Graduation Assistance Program

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Graduation Assistance Program

307 W NORTH AVE, Bonifay, FL 32425

http://gap.hdsb.org/

Demographics

Principal: Kim Cullifer

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
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* 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 Holmes 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

Graduation Assistance Program

307 W NORTH AVE, Bonifay, FL 32425

http://gap.hdsb.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)
High School 6-12	No	%

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	2013-14
Grade	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Holmes 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 at the Graduation Assistance Program is dedicated to providing a quality educational program that is centered on preventing and reducing juvenile delinquency. The program is operated in partnership with the Department of Juvenile Justice, the feeder schools, families, law enforcement, community organizations, and other public agencies. We are committed to a balanced approach that effectively provides troubled youth with guidance, education, and discipline in a caring environment to enable them to accept responsibility and become productive members of the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our philosophy is based on the belief that all students can learn and succeed when provided a learning environment that meets their needs and interests.

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
Dixon, Ron	Principal	The role of a principal is to provide strategic direction in the school system. Principals develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities. Other important duties entail developing safety protocols and emergency response procedures.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 8/1/2015, Kim Cullifer

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.*
2

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
4

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
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* 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	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	13	7	5	5	38
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	1	0	0	0	1	2
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	8	13	4	3	50
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	6	11	4	2	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	2	0	1	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	7	11	2	1	42

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	17

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	3	5	0	2	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	1	1	0	12

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	1	6	15	8	13	4	3	50
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	6	11	4	2	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	2	0	1	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	7	11	2	1	42

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	17

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	3	5	0	2	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	1	1	0	12

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%	52%	56%	0%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	44%	51%	0%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	35%	42%	0%	27%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	24%	51%	0%	29%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	34%	48%	0%	30%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	34%	45%	0%	21%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	58%	68%	0%	43%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	56%	73%	0%	66%	70%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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
06	2019	0%	48%	-48%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	46%	-46%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	9%	51%	-42%	52%	-43%
	2018	15%	40%	-25%	51%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	0%	48%	-48%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
09	2019	0%	54%	-54%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	47%	-47%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	46%	-46%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	0%	52%	-52%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	37%	-37%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	61%	-61%	54%	-54%
	2018	29%	46%	-17%	54%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	35%	-35%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	30%	-30%	45%	-45%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	0%	41%	-41%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	63%	-63%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	42%	-42%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	10%	73%	-63%	71%	-61%
2018	10%	67%	-57%	71%	-61%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	64%	-64%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	46%	-46%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	40%	-40%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	32%	-32%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	42%	-42%	56%	-56%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		0%			

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				9	20						
WHT	8	9			14						
FRL	10				20						
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	10
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	60
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	81%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	15
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 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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	8
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	10
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.

N/A- COVID-19

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

N/A - COVID-19

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.

N/A- Covid-19

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

1. Attendance
2. Graduation Rate
3. ELA - FSA scores
4. Math - FSA scores
5. Discipline

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	small group academic instruction is not only related to COVID- 19 procedures but relevant to our successful program. It impacts student learning with more individualized instruction and helps repeated disruptive behaviors.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase GPA of targeted student by 20% by June 1, 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ron Dixon (dixonr@hdsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Maximize academic learning time with efficient transitions. Teach reinforce appropriate group behavior (behavior management and control)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Reduce disciplinary referrals for targeted students by 50%.

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.

Service options may include but not be limited to the following: behavior management, small student/adult ratio, individual therapy, group therapy and computer assisted instruction.The curriculum concerns that need to be discussed may include but not be limited to the following: quality of life, health maintenance, job training, academic instruction, behavior control, social development and emotional development and human growth and development.

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.

School Advisory Council is formed at the beginning of each year and will meet to evaluated school performance and discuss possible improvement. Collaborative therapy systems have been set in place with

various groups that will visit targeted students. Holmes County Sheriff's Department provides a School Resource officer and Florida Department of Juvenile Justice will provide additional information and input as needed. Community partners are a key element in our success rate.

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: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00