

Jackson County School Board

Graceville 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Graceville School

5539 BROWN ST, Graceville, FL 32440

<http://ghs.jcsb.org>

Demographics

Principal: Carlan Martin

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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)	K-12 General 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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Graceville School

5539 BROWN ST, Graceville, FL 32440

<http://ghs.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	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

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

Small Town ... Big Thinkers!!!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Administrators are building a Safe Haven.

Faculty/Staff are building Expectations.

Students are building Imaginations.

Community Members are building Endless Opportunities.

Parents are building Tomorrow's Leaders.

We are Graceville High School

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wertenberger, Todd	Teacher, K-12	Data Mentor – Assists in collecting, organizing, visually displaying, analyzing and interpreting data
Ellerbe, Haley	School Counselor	Content Specialist – Assists in making key decisions about instructional needs of struggling students, identifies evidenced-based interventions most likely to be effective in addressing the area of concern, and provides training/consultation as needed
Kent, Laura	Principal	Instruction Leader – (Administrator) - Ensures fidelity of the process, sets regularly scheduled times for the SST to convene, makes decisions on how T2 and T3 services will be delivered
Wheatley, Richard	Assistant Principal	Team Leader - Directs team activities, receives referrals for the SST, informs staff/parents, sets mtg times, ensures the proper documentation is maintained, and sets dates/times for follow-up meetings
McDaniel, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	School Improvement Chair and Staff Liaison – Key communicator with staff, establishes procedures to gain staff input and collaboration with other school initiatives
Sutton, Sharese	Teacher, K-12	Teacher – of the student whose needs are being addressed
Tucker, Amber	School Counselor	Behavior Specialist – Assists in identifying function of problem behaviors and developing Behavior Intervention Plans, collaborates and provides training as needed

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Carlan Martin

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.*

1

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

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)	K-12 General 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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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 .	

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	47	36	35	40	35	28	43	33	38	41	26	33	43	478	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	5	2	1	4	20	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	2	10	7	5	7	9	51	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	6	12	10	4	0	0	52	

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	
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	9	12	7	10	13	12	12	10	14	11	7	14	12	143
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	2	5	1	0	6	4	28

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/23/2020

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	6	4	9	10	46	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	5	5	5	21

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	6	4	9	10	46

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	5	5	5	21

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	45%	58%	61%	44%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	54%	59%	44%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	23%	47%	54%	33%	41%	51%
Math Achievement	38%	55%	62%	46%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	47%	52%	59%	54%	54%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	46%	52%	44%	49%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	44%	56%	45%	51%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	69%	78%	66%	61%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	39%	55%	-16%	54%	-15%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		39%				
07	2019	54%	56%	-2%	52%	2%
	2018	38%	45%	-7%	51%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	38%	57%	-19%	56%	-18%
	2018	48%	59%	-11%	58%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	50%	59%	-9%	55%	-5%
	2018	44%	50%	-6%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
10	2019	42%	49%	-7%	53%	-11%
	2018	29%	55%	-26%	53%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	39%	56%	-17%	55%	-16%
	2018	37%	52%	-15%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		39%				
07	2019	49%	55%	-6%	54%	-5%
	2018	32%	49%	-17%	54%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
08	2019	22%	30%	-8%	46%	-24%
	2018	50%	45%	5%	45%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-28%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

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

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		9%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	68%	65%	3%	70%	-2%
2018	70%	66%	4%	68%	2%
Compare		-2%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	50%	-2%	61%	-13%
2018	50%	61%	-11%	62%	-12%
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	29%	44%	-15%	57%	-28%
2018	68%	57%	11%	56%	12%
Compare		-39%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	30	40	18	20	46			40			
BLK	33	33	19	30	41	38	26	67		89	42
HSP	70										
MUL	44	47		47	46						
WHT	57	51	27	45	54	55	63	78	73	67	63
FRL	44	43	23	35	44	41	41	72	79	78	53
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	32	27	29	43						
BLK	32	43	52	43	48	57	21	66		75	33
MUL	47	59		58	50						
WHT	51	46	33	48	56	43	54	77	75	87	65
FRL	40	47	46	46	49	48	30	66	63	76	32

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	6	24	27	7	54	50					
BLK	34	37	29	33	55	44	31	53		76	19
MUL	50	24		58	47						
WHT	51	53	43	55	54	50	53	77	54	100	42
FRL	39	40	30	41	51	43	39	63	50	80	21

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	560
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	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	42
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	70
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	46
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	58
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	50
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 the Lowest 25% in ELA. This component went from 47% in 2018 to 23% in 2019. The contributing factors are lack of phonics instruction, lack of academic vocabulary, lack of comprehension strategies, loss of instructional time due to Hurricane Michael, and not all teachers were Reading Endorsed.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is the Lowest 25% in ELA. The contributing factors to this decline was due to lack of instructional time, lack of reading at home and lack of phonics instruction.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the Lowest 25% in ELA. The state average was 54% and our school average was 23%, that is a 31% difference. The contributing factors to this decline was due to lack of instructional time, lack of reading at home and lack of phonics instruction.

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

Science Achievement and Social Studies Achievement both showed the most improvement with a 4% increase. 5th grade Science Achievement increased by more than 15%. The school implemented academic vocabulary in 5th grade Science Lab.

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

The number of Level 1 students in grades 6th thru 8th in both ELA and Math are potential areas of concern.

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

1. Lowest 25% in ELA
2. Lowest 25% in Math
3. Science and Social Studies Proficiency
4. Graduation Rate
5. ESSA Subgroup Students with Disabilities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus
Description
and Rationale:**

ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%. This Area of Focus went from 47% in 2018 to 23% in 2019. We would like our students to be successful in all areas and assisting them reach proficient levels on the ELA assessment is key to this success.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

Our intended measurable outcome is to increase the ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% from 23% to 54%. While improving overall student proficiency to 54% and overall student learning gains to 54%.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Implementation of online learning program, i-Ready.

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

This program can be used as a diagnostic tool to identify areas of weakness and create an individualized remediation pathway to improve student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. ELA/Reading teachers utilize FSA and i-Ready data to differentiate/scaffold instruction to increase performance.
2. Follow District curriculum maps; incorporate research-based instructional methods.
3. Ensure lesson plans and classroom assessments align with Standards, cognitive complexity of models, examples, questions and tasks.
4. Monitor implementation of strategies/best practices in department meetings and during walkthroughs/ classroom observations.
5. ELA monthly meetings will serve as "mini" PD's. Effective and proven word acquisition and vocabulary strategies will be shared. The expectation is all Language Arts and Reading teachers will attempt shared strategies within their curriculum and share their successes and challenges at the department meeting.
6. Hourly Title I paraprofessional will assist in small group pullout to differentiate instruction.
7. Performance Coach books will be used as supplemental intensive instructional resources. Utilize the i-Ready toolbox.
8. ELA teachers will collaborate with science and social studies teachers to incorporate content-area articles for reading comprehension practice.
9. Access to the District Reading Resource Teachers.

**Person
Responsible**

Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%. This Area of Focus went from 54% in 2018 to 43% in 2019. We would like our students to be successful and assist them reach proficient levels on the FSA Math assessment, Algebra 1 and Geometry End of Course Exams is key to their success.

Measurable Outcome: Our intended measurable outcome is to increase the Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% from 43% to 54%. Student proficiency will also improve to 54% and overall student learning gains will improve to 54%. Middle School Acceleration will be 80%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Teresa McDaniel (teresa.mcdaniel@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of computer-assisted instructional models, Imagine Math and i-Ready

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These programs can be used as a diagnostic tool to identify areas of weakness and create an individualized remediation pathway to improve student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1.Math teachers will use collaborative structures and student-centered conversation in their lessons and follow Curriculum Maps.
- 2.Math teachers will use Formative Assessments in the classroom to monitor student progress and to modify and inform instruction.
- 3.Math teachers utilize FSA, i-Ready, and Imagine Math data to differentiate/scaffold instruction to increase student performance.
- 4.Ensure lesson plans and classroom assessments align with Standards, cognitive complexity of models, examples, questions and tasks.
- 5.Administrators will monitor implementation of strategies/best practices in department meetings and during walkthroughs/classroom observations.
- 6.Math monthly department meetings will serve as “mini” PD’s. Effective and proven math strategies are shared at each meeting. The expectation is that all Math teachers will attempt shared strategies within their curriculum and share their successes and challenges at the following department meeting.
- 7.Performance Coach books as supplemental intensive instructional material. Supplemental materials, from Imagine Math and Algebra Nation, implemented as needed.
- 8.After school tutoring provided.

Person Responsible Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Science Achievement. The 8th Grade Science FSA went from 8% in 2018 to 6% in 2019 and the Biology EOC went from 73% in 2018 to 54% in 2019. We would like our students to be successful and assist them reach proficient levels on the FSA 5th and 8th Grade Science Assessments, and Biology End of Course Exam is key to their success.

Measurable Outcome: Our intended measurable outcome is to increase the Science Achievement from 43% to 54%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cindy Franklin (cindy.franklin@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Progress Monitoring Assessments- Fusion Textbook Benchmark Assessment for Middle School and Ready Set Go from Research & Education associations for Biology.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring is used to assess students' academic performance, to quantify a student rate of improvement or responsiveness to instruction, and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction and modify instruction accordingly.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Science teachers will unpack science standards, have a clear understanding of the test item specifications and develop learning targets that align with the standards.
2. Lesson plans and classroom assessments will align with the standards, cognitive complexity of models, examples, questions and tasks.
3. Teachers will follow the District Curriculum Maps.
4. Teachers will use Student Data to intentionally plan and differentiate lessons with complex tasks.
5. Teachers will develop and use formative assessments to monitor student learning and achievement.
6. Teachers will implement research-based teaching methods in their classrooms.
7. Teachers will also identify struggling students and provide supplemental materials for support as needed.
8. District Reading Resource Teachers work with our Science Teachers on resources for word acquisition and vocabulary strategies.

Person Responsible Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Social Studies Achievement. The Civics EOC went from 76% in 2018 to 85% in 2019. The US History EOC went from 70% in 2018 to 68% in 2019. We would like our students to be successful and assisting them reach proficient levels on both the Civics and US History End of Course Exams is key to their success.

Measurable Outcome: Our intended measurable outcome is to increase the Social Studies Achievement from 73% to 80%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Progress Monitoring Assessments - Civic Holt McDougal Textbook Benchmark Assessments

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring is used to assess students' academic performance, to quantify a student rate of improvement or responsiveness to instruction, and to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction and modify instruction accordingly.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Social Studies teachers will unpack social studies standards, have a clear understanding of the test item specifications and develop learning targets that align with the standards.
2. Lesson plans and classroom assessments will align with the standards, cognitive complexity of models, examples, questions and tasks.
3. Teachers will follow the District Curriculum Maps.
4. Teachers will use Student Data to intentionally plan and differentiate lessons with complex tasks.
5. Teachers will develop and use formative assessments to monitor student learning and achievement.
6. Teachers will implement research-based teaching methods in their classrooms.
7. Teachers will also identify struggling students and provide supplemental materials for support as needed.
8. District Reading Resource Teachers will work with Social Studies Teachers on word acquisition and vocabulary strategies.

Person Responsible Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Improve Graduation Rate. Our goal is to see our students graduate with a standard high school diploma. We are committed to provide all possible assistance to our students to help them be successful on high stakes tests and earning their diploma. Our graduation rate went from 84% in 2018 to 80% in 2019. High School Acceleration was 52% for 2019.

Measurable Outcome: Our intended outcome is for all of our students to graduate and improve our graduation rate by 10%. Our high school acceleration rate will be 54%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Creating student academic plans

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Studies show that individualizing the student's academic plan greatly impacts his/her ability to succeed academically in reaching graduation with some form of acceleration part of their learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide tutoring and preparation for retake FSA and EOC tests and the ACT and PSAT in an effort to earn concordant scores. Offer on campus during the school day the ACT-NCR as an option for those students who qualify.
2. Expose our students to the various opportunities they may take after graduation and guide them in their desired direction thru College and Career Night, Guest Speakers, etc.
3. Guidance counselor informs students and parents what is needed for graduation and assists with creating a plan for students to follow to earn all required credits and the required GPA, and the required test scores.
4. Monitor the progress of all students, and proactively intervene when students show early signs of attendance, behavior, or academic problems.
5. Provide intensive, individualized support to students who have fallen off track and face significant challenges to success
6. Offer dual enrollment courses and industry certification courses for students.

Person Responsible: Haley Ellerbee (haley.ellerbee@jcsb.org)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

This subgroup fell below the Federal Index of 41%, it was 32%.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase ELA Achievement from 30% to 54% for Students with Disabilities.
Increase ELA Learning Gains for Lowest 25% from 18% to 54% for Students with Disabilities.

**Person responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Implementation of computer-assisted instructional model- iReady

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

These programs can be used as a diagnostic tool to identify areas of weakness and create individualized remediation pathway to improve student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will share strategies and practices being used that are successful.
2. Teachers will differentiate instruction and provide supports for ESE students in General Education classes.
3. Teachers utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/ scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

Person Responsible

Laura Kent (laura.kent@jcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Decrease the number of Level 1 proficiency in middle school for ELA and math assessments.

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.

Graceville School strives to provide ideal opportunities for parental involvement. Open house is an excellent opportunity for both parents and teachers to become familiar with one another and build key initial

relationships.

Parents of athletes and band members are encouraged to join these booster clubs.

Parents of students with IEP's are contacted and met with periodically.

Parents are encouraged to become involved by attending school advisory meetings throughout the year.

Teachers use various communication methods to keep parents informed of class announcements including the school and district websites.

Teachers use email and phone calls to contact parents as needed.

Teachers attend parent conferences as needed.

Teachers share their email and telephone extensions and what is expected on their class syllabus/ newsletters.

PTO and SACs meetings.

Parent surveys are offered to give parents a voice on how they feel about the school and comments to improving.

FOCUS is the online gradebook and attendance tool that is available for students and parents to monitor student progress.

Progress reports are generated and distributed at least once per grading period and nine-week report cards are given to students.

Student handbooks and district parent guide and calendars are given to students at the beginning of the school year.

There is a Graceville School Facebook page to keep students, parents and the community up to date on school activities.

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
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00