Yulee Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Yulee Elementary School

86063 FELMOR RD, Yulee, FL 32097

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Bryce Cubbal

Start Date for this Principal: 10/2/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School 3-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (65%) 2020-21: (74%) 2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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.

The vision of Yulee Elementary School is to establish a positive collaborative work culture that promotes and fosters teaching and learning among the community of learners. The school's instructional focus will be centered on the use of small groups and include differentiation for all students as well as the integration of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) within literacy blocks. Classroom instruction will include a strong emphasis on the development of a model for vocabulary instruction as well as the teaching of fluency and comprehension skills in Reading and Math blocks. Curriculum will also be spiraled on a daily basis.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Albury, Rachael	Teacher, K-12	Grade Chair
Jones, kellie	Teacher, K-12	Grade Chair
Franklin, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	ESE Chairperson
Goddard, Jessica	Reading Coach	Supports ELA instruction.
Tate, Jonathan	Teacher, K-12	PE Coach
szubelak, gloria	Teacher, K-12	Grade Chair.
Libby, Tara	Assistant Principal	Supports the Principal, instruction, and other school wide initiatives.
noll, michelle	Paraprofessional	Serves classrooms for instrucitonal support, aides in student supervision and is a represntative on our leadership team.
Page, Moya	Guidance Counselor	Listen to students' concerns about academic, emotional or social problems. Facilitates testing and supports other school level inititiaves.
Cubbal, Bryce	Principal	Coordinates administrative oversight and plans for all phases of instructional leadership for the school including educational programming, administration, budgetary planning, discipline, and counseling services.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 10/2/2022, Bryce Cubbal

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
7

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
27

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

638

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

11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	185	222	229	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	636
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	31	49	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	15	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	8	17	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/18/2022

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	231	225	227	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	683
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	53	54	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	29	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	31	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	32	16	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	9	6	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	10	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	231	225	227	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	683
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	53	54	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	29	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	31	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	32	16	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	9	6	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	10	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	67%	69%	56%	71%			71%	76%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	66%	61%	72%			63%	65%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	54%	52%	58%			45%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	78%	81%	60%	83%			80%	85%	63%
Math Learning Gains	68%	70%	64%	84%			68%	77%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	64%	55%	77%			50%	67%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	70%	51%	73%			71%	75%	53%

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
03	2022					
	2019	75%	75%	0%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2022					
	2019	62%	68%	-6%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2022					
	2019	73%	75%	-2%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2022					
	2019	81%	83%	-2%	62%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2022					
	2019	74%	81%	-7%	64%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2022					
	2019	82%	86%	-4%	60%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	70%	73%	-3%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	39	55	52	43	42	44	29				
ELL	38	60		56	70						
ASN	64	85		86	85						
BLK	49	46	55	65	54		29				
HSP	60	64		70	60						
MUL	70	70		78	70		80				
WHT	69	66	56	79	68	58	68				
FRL	57	60	48	67	60	50	53				

			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	45	61	67	63	68	67	36				
ELL	38			62							
ASN	65			76							
BLK	57	53		77	87		64				
HSP	67			77	80		60				
MUL	68	64		73	79		69				
WHT	73	77	67	85	84	81	76				
FRL	63	65	58	77	77	70	61				
			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	39	36	33	64	58	48	42				
ELL	42			75							
BLK	56	72		72	64		50				
HSP	67	54		76	57		68				
MUL	71	70		76	79	64	67				
WHT	72	62	41	81	68	51	74				
FRL	61	55	37	72	61	44	63				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	80
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	64
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	74
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	66
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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Our School wide FSA ELA Achievment percentage dropped 4% from a 71% in 2021 to 67% in 2022. Our School wide FSA Math Achievement percentage dropped 5% from 83% in 2021 to 78% in 2022. Although all grade levels dropped slightly the largest decrease was found in 3rd grade Math dropping from 80% in 2021 to 73% in 2022. There is still specific concern for 4th grade ELA scoring 65% in 2022. 4th grade scores over the past 4 years continue to land in the 60 percent range.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Although second highest in the County, ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains demonstrates the greatest need scoring 56%. Our Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains also show a great need for improvement scoring a 58% dropping from a 77% in 2021.

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 quartile students were not responding to our current instructional practices. We have since revamped our instrucitonal practices to better meet the needs of our lower quartile of students. We have disected our data, and instructional practices in order to offer better differentiatted instruction to our students. We are also continuing Professional Development to our teachers to help support this instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Non of our data components showed improvement, but our Lowest Quartile ELA learning gains showed the least amount of drop. 58% in 2021 to 56% in 2022.

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

We continue to perform weekly and monthly data analysis to better understand our students' performance data. Our data chats continue to improve so that productive instructional decisions can be made. Teacher support also continues as every grade level models lessons and instructional strategies weekly.

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

Targeted in school support using our small group instruction model, tiered support using our MTSS, and differentiated and scaffolded instruction. In addition, after school tutoring and in school support time that targets student deficits and standards based instruction.

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.

Professional Development focused on scaffolding, differentiated instruction, and the Science of Reading. We will continue to support best practices with all teachers through PLC, modeling, and classroom observations.

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

Additional services implemented include meeting monthly with our A-Team, Literacy and Math Committee, and Leadership Team to ensure we are progressing academically. We will also continue our weekly collaborative grade level meetings where teaching best practices are modeled and discussed.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Yulee Elementary will increase the total number of students performing at a proficiency level of 3 or higher on the 22-23 ELA State F.A.S.T. Assessment. Our overall ELA scores dropped compared to 20-21. Students becoming proficient readers is foundational for success in other subjects. If we continue to meet the needs of different subgroups, we will eventually improve proficiency for all.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Yulee Elementary will increase the total number of students performing at a proficency level of 3 or higher from 67% on 21-22 FSA to 72% on 22-23 ELA State F.A.S.T Assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will monitor our progress by dissecting our results from Progress Monitoring 1 of the F.A.S.T. Assessment. PM1 indicated 30% are at the proficiency level. We wil continue the same practice for PM2 as well. Finally, we will also analyze student grades on standards based classroom assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bryce Cubbal (cubbalbr@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Small Group Differentiated Instruction and Professional Development for Teachers in the Science of Reading.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	We must meet our students where they are academically. This will ensure learning gaps are filled so that we can move toward On Level instruction. We must also continue to provide Professional Development for Teachers in how to provide quality differentiated and scaffolded instruction. Teachers need to continue to learn engagement strategies as well as researched based Science of Reading instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Targeted in-school support with small group instruction
2. Tiered support as indicated in MTSS and supported by the A-Team
3. After school tutoring of our lower quartile with specific instruction based on area of need
4. Intervention Time (Hornet Time) utilized with students needing support of specific skills and standards
5. Incorporating a more direct use of the Gradual Release Model in small group instruction.
6. Incorporating researched-based Vocabulary Strategies.

Person Responsible   Bryce Cubbal (cubbalbr@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Yulee Elementary will increase the total number of students performing at a proficiency level of 3 or higher on the 22-23 Math State F.A.S.T Assessment. Our Math scores dropped compared to 20-21. Students becoming proficient in Math during Elementary Years helps ensure foundational knowledge is learned. If we continue to meet the needs of different subgroups, we will will eventually improve proficiency for all.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Yulee Elementary will increase the total number of students performing at a proficency level of 3 or higher from 78% in 2022 on the Math FSA to 83% on the 22-23 Math State F.A.S.T Assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will monitor our progress by dissecting our results from Progress Monitoring 1 of the F.A.S.T Assessment, PM1 indicated 7% are at the proficiency level. We will continue the same practice for PM2 as well. Finally, we will analyze student grades on standards based classroom assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bryce Cubbal (cubbalbr@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Small Group Differentiated instruction and Professional Development for teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	We must meed our students where they are academically. This will ensure learning gaps are filled so that we can move toward On Level instruction. We must also continue to provide Professional Development for Teachers in how to provide quality differentitated and scaffolded instruction. Teachers need to continue to learn engagement strategies as well as researched based Mathmetical Practices.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Targeted in-school support with small group instruction
2. Tiered support as indicated in MTSS and supported by the A-Team
3. After school tutoring of our lower quartile with specific instruction based on area of need
4. Intervention Time (Hornet Time) utilized with students needing support of specific skills and standards
5. Incorporating a more direct use of the Gradual Release Model in small group instruction.
6. Incorporating researched-based Vocabulary Strategies.

Person Responsible   Bryce Cubbal (cubbalbr@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our current data indicates that 94% of our students are attending school 90% or more of the current calendar days. Increasing student attendance will increase overall achievement. Students must be present in school to receive necessary doses of instruction, intervention and support.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By the end of the 2023 school year, 94% of YES students will attend 90% or more of school calendar days.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Attendance data indicating the students and the number of unexcused absences will be reviewed each month at our A-Team meeting.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bryce Cubbal (cubbalbr@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Parent communication will be used to bring awareness of attendance policy and to implement student, classroom, and school-wide positive incentives regarding attendance. In addition, procedures have been put in place for teachers to communicate with parents about their student's absences.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	It is evident that parent/student communication and incentives are needed to express the importance of attendance and the correlation to student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Positive reinforcement/incentives given to classes and students.

Person Responsible   Tara Libby (libbyta1@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Attendance Policy Communicated and Reminded periodically.

Person Responsible   Tara Libby (libbyta1@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Parent letters and phone calls from teachers following up on absences as well as providing instructional materials when necessary. Procedures are in place for teachers to follow-up on student absences.

Person Responsible   Tara Libby (libbyta1@nassau.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

NA

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

School staff, faculty, and administrators strive to strengthen parent involvement in the school which builds a positive school culture and environment. The school will coordinate and integrate parental involvement strategies including community involvement opportunities and business partnerships.
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, 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, Parent Nights (STEAM, Literacy)
• School Web Page
• Focus
• Newsletters communicating classroom and school news to parents
• Parent phone calls, Blackboard, and conferences, school marquee

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

Stakeholder groups include instructional staff and non-instructional staff, students, and families of students, volunteers, School Advisory Council members and District Office personnel. Additional stakeholder groups include after-school care providers, social services, and business partners. Stakeholder groups meet or are consulted to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment of our schools.