

Jackson County School Board

Malone 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	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Malone School

5361 9TH ST, Malone, FL 32445

<http://malone.jcsb.org>

Demographics

Principal: Bryant Hardy

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2012

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)	97%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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 is pending approval by the Jackson County School Board.

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	22

Malone School

5361 9TH ST, Malone, FL 32445

<http://malone.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	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Jackson County School Board.

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.

Keep it Real.

- Responsibility
- Excellence
- Achieving
- Learning

Provide the school's vision statement.

Passion for Learning, Compassion for Others

- Reading is the cornerstone for learning.
- Work ethics and interpersonal skills are key to learning.
- Students are life-long learners.
- Character is determined by respect, compassion, loyalty, and tolerance for self and others.
- Technology skills are essential.
- We are becoming a global society due to technological advances, and thus people are growing even more interconnected and are affected by world-wide events.

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
Powell, Doug	Principal	Instructional 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. (Doug Powell)
Orlando, Lisa	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.
King, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Hardy, Bryant	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 (Bryant Hardy)
Davis, Dena	Teacher, K-12	
Whitfield, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Staff Liaison – Key communicator with staff, establishes procedures to gain staff input and collaboration with other school initiatives. Record Keeper – Documents/completes required paperwork in the meetings, serves as timekeeper, informs team when time is running short.
Braswell, Ricky	Teacher, K-12	
Waddell, Orenza	Teacher, K-12	
	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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/1/2012, Bryant Hardy

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.*

5

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)	97%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	44	39	43	41	36	41	44	42	30	42	41	41	30	514
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	3	1	2	0	2	2	0	4	0	3	4	24
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	5	4	4	10	6	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	7	2	8	3	2	39

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	1	2	1	0	1	1	2	2	10

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	6	16	15	11	12	10	15	10	13	5	10	11	8	142
Students retained two or more times	0	3	3	4	3	4	6	3	4	0	3	7	4	44

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/11/2020

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	46	48	50	47	41	50	46	31	40	41	42	31	31	544
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	8	9	6	6	7	3	5	4	3	8	14	84
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	2	1	3	1	2	2	2	1	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	12	5	3	4	16	16	20	6	4	2	2	96
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	3	6	9	6	8	3	50

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	5	1	4	4	10	9	4	9	7	3	1	58

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	1	5	3	4	6	3	3	0	4	6	3	2	40

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	46	48	50	47	41	50	46	31	40	41	42	31	31	544
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	8	9	6	6	7	3	5	4	3	8	14	84
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	2	1	3	1	2	2	2	1	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	12	5	3	4	16	16	20	6	4	2	2	96
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	3	6	9	6	8	3	50

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	5	1	4	4	10	9	4	9	7	3	1	58

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	1	5	3	4	6	3	3	0	4	6	3	2	40

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	63%	58%	61%	62%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	54%	59%	58%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	47%	54%	46%	41%	51%
Math Achievement	68%	55%	62%	71%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	47%	52%	59%	60%	54%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	46%	52%	60%	49%	50%
Science Achievement	39%	44%	56%	56%	51%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	69%	78%	58%	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	61%	58%	3%	58%	3%
	2018	70%	66%	4%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	62%	12%	58%	16%
	2018	75%	66%	9%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	59%	60%	-1%	56%	3%
	2018	60%	54%	6%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
06	2019	58%	55%	3%	54%	4%
	2018	62%	58%	4%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
07	2019	69%	56%	13%	52%	17%
	2018	63%	45%	18%	51%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	61%	57%	4%	56%	5%
	2018	51%	59%	-8%	58%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
09	2019	56%	59%	-3%	55%	1%
	2018	57%	50%	7%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
10	2019	50%	49%	1%	53%	-3%
	2018	70%	55%	15%	53%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	87%	70%	17%	62%	25%
	2018	84%	72%	12%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	87%	71%	16%	64%	23%
	2018	91%	72%	19%	62%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	46%	58%	-12%	60%	-14%
	2018	52%	62%	-10%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
06	2019	68%	56%	12%	55%	13%
	2018	84%	52%	32%	52%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
07	2019	79%	55%	24%	54%	25%
	2018	81%	49%	32%	54%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	0%	30%	-30%	46%	-46%
	2018	68%	45%	23%	45%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-68%				
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	31%	52%	-21%	53%	-22%
	2018	60%	54%	6%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	4%	28%	-24%	48%	-44%
	2018	24%	45%	-21%	50%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	63%	61%	2%	67%	-4%
2018	48%	82%	-34%	65%	-17%
Compare		15%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	71%	10%	71%	10%
2018	84%	57%	27%	71%	13%
Compare		-3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	65%	-8%	70%	-13%
2018	82%	66%	16%	68%	14%
Compare		-25%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	50%	12%	61%	1%
2018	61%	61%	0%	62%	-1%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	37%	44%	-7%	57%	-20%
2018	59%	57%	2%	56%	3%
Compare		-22%			

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	43	50	27	58	47		19			90	
ELL											
BLK	58	48	38	58	39	35	26	50	56	92	45
HSP	71	76		82	50						
MUL	45			58	40						
WHT	67	58	53	73	52	39	51	84	79	88	91
FRL	61	58	52	64	44	38	38	65	65	77	59
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	51	50	38	59	59	57	36	64			
BLK	55	54	54	65	59	52	23	81		88	47
HSP	58	56		89	88						
MUL	53	50		73	50						
WHT	70	61	46	73	60	63	52	80	71	82	83

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
FRL	58	53	49	70	56	54	26	74	60	79	53
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	32	36	39	46	52	53					
ELL	55			73							
BLK	48	55	44	63	61	54	34	48			
HSP	56	58		65	60						
MUL	60			100							
WHT	69	59	50	73	59	58	70	66	47	88	41
FRL	55	53	44	67	61	61	48	40	30	90	32

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	60
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	723
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	50
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	68
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	48
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	67
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	57
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.

Data showed the lowest performing component was 8th grade science. The contributing factor was that the top performing 8th graders were tested in biology instead of basic science.

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

The component with the greatest decline from the prior year was 5th grade science. There was a beginning teacher to this subject. Also, a county science curriculum map was put into place over the summer for all elementary grades to ensure the test item specs are being covered.

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 greatest gap compared to the state average was 8th grade science. Again, the contributing factor was that the top performing 8th graders were enrolled and tested in biology instead of basic science.

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

Biology showed the most improvement with the top performing 8th graders being tested in biology instead of basic science.

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

Attendance and those with a level 1 on state assessments.

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

1. 8th grade science
2. 5th grade science
3. Math lowest 25%
4. Attendance
5. ELA-Key ideas and details

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data has indicated that the students are deficient in the area of key ideas and details that is assessed for graduation.
Measurable Outcome:	If we increase students' comprehension of rigorous text through the use of targeting key ideas and details, then 67% of students will score a level 3 or above on the annual statewide reading assessment. Student learning gains will be 50% and learning gains of the lowest 25% will be 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Doug Powell (doug.powell@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>-Create Opportunities for Peer-to-Peer Learning so that students assist each other in understanding concepts. . In large classes, this can be accomplished by "pair-share" questions they discuss with their immediate neighbors.</p> <p>-State Clear Learning Goals repeatedly, so students have a clear idea of where they are going and what it will look like when they get there. This is a practice that creates transparency in learning and teaching.</p> <p>-Teach Strategies for Learning with general resources and techniques specific to a discipline. Encourage students to use resources from the library and provide information on ways to learn in the particular content area that is being taught.</p> <p>-Improve school-wide attendance. Poor attendance is a barrier to improved student achievement.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>-The basis of excellent "group work" is work that is meaningful for students, in which they can all contribute to each others' learning.</p> <p>-Students today often have gaps in their knowledge of study techniques, such as effective note-taking, approaches to time management, and test preparation.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. iReady supplemental curriculum, assessments, and teacher toolbox
2. Access to district elementary and secondary ELA resource teachers
3. Coach ELA supplements
4. Open Court phonics supplements
5. Lexia Core5 for ELA intensive supports, ELL supports, and kindergarten readiness
6. MTSS support

Person Responsible Doug Powell (doug.powell@jcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Data has indicated that the learning gains of our lowest 25% have the largest gap within the state average.

Measurable Outcome:

If we continue to focus on students geometry skills, then we plan to increase the learning gains of the lowest 34% to 36%. Student proficiency will be 70%. Learning gains for all students will be 50%. Middle school acceleration (Algebra 1) will be 91%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Check for Student Understanding by asking for feedback from students in various ways, regularly. Ask what students what they understand.
- Share and Model concepts to explain and then demonstrate how students will do a task, whether a physical or thinking task.
- Build in time to succeed by allowing varying time per unit, in particular to account for learning difficult concepts. While difficult to accomplish "on the fly," instructors who have taught the content before can provide students more time on difficult concepts. Consider examining the "threshold concepts" in your content area.
- Improve school-wide attendance. Poor attendance is a barrier to improved student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Research shows that this habit of asking for student feedback has more impact for learning than giving students feedback. Clarity and rapport are key foundations for effective teaching.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teacher meets with the needs based groups which are created based on the analysis of summative and formative assessments.
2. Access to Elementary and Secondary Math Resource Teacher
3. MTSS support
4. Imagine Math Online programs
5. Purchase supplemental math resources

Person Responsible

Bryant Hardy (bryant.hardy@jcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: The decrease in school wide science achievement levels.

Measurable Outcome:

If we increase the content area of life science from 40% to 48%, that would increase the 8th grade passing achievement levels 21%. Overall science performance for Malone School will improve to 42%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Doug Powell (doug.powell@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- The top performing 8th grade students will now be enrolled in basic science.
- State Clear Learning Goals repeatedly, so students have a clear idea of where they are going and what it will look like when they get there.
- Share and Model concepts to explain and then demonstrate how students will do a task, whether a physical or thinking task. Sharing and modeling looks different in each discipline.
- For some, that may be "thinking out loud" to show students how experts process or it may be doing a physical demonstration.
- Improve school-wide attendance. Poor attendance is a barrier to improved student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

With the top performing students enrolled in basic science, we expect the student achievement for the 8th grade assessment to improve tremendously. The other strategies create transparency in learning and teaching. Clarity and Rapport are key foundations for effective teaching.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will receive professional development in understanding and developing rigor for instruction to increase student's knowledge of all science standards.
2. Purchase supplemental science resources
3. Follow the newly developed district science curriculum map
4. Use online science supplements and the online HMH Ed science curriculum
5. MTSS support

Person Responsible

Doug Powell (doug.powell@jcsb.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improve overall social studies achievement by improving US History scores to match Civics proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase US History from 64% to 68% to increase overall social studies achievement to 74%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Doug Powell (doug.powell@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Reach out for assistance from PAEC for professional development, standards break down for targeted instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing professional learning to improve teaching and learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Partner with PAEC for professional learning in US History
2. Use test item specifications to provide targeted learning for the lowest content strand on US History 2019 assessment results.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Maintain a robust graduation rate above 90% to compete with state average. High School acceleration is below state average.
Measurable Outcome:	Maintain a current graduation rate of 93%. High School acceleration will increase to 80%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Doug Powell (doug.powell@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitor student progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These factors determine if they graduate or not

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monthly graduation/high school acceleration checks to make sure they are in the correct courses for graduation and passed the required state test and pass the classes with a GPA of 2.0 or higher
2. Monitor attendance
3. Motivate students to complete an industry certification exam prior to graduation with incentives from school administration.

Person Responsible Doug Powell (doug.powell@jcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In addition to our areas of focus and the top five priorities for our school improvement, we want to continue to improve school safety and attendance. The the FortifyFL app is LIVE. Now, any student, educator, parent or member of the public can report school safety concerns directly to law enforcement and school administrators anonymously and easily through the FortifyFL app. We plan to spread the word about it with our students and their families. All gates will continue to remain locked, all glass in doors will be covered, walk through's will be done to ensure all classrooms are locked, and "safety zone" drills will continue to be held.

Poor attendance is a barrier to improved student achievement. We plan to improve school-wide attendance by continuing to connect with students, keeping high morale, boosting personalized learning, improving interactions, implementing rewards for positive behavior, and increasing parent involvement. Overall we will continue making school an engaging and welcoming place where students want to attend.

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.

Malone School teachers and administration work hard to create stimulating, caring, and supportive environments to motivate learning of subject matter and academic skills. They also provide conditions where students learn to cooperate, share responsibility, develop understanding and skills related to conflict resolution and mediation, and much more. The classrooms are arranged and instruction is organized to promote positive behavior. Our optimal design promotes personalized and holistic learning and minimizes learning, behavior, and emotional problems. When a problem does arise, it is addressed immediately with response to intervention strategies. Guidance counselors are available to provide needed services that address student needs. Homeroom teachers are provided for students, grades 6-12 who provide additional opportunities for counseling and mentoring that may not require the attention of the school guidance counselor. Behavior Specialists, private counseling, and the RTI process are also provided to service the emotional needs of our students. Parents are made aware through positive parent-school communication during teacher-parent conferences.

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
Total:			\$0.00