructional practices.
2. ixl social studies.
3. Establish remediation in the daily schedule.
4. Utilize staff to support remediation.
5. Monitor and implement the MTSS process.

Person Responsible Tim Baggett (tim.baggett@jcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Grand Ridge School will monitor attendance through the EWS system while supporting students through established district policies and procedure.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Grand Ridge School builds and sustains positive partnerships with local stakeholders in order to establish and maintain meaningful relationships while ensuring that all stakeholders have the same vision for Grand Ridge School and its achievements. Stakeholders are invited to school advisory council meetings to address concerns, promote the school vision as well as give vital input towards strategies for school improvement. Efforts between the school and community are data driven and directly affect the school as well as student achievement. The school continuously provides information to the community through multiple outlets such as the school website, Facebook page, The Tribal Newsletter, grade group letters, remind, emails, etc Grand Ridge School staff creates a positive environment where students feel safe. Students are trained in internet safety and parent and students are asked to sign an acceptable use policy. Parents, students and teachers are asked to sign a student accountability agreement. Student handbooks are available for all students and parents. Teachers are trained for anti-bullying, hazardous spills and active shooter events. Students are continuously supervised during school hours. The school employs a full time resource officer as well as a guardian to ensure the safety of the school..

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00

	Total: \$0.00
--	-----------------------------