

Nassau County School District

Yulee Middle School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	14
Budget to Support Goals	17

Yulee Middle School

85439 MINER RD, Yulee, FL 32097

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: George Raysor

Start Date for this Principal: 9/25/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: B 2016-17: B 2015-16: C 2014-15: B 2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	

Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 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

Our 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

At Yulee Middle School, our vision is to promote, support, and afford students with the opportunity to become productive members of society and life-long learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Raysor, George	Principal	
Middleton, Tara	Assistant Principal	
Ariatti, Tarin	Instructional Coach	
Fletcher, Kelly	Guidance Counselor	
Hightower, Deondra	Guidance Counselor	
Gillette, Cedric	Dean	SAC- Co-Chair
Davidson, Heather	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Head
Planz, Jaclyn	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair
Reynolds, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Head

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	357	364	331	0	0	0	0	1052
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	50	39	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	4	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	34	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	76	60	0	0	0	0	179
	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	8	23	20	0	0	0	51

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

69

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/25/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	55	44	0	0	0	0	145
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	73	58	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	76	60	0	0	0	0	179

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	21	48	37	0	0	0	0	106

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	59%	64%	54%	58%	63%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	53%	54%	54%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	44%	47%	45%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	71%	74%	58%	64%	68%	58%
Math Learning Gains	65%	62%	57%	57%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	56%	51%	47%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	64%	51%	56%	61%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	72%	72%	72%	66%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	357 (0)	364 (0)	331 (0)	1052 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	27 ()	50 ()	39 ()	116 (0)
One or more suspensions	6 ()	18 ()	4 ()	28 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	6 ()	14 ()	34 ()	54 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	43 ()	76 ()	60 ()	179 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	56%	63%	-7%	54%	2%
	2018	60%	64%	-4%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	55%	59%	-4%	52%	3%
	2018	52%	57%	-5%	51%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	63%	65%	-2%	56%	7%
	2018	63%	68%	-5%	58%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	61%	71%	-10%	55%	6%
	2018	52%	64%	-12%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	74%	76%	-2%	54%	20%
	2018	67%	70%	-3%	54%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
08	2019	67%	62%	5%	46%	21%
	2018	68%	60%	8%	45%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	63%	60%	3%	48%	15%
	2018	56%	60%	-4%	50%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	72%	-3%	71%	-2%
2018	77%	67%	10%	71%	6%
Compare		-8%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	74%	25%	61%	38%
2018	100%	77%	23%	62%	38%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	59%	-59%	56%	-56%

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	33	24	31	44	45	40	24	8		
ELL		30			50						
ASN	80	69		87	62						
BLK	35	39	34	55	61	61	45	68			
HSP	50	51	40	67	65	67	41	62			
MUL	57	34	50	72	66	64	62	85			
WHT	62	56	40	72	65	57	68	71	49		
FRL	48	47	38	62	59	54	55	59	33		

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	17	37	37	29	44	38	21	41			
ELL		43	55	33	36	36					
ASN	80	64		80	55						
BLK	51	49	39	45	49	38	39	45	36		
HSP	46	60	71	66	56	50	36	80	18		
MUL	60	54	40	65	47	60	50	62			
WHT	60	53	43	66	59	48	60	74	34		
FRL	48	51	46	54	52	41	46	63	26		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	533
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	40
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	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	55
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	61
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	
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	60
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	51
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

Our SWD subgroup performed the lowest based on our 2018-2019 FSA results. Scheduling and clear expectations in regards to effective "gap instruction" were the primary barrier for YMS last year. However, our scores did reflect a 6% improvement from the previous year.

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

Our greatest decline was our our Black subgroup with a 16% decrease in reading high achievement. Time was a critical issue as teachers did not have sufficient time to hit the complexity level of the standards. In addition, supplemental resources were limited for teachers.

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

All grades 6-8 performed higher than the state average in both reading and math. However, our Civics EOC was 1% below the state's average. Resources and time have been a barrier for Yulee Middle School.

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

Our percentage of 6th graders performing at or above grade level improved by 7% from the previous year. We contribute our success to planning more collaboratively within our grade level as well as teachers implementing lessons that consistently reflects the complexity of the standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

One or more suspensions in 7th grade is an area of concern. Last year, there were 78 one or more suspensions.

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

1. Increasing the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level on FSA Reading.
2. Percentage of ESE students scoring at or above grade level.
3. Improve our FCAT Science by 7% from previous year.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	FSA Reading Proficiency
Rationale	YMS 2018-2019 FSA Reading data in reading for 6th and 7th grade was below 60%. Our 7th grade students have performed below 60% for the last 5 years as a whole.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	This year in 6th, 7th and 8th (intensive classes) grades we have a 90 minute instructional block with emphasis on a small group model. This model has proven to be effective and provides teachers with the opportunity to meet with students daily in a small group. The approach enables teachers to hone in on students' deficiencies with fidelity.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will be using Ready books during whole group instruction, selecting anchor text that aligns more to the complexity of the standard(s), and using small groups to differentiate instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The complexity level of text in the Ready book aligns closer to the text students will be exposed to during state testing. Intentionally selecting resources that correlate closer to the standards provides teachers with the best opportunity to assist their students in maximizing their potential. Based on data from the past 5 years, it is evident changes needed to be made.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Longer Instructional block in ELA/Reading. 2. Implementation of iReady Diagnostic for Level 1's and 2's. 3. Increased time for ESE teacher in ELA block. 4. Data from STAR, iReady, Leveled Literacy Intervention to prescribe differentiated instruction. 5. Professional Development for ESE and ELA teachers.
Person Responsible	George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Students With Disabilities
Rationale	For two consecutive years, our ESE population has performed below 41%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	42% percent of our ESE population will score at or above a level 3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilizing data to provide prescribed gap instruction. ESE teachers scheduled to be in class with ESE students for 45 minutes each day to provide services to students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	For two consecutive years, our ESE population has performed below expectations. Reviewing schedules and observations determined a change was essential.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strategically scheduling ESE teachers 2. Professional Development 3. Specific expectations in regards to planning and classroom responsibilities. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

School staff, faculty, and administrators strive to strengthen family involvement and family empowerment in the school. The school will coordinate and integrate parental involvement strategies with School Improvement, Strategic Planning, Title I, Title II, Title IV, Title VI, Community Involvement Programs, Business Partnerships, and other community involvement activities.

The school will provide the coordination, technical assistance, and other support necessary

to assist in planning and implementing effective and comprehensive parent involvement programs, based on the National Standards for Parent/Family Involvement Programs, which include:

- A. Communication between home and school is regular, two-way and meaningful.
- B. Responsible parenting is promoted and supported.
- C. Parents play an integral role in assisting student learning. The School will help parents understand the state's academic standards, student progression requirements, and how to monitor their children's progress.
- D. Parents are welcome in school, treated with courtesy and respect, and their support and assistance are sought.
- E. Parents are full partners in the decisions that affect children and families.
- F. Community resources are utilized to strengthen school programs, family practices, and student learning.

The school will communicate parental choices and responsibilities to parents. Emphasis will be placed on active parent involvement at each school. The following are examples of family and community involvement communication:

- Open House
- School web page and social media such as Facebook
- Focus
- Newsletters communicating classroom and school news to parents
- Parent phone calls, School Remind, and face-to face meetings
- College and Career Fairs
- School Matters Publication

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

School based teams meet to discuss students with barriers to academic and social success.

Mentors are assigned to students identified with concerns.

School-wide recognition systems which includes PBIS are in place.

Offer instruction and various campus activities that address social/emotional needs of students.

Connect students to agencies who have Cooperative Agreements or are on campus.

School counseling program with dedicated time to: 1. Assess the needs of the students and the barriers blocking their success (Data-Driven Decision Making), 2. Identify interventions that the research suggests works to remove the barrier to success (Evidence-Based Intervention), and 3. Evaluate your intervention (Evaluation)

Engage with identified staff (i.e. school counselor, school-based team leader) to provide a differentiated delivery of services based on student/school need. (Include core, supplemental, and intensive supports.)

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

Each school holds student/parent orientation meetings to assist with the transitioning from one school level to another. The Student Progression Plan and student handbook is distributed and reviewed.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

The school's leadership team oversees the implementation and monitoring of its MTSS and SIP structures through data-based decision making which identifies areas of deficit and identifies and provides supports and resources needed to address those deficits.

Leading questions: Is our core instruction meeting the needs of 75-80 % of our students? If not, is it a curriculum or instruction issue? Are certain groups of students failing to meet expectations in certain subjects? Or, are there certain groups who have other non-academic barriers to achievement that must be addressed before they will be able to meet academic success?

Title II

The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:

- training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher Program
- training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL training and substitute release time for Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation

Title III

The District provides supplemental academic instruction and services to students who are ELL. The district employs an ELL instructional coach.

Title X- A portion of funds are set aside and reserved to meet the academic and personal needs of identified homeless families. These needs could include academic supplies or assistance with personal hygiene items, or referrals to social service agencies.

Violence Prevention Programs:

The District has adopted bullying prevention and intervention policies and procedures. Each year training is provided.

Career and Technical Education

Articulation agreements allow students to earn college and postsecondary technical credits in high school and provide more opportunities for students to work towards postsecondary degrees.

Students will gain an understanding of business and industry workforce requirements by acquiring Ready to Work and other industry certifications. Readiness for postsecondary opportunities will strengthen with the integration of academic and career and technical education components and a coherent sequence of courses.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

Efforts to support the development of students' academic and career plans include; large group presentations, classroom presentations, individual conferences with students throughout their secondary school careers, Career Fairs and college Board partnership through PSAT 8.

Part V: Budget						
1	III.A	Areas of Focus: FSA Reading Proficiency				\$25,870.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	510-Supplies	0221 - Yulee Middle School	General Fund	1.0	\$18,879.00
	7300	510-Supplies	0221 - Yulee Middle School	General Fund	1.0	\$4,991.00
	6200	612-Library Books for Existing Libraries	0221 - Yulee Middle School	General Fund	1.0	\$2,000.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Students With Disabilities				\$0.00
					Total:	\$25,870.00