Nassau County School District

Fernandina Beach High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Fernandina Beach High School

435 CITRONA DR, Fernandina Beach, FL 32034

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Chris Webber Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

Active High School 9-12 K-12 General Education No [Data Not Available] ck/African American Students conomically Disadvantaged Students cylish Language Learners panic Students ltiracial Students dents With Disabilities ite Students 2018-19: A (71%)
8-12 K-12 General Education No [Data Not Available] ck/African American Students chomically Disadvantaged Students glish Language Learners panic Students ltiracial Students dents With Disabilities ite Students
[Data Not Available] ck/African American Students onomically Disadvantaged Students glish Language Learners panic Students ltiracial Students dents With Disabilities ite Students
[Data Not Available] ck/African American Students chomically Disadvantaged Students glish Language Learners panic Students ltiracial Students dents With Disabilities ite Students
ck/African American Students chomically Disadvantaged Students glish Language Learners panic Students ltiracial Students dents With Disabilities ite Students
pnomically Disadvantaged Students glish Language Learners panic Students Itiracial Students dents With Disabilities ite Students
2018-19: A (71%)
2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (66%)
nformation*
Northeast
<u>Dustin Sims</u>
N/A
[not available]

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Nassau 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Fernandina Beach High School's mission is to develop each student as an inspired life-long learner and problem solver with the strength of character to serve as a productive member of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fernandina Beach High School will provide a safe and productive learning environment in which students can communicate effectively, think critically, solve problems and are technologically literate through a variety of curricular and extra-curricular activities. Through a challenging course of study with high standards, students will become responsible learners who can not only work collaboratively, but also be accountable for their own academic and developmental progress.

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
Webber, Chris	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Chris Webber

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.

50

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

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

985

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

1

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

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator							Gra	ade	e L	evel				Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	273	239	251	218	981
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	8	4	3	1	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	6	4	14	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	19	22	10	88
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	29	0	0	51
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						Gr	ade	e Le	evel					Total
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal
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														
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Retained Students: Current Year	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		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/7/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator		Grade Level													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Number of students enrolled	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	236	255	211	246	955	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	49	36	56	175	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	1	0	13	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	9	10	38	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	8	6	29	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	14	12	16	70	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	13	11	15	59	

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

Indicator						Gr	ade	e Le	vel					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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														
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Retained Students: Current Year	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		

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator		Grade Level													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Number of students enrolled	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	236	255	211	246	955	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	49	36	56	175	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	1	0	13	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	9	10	38	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	8	6	29	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	14	12	16	70	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	13	11	15	59	

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

Indicator						Gr	ade	e Le	vel					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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														
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Retained Students: Current Year	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		

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).

Sahaal Grada Component		2021			2019		2018		
School Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	69%			71%	65%	56%	69%	66%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	62%			61%	55%	51%	62%	58%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%			42%	38%	42%	58%	49%	44%
Math Achievement	65%			71%	64%	51%	67%	64%	51%
Math Learning Gains	40%			56%	54%	48%	53%	55%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%			65%	52%	45%	46%	52%	45%
Science Achievement	81%			93%	84%	68%	77%	78%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	82%			80%	80%	73%	81%	80%	71%

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					
09	2021										
	2019	72%	65%	7%	55%	17%					
Cohort Co	mparison										
10	2021										
	2019	67%	64%	3%	53%	14%					
Cohort Comparison		-72%									

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

SCIENCE									
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison			

		BIOLO	GY EOC		
Year	ear School Dis		School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	91%	84%	7%	67%	24%
		CIVIC	S EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
		HISTO	RY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	79%	82%	-3%	70%	9%
		ALGEE	RA EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	60%	74%	-14%	61%	-1%
		GEOME	TRY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	77%	68%	9%	57%	20%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

		Grade 9		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

		Grade 10		
	Niconale 10/	Graue 10		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

		Grade 11		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

		Grade 12		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

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	30	40	29	55	43	15	59	50		90	28
ELL	24	53	50	13							
BLK	58	47	35	47	31		72	62		89	48
HSP	51	53	47	44	20	9	61	53		84	69
MUL	64	75		65	25		91				

		2021	SCHOO	DL GRAD	E COMP	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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
WHT	73	64	47	73	46	41	84	89		96	75
FRL	58	56	47	52	35	32	73	70		89	49
		2019	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMP	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	46	48	38	42	64		100	96		95	33
BLK	42	44	20	61	64	80	80	65		69	55
HSP	53	47	44	52	47			63		71	58
MUL	66	70		55	62		100			91	70
WHT	78	65	53	77	56	59	92	88		94	80
FRL	58	57	38	53	49	62	85	67		79	65
		2018	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMP	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	58	69	63	70	58		70			75	22
ELL	27	50	46	23			20				
BLK	40	68	67	53	42		45	70		79	58
HSP	49	56	45	52	64		56			86	68
MUL	67	43		50	55		70			71	90
WHT	77	62	58	72	53	49	86	85		91	70
FRL	49	61	63	54	51	42	62	77		77	52

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)	[not available]					
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63					
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	46					
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	688					
Total Components for the Federal Index	11					
Percent Tested	97%					

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44

Students With Disabilities	
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	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	54
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	49
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	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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?

Student absences across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas are affecting improvement in scores.

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

The greatest decline from the 2019 state assessments was the ELA lowest 25% students. The contributing factors were a lack of students understanding in the "key ideas and details" strand of the FSA ELA assessment.

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

Lack of student attendance was a major contributing factor. New actions would be to communicate more effectively with parents and guardians to ensure students come to school.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in our math lowest 25th percentile as we were 20% higher than the state average and a 19% improvement from last years scores.

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

Some of the actions were that we provided more support facilitation in these classes, we offered more tutoring times, and we assigned some of our veteran teachers to these classes.

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

More consistent and timely progress monitoring.

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.

STAR and IXL training professional development opportunities will be provided so teachers have a better understanding of the progress monitoring tools that we will use.

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

Teacher collaborative planning days will be provided for data review and lesson planning. MTSS monitoring of at risk students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measureable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

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.

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

	Part V: Budget				
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Select below:	\$0.00		
	•	Total:	\$0.00		