

Jackson County School Board

Jackson Alternative School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Jackson Alternative School

2701 TECHNOLOGY CIR, Marianna, FL 32448

<http://jas.jcsb.org>

Demographics

Principal: Rex Suggs

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2020

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)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Jackson Alternative School

2701 TECHNOLOGY CIR, Marianna, FL 32448

<http://jas.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)
Combination School PK-12	Yes	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

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.

Our mission is to provide the resources to help each student develop to his or her maximum potential and to become as productive and independent as possible at home, in the community, and/or during post-secondary education/employment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our faculty and staff should ...

- ...be involved in decision-making.
- ...be recognized, encouraged, and supported for their efforts.
- ...make full use of instructional time.
- ...utilize activities which stimulate high order thinking.
- ...possess a strong desire to be the best they can be.
- ...work together in a cooperative manner.
- ...be interested in the health and welfare of the students.
- ...be role models for the students.
- ...display initiative and operate professionally.
- ...display a positive attitude toward students and 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
Suggs, Rex	Principal	Rex Suggs is the Principal and oversees the SIP. Jenny Bryan is the Head Leadership Team member. Bertha, Preston, and Chris are support members.
Bryan, Jenny	School Counselor	
Roberts, Bertha	Teacher, K-12	Intensive Reading Teacher
Roberts, Preston	Teacher, K-12	ACE High School Teacher
Truette, Chris	Teacher, ESE	CACL ESE Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/26/2020, Rex Suggs

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

13

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I

* 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	3	4	3	3	10	12	9	9	8	4	7	72
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4	2	4	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	4	1	1	2	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	2	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4	5	6	3	3	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	5	5	6	1	2	32

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	5	6	6	1	0	30

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	1	2	2	0	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	2	0	4	4	2	1	3	1	0	20

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/26/2020

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	2	6	1	8	8	14	8	14	7	8	3	79
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	1	1	1	0	5	1	1	2	0	1	13

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	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	1	2	1	0	1	11

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	2	6	1	8	8	14	8	14	7	8	3	79
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	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	1	1	1	0	5	1	1	2	0	1	13

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	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	1	2	1	0	1	11

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	0%	58%	61%	0%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	54%	59%	0%	52%	57%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	47%	54%	0%	41%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	55%	62%	0%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	52%	59%	0%	54%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	46%	52%	0%	49%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	44%	56%	0%	51%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	69%	78%	0%	61%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019					
	2018	0%	66%	-66%	57%	-57%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	62%	-62%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	66%	-66%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	46%	55%	-9%	54%	-8%
	2018	20%	58%	-38%	52%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison		46%				
07	2019	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	45%	-45%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
08	2019	8%	57%	-49%	56%	-48%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
09	2019	31%	59%	-28%	55%	-24%
	2018	10%	50%	-40%	53%	-43%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		31%				
10	2019	30%	49%	-19%	53%	-23%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		30%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018	0%	72%	-72%	62%	-62%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	71%	-71%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	72%	-72%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	10%	58%	-48%	60%	-50%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
06	2019	8%	56%	-48%	55%	-47%
	2018	9%	52%	-43%	52%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
07	2019	0%	55%	-55%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
08	2019	0%	30%	-30%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	45%	-45%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	7%	28%	-21%	48%	-41%
	2018	0%	45%	-45%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	23%	61%	-38%	67%	-44%
2018	0%	82%	-82%	65%	-65%
Compare		23%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	65%	-65%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	66%	-66%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	50%	-50%	61%	-61%
2018	17%	61%	-44%	62%	-45%
Compare		-17%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	9%	44%	-35%	57%	-48%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	56%	-56%
Compare		9%			

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	21	46		22	36						
BLK	6	12		7	18						
WHT	35	69		25	40					8	
FRL	22	33		13	25		17			12	

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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	20
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	137
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	82%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

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	
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	11
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	35
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	20
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

Math scores

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

ELA scores

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.

ELA scores

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

Our Science scores were higher

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

Attendance is a problem we face here at JAS. We are implementing things this year to try and improve our attendance rate.

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

1. Ensuring 95% of students are tested.
2. Improving student performance of black students
3. Improving the performance of economically disadvantaged students
4. Improving the performance of students with disabilities
5. Improving the performance of white students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Percent Tested

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: For the 2019 assessment year, 82% of students eligible for testing took the state assessment. This negatively impacted student performance outcomes.

Measurable Outcome: For the 2021 assessment, 95% of students will take state assessments as required by statute.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rex Suggs (rex.suggs@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: School staff will build positive relationships with students and convey the importance of taking assessments to measure their knowledge.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Relationship building is a positive and effective tool to improving outcomes from students.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: For the 2019 assessment year, 82% of students eligible for testing took the state assessment. This negatively impacted student performance outcomes.

Measurable Outcome: For the 2021 assessment, 95% of students will take state assessments as required by statute.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: School staff will build positive relationships with students and convey the importance of taking assessments to measure their knowledge.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: As a school, we are trying to improve our chronic absenteeism/truancy rate. For the 2021 assessment, 95% of students will take state assessments as required by statute. We are putting things in place as a school to help reduce/deter chronic absenteeism and truancy among the students.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We have an Intensive Reading Teacher that sees all of our students in grades 6-12 daily. She works with the students to help build their language/reading skills. She will provide intervention strategies and techniques. This will help the students greatly when it comes to state testing, as well as other benefits.

Measurable Outcome: Our students will learn simple and effective ways to help build reading skills to better understand classroom curriculum.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rex Suggs (rex.suggs@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence will be shown in the student's reading and language grades, classroom assignments, classroom tests, and state testing.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our Intensive Reading Teacher will use a variety of strategies to help improve reading and language skills among our students. She will utilize strategies such as read alouds, literature circles, writing journals, instructional journals, small group instruction, IREADY lessons, and the FLVS curriculum to help achieve this goal.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with Disabilities, White students, African American students, and Economically Disadvantaged students have all been identified at my school as being below the target.

Measurable Outcome: The school plans to raise our target for overall academic performance to 35% for 3 of the 4 subgroups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rex Suggs (rex.suggs@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Since reading comprehension skills are needed for all areas of academic, we are going to focus on that. Mastery of reading comprehension skills will be monitored through test grades, assignments, iReady passages, and state testing.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Reading comprehension is a vital skill to have to navigate through life and society. Reading comprehension skills are used in all areas of academics. Reading comprehension is essential for all jobs and everyday communication.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will monitor attendance to reduce chronic absenteeism. We make phone calls daily to parents of students who do not show up for school. We are implementing school wide rewards for perfect attendance each semester.

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.

Teachers will meet with parents during school hours, during Open House which will be held prior to the start of the student's school year, and conduct phone conferences when parents are unable to attend the meetings on campus. As an alternative school, our situation is unique to the needs of our student population which focuses on parental contact and involvement. During a student's initial staffing interview the best method of contact is established, and then continual updating of contact information along with the Title 1 survey is monitored to ensure that parents are involved in meetings concerning the education and welfare of their child while at Jackson Alternative School.

Parents are encouraged to monitor student progress using the FOCUS online grade book and to contact teachers, guidance, and/or administration with any concerns. During the initial staffing, parents are informed that the school has an open door policy and are invited to visit during school hour to unobtrusively monitor their child's instruction.

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: Other: Percent Tested	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00