

Jackson County School Board

Grand Ridge School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Grand Ridge School

6925 FLORIDA ST, Grand Ridge, FL 32442

<http://grs.jcsb.org>

Demographics

Principal: **Becky Hart**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 5-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 10/19/2021.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Grand Ridge School

6925 FLORIDA ST, Grand Ridge, FL 32442

<http://grs.jcsb.org>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 5-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>91%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>30%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 10/19/2021.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Grand Ridge School is Prepare to Soar: Middle School Academics for High School Success!

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Grand Ridge School is to prepare all students for success as educated and caring citizens by inspiring and building good character and a passion for lifelong learning.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dewitt, Steve	Principal	Principal. Instructional leader: provides a common vision for the use of data based decision; ensures the team is implementing RtI; ensures implementation of intervention as well as support and documentation; ensures professional activities to support RtI implementation and communicates with parents regarding school based RtI plans and activities.
Hart, Becky	Assistant Principal	Asst Principal: participates in the analysis of data; provides services in educational programs and interventions based on specific student individual needs; directs activities and meetings of the leadership team.
Bannerman, Mendy	Teacher, K-12	RtI/MTSS Specialist/Data Coach: provides expertise and knowledge necessary to interpret, manage and display data; provides support to teachers with data & interventions.
Melvin, Barbara	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor/ Record keeper: participates in the collections and analysis of data; documents and completes all paperwork required during meetings. Also serves as time keeper.
Hamilton, Laurie	Instructional Technology	Media Specialist/Librarian: Provides expertise to media, technology, and educational support to students, faculty and staff.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/10/2021, Becky Hart

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

3

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

26

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

343

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	78	77	82	106	0	0	0	0	343
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/8/2021

2020-21 - 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	77	90	109	102	0	0	0	0	378
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4	20	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	10	17	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	16	0	0	0	0	34

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	23	25	32	29	0	0	0	0	109
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	9	8	0	0	0	0	28

2020-21 - 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	77	90	109	102	0	0	0	0	378
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4	20	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	10	17	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	16	0	0	0	0	34

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	23	25	32	29	0	0	0	0	109
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	9	8	0	0	0	0	28

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				64%	55%	54%	52%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	55%	54%	54%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	43%	47%	49%	46%	47%
Math Achievement				69%	47%	58%	53%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				69%	41%	57%	45%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	34%	51%	44%	49%	51%
Science Achievement				48%	32%	51%	53%	54%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				67%	77%	72%	48%	66%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	71%	60%	11%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2021					
	2019	55%	55%	0%	54%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
07	2021					
	2019	60%	56%	4%	52%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2021					
	2019	68%	57%	11%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	75%	58%	17%	60%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2021					
	2019	74%	56%	18%	55%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
07	2021					
	2019	62%	55%	7%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
08	2021					
	2019	46%	30%	16%	46%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	59%	52%	7%	53%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	36%	28%	8%	48%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	67%	71%	-4%	71%	-4%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	91%	50%	41%	61%	30%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	43	49	23	35	29	24	31	50			
BLK	44	42	30	37	21	25	31	47	41		
HSP	50	50		44	39						
MUL	68	53		58	16						
WHT	57	45	34	62	28	29	55	68	63		
FRL	48	42	29	45	26	22	42	62	37		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	44	52	40	44	58	50	48	33			
BLK	51	45	52	60	61	52	20	67	83		
HSP	47	56		44	61		25				
MUL	62	81		57	90		36				
WHT	69	60	54	73	69	59	57	68	81		

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
FRL	60	53	51	66	66	64	47	60	79		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	35	46	46	34	33	18	45	53			
BLK	37	53	52	46	42	43	38	22			
HSP	50	50		44	47						
MUL	39	40		32	40	42		17			
WHT	57	56	49	57	46	44	58	60	61		
FRL	47	54	52	49	46	50	40	39	50		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
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	409
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	49
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Loss of instruction due to Covid-19. We had attendance issues of students, faculty, and staff. We had students enrolled online through the District platform. We had students enrolled online through home ed programs. We had students failing online that were required to reenter brick and mortar with much loss of education.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Reading. We implemented Intensive Reading into the daily schedule for Level 1 FSA Spring 2021 scores.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors to this need for improvement were based upon the loss of instruction through the Covid-19 pandemic. The actions needed to address this loss of instruction was to add intensive reading to our daily schedule for FSA Level 1 Reading and progress monitoring through iReady and STAR.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science showed the most improvement 2019 48% / 2021 50%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

A contributing factor is 5th gr remains self-contained for all subjects. The transition time between switching classes is eliminated and gives opportunities for seamless instruction without loss of minutes transitioning. New actions for 21-22 school year are reading endorsement has been obtained by 50% of the 5th grade teachers.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Data driven instruction and implementation of school wide PLC's and opportunities for PD.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Preplanning PD's for PLC's, monitoring the PLC's with cross support with the Administration Team and progress monitoring programs in person and online training. .

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Continue to build on the PLC's and continue training and overseeing the student data trends.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	Grand Ridge School would like to see an overall ELA Proficiency 58 %, ELA learning gains for all students at 45% proficiency and the lowest 25 percentile with 5% learning gains. Data was reviewed form the 2021 FSA.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Grand Ridge School would like to see 2022 ELA achievement for all grades increase from 55% to 58%, ELA learning gains for all ELA students increase from 45% to 50% and the lowest 25th percentile increase from 33% to 38%.
Monitoring:	Literacy Leadership will evaluate the data from iReady, STAR, and Lexia Power Up for progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Steve Dewitt (steve.dewitt@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. i-Ready program 2. Intensive Reading 3. Lexia Power-up 4. STAR 5. Coachbooks 6. Ready books
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proven effective strategy based on data. 2. Access to multiple methods of instruction, small and individual learning groups. 3. Rtl/MTSS supported by FLDOE as an evidence based strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will use i-Ready, STAR, Lexia Power Up within instructional minutes.
2. Teachers will use i-Ready, STAR, & Lexia Power Up to develop small group instruction.
3. Teachers will use supplements from i-Ready, Lexia Power Up & STAR for Tier 2 small group instruction.
4. Monitor implementation of small group & individual instructional practices.
5. Implement Coach books and Ready iReady books.
6. Establish remediation time in the daily schedule.
7. Intensive Reading classes for Level 1 FSA.
8. Utilize staff to support enrichment & remediation.
9. Monitor Rtl/MTSS process.

Person Responsible Steve Dewitt (steve.dewitt@jcsb.org)

Intensive Reading- Lexia Powerup

Person Responsible Steve Dewitt (steve.dewitt@jcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Grand Ridge School would like to see an overall math proficiency at 58%, math learning gains for all grades at 35%, lowest 25th percentile increase to 30% and Algebra 1 EOC results 80%. Data was reviewed from the 2021 FSA and EOC results.

Measurable Outcome: Grand Ridge School would like to see an overall math proficiency increase from 56% to 58% or higher. Overall math learning gains increase from 27% to 35% or higher and the lowest 25th percentile increase from 25% to 30% or higher. Algebra 1 EOC results to maintain at 78% or above.

Monitoring: Leadership Team will evaluate the data from iReadyMath, Imagine Math, and IXL Math for progress monitoring.
 Algebra 1 class options for 2 methods of learners: accelerated Alg 1 learners and at pace Alg 1 learners.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Steve Dewitt (steve.dewitt@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Differentiate instruction.
2. MTSS/Rtl process
3. iReady instructional support and diagnostic assessments.
4. Imagine Math and diagnostic assessments.
5. IXL Math
6. Coach books / Math

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Students will have access to multiple methods of instruction: small & individual learning groups.
2. iReady and Imagine Math data.
3. MTSS/Rtl that is supported by FLDOE as an evidence based strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor implementation of small & individual instructional practices.
2. Implement iReady, Imagine Math, Coach books as well as supplemental resources for classroom instruction.
3. Implement remediation time in the schedule.
4. Utilize staff to support remediation.
5. Monitor MTSS/Rtl process.
6. Apply for JCEA Admin grant to obtain grant money for Imagine Math Training 3 online sessions for 6th-8th gr online training.

Person Responsible Steve Dewitt (steve.dewitt@jcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improve student performance on FSA science assessment. 2021 proficiency was 50%.
Measurable Outcome:	Student achievement performance will be at 51% or higher on the 2022 science achievement FSA assessment.
Monitoring:	Leadership Team will evaluate the data from IXL science, Flocabulary and Coach Science books for use with fidelity.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Steve Dewitt (steve.dewitt@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Curriculum mapping, teacher training, reading endorsing comps / PD. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. District curriculum mapping and training for implementation. 2. Coach books/ Science 3. IXL / Science 4. Vocabulary: Reading endorsing comps and PD 5. Vocabulary: Flocabulary 8th gr
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor implementation of small & individual instructional practices.
2. Implement Coach/Science books, Flocabulary & IXL Science as well as supplemental resources for classroom instruction.
3. Utilize staff to support remediation.

Person Responsible Steve Dewitt (steve.dewitt@jcsb.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To maintain or increase student achievement on Civics EOC. 2021 Proficiency was 64%.
Measurable Outcome:	Maintain at 64% or increase student performance on the 2022 Civics EOC assessment.
Monitoring:	Leadership Team will evaluate the data from IXL Social Studies for use with fidelity.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Differentiate instruction. 2. IXL Social Studies 3. Vocabulary: Teacher will use vocabulary strategies learned from Kathy Orapallo reading PD.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Different methods of instruction--such as small learning groups and individual learning groups. 2. IXL Social Studies 3. Vocabulary PD strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor implementation of small & individual instructional practices.
2. Implement IXL Social Studies as well as supplemental resources for classroom instruction.
3. Utilize staff to support remediation.

Person Responsible Steve Dewitt (steve.dewitt@jcsb.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To select a better industry cert to better suit the needs of our school and students. To assist with middle school acceleration currently at 54%
Measurable Outcome:	increase student participation from 0% completers to 40% completers and passage of industry certification exams from 0% to 40%.
Monitoring:	School leadership team and District CTE Director will maintain and monitor monthly the appropriate exams as well as curriculum and materials for preparation are being used with fidelity.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use CAERT lessons and strategies. 2. Standards based lessons. 3. Lab activities shown through lesson plans. 4. Socrates test prep
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Different methods of instruction--such as small learning groups and individual learning groups. 2. Lab activities usage. 3. Socrates test prep

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Attendance and SESIR reporting will be monitored as part of the overall discipline data review.

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.

Grand Ridge School builds and sustains positive partnerships with local stakeholders in order to establish and maintain meaningful relationships while ensuring that all stakeholders have the same vision for the school and its achievements. Stakeholders are invited to SAC meetings to address concerns, promote the school vision as well as give vital input towards strategies for school improvement. Efforts between the school and community are data driven and directly affect the school as well as student achievement. The school continuously provides information through multiple outlets such as: school website, school Facebook page, The Tribal Newsletter, PLC meetings, grade group letters, Remind contact, and school email. Grand Ridge School creates a positive environment where students feel safe with the use of: school campus cameras, perimeter fencing, and Jackson Co Law Enforcement officer. Students are trained in internet safety and parent and students are asked to sign an acceptable use policy. Parents, students and teachers are asked to sign a student accountability compact agreement. Student handbooks are available for all students and parents. Students have access to a campus Mental Health counselor for emergent needs and referral based thereafter. Teachers are trained for anti-bullying, hazardous spills and active shooter events. Students are continuously supervised during school hours.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Faculty, staff, local business organization, Student Advisory Counsel (SAC), students and parents. The school completes a Parent 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: Career & Technical Education	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00