

Nassau County School District

Yulee Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Yulee Middle School

85439 MINER RD, Yulee, FL 32097

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: George Raysor

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
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 Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Raysor, George	Principal	Raysor, George- Principal of Yulee Middle School Middleton, Tara - Assistant Principal of Yulee Middle School Smith, Kristen- Dean of Students of Yulee Middle School Davidson, Heather- Instructional Coach Reading Coach and MTSS Co-Lead Glover-Crosby, Debra -Teacher, K-12 Science Department Chair Smith, Anna -Teacher, K-12 Math Co-Department Chair Elwell, Chrissy -Teacher, ESE Department Chair Koenig, Ricci -Teacher, K-12 Social Studies Department Chair
Middleton, Tara	Assistant Principal	
Smith, Kristen	Dean	
Amos, Lori	Assistant Principal	
Davidson, Heather	Instructional Coach	
Glover-Crosby, Debra	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Anna	Teacher, K-12	
Elwell, Chrissy	Teacher, ESE	
Koenig, Ricci	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, George Raysor

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.*

1

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

69

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,094

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

2

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

15

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	0	379	352	361	0	0	0	0	1092
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	94	109	0	0	0	0	308
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	18	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	1	16	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	39	54	0	0	0	0	117
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	34	32	0	0	0	0	83
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	27	28	45	0	0	0	0	100

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/22/2021

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	0	347	346	350	0	0	0	0	1043
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	31	27	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	40	58	0	0	0	0	112
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	8	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	30	51	0	0	0	0	112
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	21	40	0	0	0	0	93

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	25	49	0	0	0	0	95

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

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	0	347	346	350	0	0	0	0	1043
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	31	27	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	40	58	0	0	0	0	112
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	8	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	30	51	0	0	0	0	112
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	21	40	0	0	0	0	93

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	25	49	0	0	0	0	95

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

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).

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
06	2021					
	2019	56%	63%	-7%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	55%	59%	-4%	52%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
08	2021					
	2019	63%	65%	-2%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	61%	71%	-10%	55%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	74%	76%	-2%	54%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
08	2021					
	2019	67%	62%	5%	46%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	63%	60%	3%	48%	15%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	69%	72%	-3%	71%	-2%

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	99%	74%	25%	61%	38%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Star is the progress monitoring tool used in Nassau County for reading and math. District level Common Assessments have been created for Science and Civics.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71		
	Economically Disadvantaged	0		
	Students With Disabilities	4		
	English Language Learners	0		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71		
	Economically Disadvantaged	9		
	Students With Disabilities	0		
	English Language Learners	0		
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	62		
	Economically Disadvantaged	0		
	Students With Disabilities	5		
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71		
	Economically Disadvantaged	21		
	Students With Disabilities	5		
	English Language Learners	0		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	1.57		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4		
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71		
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.8		
	Students With Disabilities	4		
	English Language Learners	0		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	29		
	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
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	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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 Review

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 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?

The lowest 25th percentile students struggle across all content areas with a high emphasis on reading.

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

Our lowest 25th percentile in English Language Arts demonstrates the greatest need.

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

Our lowest 25th percentile in English Language Arts consist of a large percentage of students with a specific learning disability which causes many challenges. However, using incentives to generate interest in students who are not intrinsically motivated about learning as well as selecting high interest text to address complex standards. In addition to incentives and high interest text, teachers across all content areas have to consistently embed reading strategies to assist students with improving their comprehension skills which will ultimately lead to building confidence and improving performance.

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

Based on our most recent FSA data, YMS' data showed marginal growth compared to 2019 FSA data. However, the following data components did reflect an increase: English Language Arts (+3), ELA Learning Gains(+7), Mathematics(+4), and Social Studies (+5)

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

During the 2019-2020 school year, we started implementing a 90 minute ELA and Mathematics block as well as providing teachers with specifics guidance regarding instruction. Teachers had more time to delve into the standards and differentiate their resources to meet the needs of all students. In addition to more time, teachers had common planning with their peers which allowed them to meet to discuss best practices. This proved to be an effective strategy based on our progress monitoring data and FSA scores.

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

Teachers will need to be consistent with the following:

1. Utilize data to drive their instruction.
2. Use standard based resources.
3. Implement effective engagement strategies to reach all learners.
4. Scaffold their lessons.
5. Build knowledge and vocabulary.
6. Prioritizing standards.
7. Diagnosing essential missed learning.

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.

Teachers will consistently receive feedback from administration. Our reading coach will provide individualized support as needed as well as conduct non-evaluative observations to assist with honing their skills. Administration will work with district level personnel to provide guidance to ensure teachers have the support needed. All new teachers will participate in monthly after school professional development meetings provided by the K-8 Director and support personnel. Administration will participate in monthly Principals' meetings and "Working Wednesdays" which is a new Professional Learning Communities.

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

Data will continue to be used to determine professional development needs at Yulee Middle School. All first year teachers will be required to participate in school level and district provided meetings.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: YMS 2018-2019 and 2020-2021 FSA ELA Learning Gains of the lowest 25th percentile was at or below 40%.

Measureable Outcome: The Learning Gains of our lowest 25th percentile in ELA will improve by 5%.

Monitoring: Star is used as a progress monitoring tool in Nassau county. All targeted students will be administered the Star monthly by our testing team. This data will be used to track their progress towards proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers are using Savvas books during whole group instruction in addition to research based supplemental resources. The newly adopted Savvas book contains anchor text that aligns closer to the complexity level of text on the FSA as well as the standard(s). Our small group model will allow teachers to scaffold their instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The past spring the district created a review team that participated in presentations by all publishers with a textbook approved by the state. Our team decided on Savvas because of the layout of the text, the supporting novels suggested by the state that aligned with the B.E.S.T standards. The B.E.S.T standards have a big emphasis on authentic text which will be addressed through the anchor text in the textbook and novels.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increased time for ESE teacher in ELA block.
2. Data from Star will be used monthly for monitor progress.
3. Implementation of after school tutoring.
4. Professional development for teachers.
5. 90 minute ELA block.

Person Responsible George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: For the 2019 and 2021 tested year, our ESE population has performed below 41%(19% of our SLD population were proficient 19/99 in 2021).

Measureable Outcome: 42% of our ESE population will score at or above a level 3.

Monitoring: Students performance on standard based assessments as well as Star data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our ESE teachers are using the Leveled Literacy Intervention system with our ESE students when working in small groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This system is researched-based with proven success regarding closing the achievement gaps specifically focusing on foundational skills.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based off of the ELL performance of the 2021 FSA, ELL students performed higher in Math than ELA with 57% of the students demonstrating proficiency. However, in ELA, 50% of the ELL students who participated in the FSA scored a level 2; 50% scored a level 1.

Measureable Outcome: 42% of the ELL students will perform at or above a level 3 on the FSA ELA assessment.

Monitoring: Students will be monitored on their performance utilizing monthly STAR Data assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing data from WIDA and/or the IPT assessment, the ELA teacher will implement the LEP Plan and deliver individualized instruction to the ELL students that will help improve the students understanding and use of the English language.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: For the past year, ELL students have performed below expectations. Providing instruction that helps students diminish the language barrier will allow the ELL students to understand the English language text and instruction. As a result, ELL student performance levels will improve.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Strategically scheduling ELL students with ESOL certified teachers.
2. Specific expectations in regards to planning and classroom responsibilities. Teachers will work with the peers on early release days to create lesson plans focused on meeting all students needs. Small groups will consistently be implemented during ELA and Mathematics blocks. This will give teachers the opportunity to differentiate their instruction and provide specific feedback.
3. Utilizing the district ESOL support personnel for professional development.
4. Data from STAR will be used monthly to monitor progress.
5. Implementation of after-school tutoring.
6. 90-minute ELA Block.
7. Professional Development from the district ESOL Coach.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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.

Based off of the Safe Schools for Alex dashboard, YMS reported 2.9 incidents per 100 students, which falls into the moderate category when compared to all middle/junior schools state-wide. The area slightly elevated for YMS was Drug/ Public Order Incidents with a rate of 2.37 per 100 students. YMS has enacted the following various school-wide strategies to reduce the rate of incidents:

- * Implementation of Social-Emotional Learning within the first period classroom for ALL students. YMS utilizes The Advisory Program to educate students in the area of social skills and responsible citizenship.**
- * YMS strategically places adults across campus during all class changes and non-academic student movement times from bell to bell.**
- * The Dean of Students oversees a discipline committee and has implemented a strategic disciplinary program and faculty and staff have been provided professional development for implementation of the program.**
- * The School Resource Officer is present during all school and extracurricular games and events.**
- * Starting Point provides on-campus life skills through a program known as RIPPLE.**

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.

Yulee Middle School hosts strategically planned due to COVID where safety measures are adhered to. Such as:

- * Back to School Campus Preview
- * Open House
- * Homecoming Events
- * Family Night Band Concert
- * Weekly Faculty and Staff Hornet Huddle to share positive classroom success stories.
- * Monthly Breakfast for Faculty and Staff
- * Utilizes variety of communication formats to all stakeholders including: Facebook, updated school website, Remind, School Reach, and FOCUS (parent/teacher/student portal for the reporting of grades, attendance,

and data).

- * Notifications posted on the school marquee for upcoming events.
- * Infraction Free Friday rewarding students for positive behaviors each nine weeks.

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

- * YMS employs two school counselors and one social worker who collaborate daily and work cohesively to promote positive mental health among the students, faculty, and staff.
- * Each One, Reach One Faculty/Student Mentorship Program where a faculty member is matched with a student to build a strong relationship and provide encouragement.
- * The School Advisory Committee meets throughout the year to discuss student performance, events, and progress towards meeting goals outlined in the School Improvement Plan.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00