

Nassau County School District

Fernandina Beach Middle School



2020-21 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Fernandina Beach Middle School

315 CITRONA DR, Fernandina Beach, FL 32034

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Edward Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 10/18/2018

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)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (62%)
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.

The mission of the Nassau County School District and at Fernandina Beach Middle School 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.

Our vision at Fernandina Beach Middle School is to promote, support, and afford students 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
Benson, Kathryn	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Edward	Principal	
Thompson, Renee	Instructional Media	
Joshua, Bozeman	Teacher, K-12	
Bunch, Brenda	Guidance Counselor	
Mellin, Sandra	Instructional Coach	
Kindler, Ross	Teacher, K-12	
Miller, Murttavius	Guidance Counselor	
Jones, Bailee	Teacher, ESE	
Gillette, Cedric	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 10/18/2018, Edward Brown

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Demographic Data

2020-21 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)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (62%)
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 .	

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	207	216	231	0	0	0	0	654
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	39	48	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	11	15	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	65	40	0	0	0	0	149
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	73	65	0	0	0	0	194
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	55	68	0	0	0	0	176
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	31	61	0	0	0	0	129

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	52	55	63	0	0	0	0	170

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/26/2020

Prior Year - 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	222	216	253	0	0	0	0	691
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	50	53	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	11	23	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	10	22	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	49	33	0	0	0	0	128

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	20	21	27	0	0	0	0	68

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

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
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	216	253	0	0	0	0	691
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	50	53	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	11	23	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	10	22	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	49	33	0	0	0	0	128

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	20	21	27	0	0	0	0	68

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

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	69%	64%	54%	70%	63%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	53%	54%	59%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	44%	47%	42%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	78%	74%	58%	74%	68%	56%
Math Learning Gains	64%	62%	57%	65%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	56%	51%	43%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	66%	64%	51%	76%	68%	50%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	74%	72%	72%	80%	73%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	67%	63%	4%	54%	13%
	2018	70%	64%	6%	52%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	64%	59%	5%	52%	12%
	2018	65%	57%	8%	51%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2019	72%	65%	7%	56%	16%
	2018	71%	68%	3%	58%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	69%	71%	-2%	55%	14%
	2018	65%	64%	1%	52%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	81%	76%	5%	54%	27%
	2018	73%	70%	3%	54%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
08	2019	58%	62%	-4%	46%	12%
	2018	59%	60%	-1%	45%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	65%	60%	5%	48%	17%
	2018	64%	60%	4%	50%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	77%	72%	5%	71%	6%
2018	70%	67%	3%	71%	-1%
Compare		7%			

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	97%	74%	23%	61%	36%
2018	99%	77%	22%	62%	37%
Compare		-2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	34	44	36	31	48	41	36	26			
ELL	24	38	33	40	45	33	30				
BLK	56	61	54	56	55	50	40	61	58		

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
HSP	51	52	39	64	58	47	57	68	54		
MUL	67	52		70	82	58		65			
WHT	73	56	45	83	64	61	71	77	66		
FRL	53	51	47	65	63	54	54	59	45		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	35	55	48	31	48	44	38	35			
ELL	38	40	37	33	40	28					
BLK	54	56	47	51	51	37	39	59	27		
HSP	53	45	36	57	50	32	50	52			
MUL	59	52		60	74	64		67			
WHT	73	59	51	79	70	58	70	74	62		
FRL	55	53	46	56	58	52	51	55	34		
2017 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	26	52	41	26	42	32	39	41			
ELL	30	36		50	64						
BLK	41	45	42	54	54	27	65	44	50		
HSP	48	48	35	61	60	47	33	82			
MUL	56	59	54	53	41	21	50				
WHT	78	62	43	80	69	50	84	87	60		
FRL	51	52	41	58	55	38	60	70	28		

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	64
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	637
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
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	55
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	66
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

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 students with disabilities data was the lowest performing subgroup in 2019. We feel that a major contributing factor was the composition of our ESE personnel during this school year, as we did have a sizable proportion of long-term substitutes in our support facilitation roles due to hiring complexities. Our ESE support facilitation department had also faced significant turnover as staff transitioned into other key positions on campus as well. Nonetheless, we did have the blessing of hiring support facilitators to provide high-quality gap and grade-level instruction for our students with disabilities.

In reflecting early in the school year on how to serve our students with disabilities better, we also felt that our scheduling needed to be addressed in order to streamline support facilitation schedules to allow our ESE staff to support students the entire period in their core content areas. We believe that this change will contribute demonstrably to the learning gains and improvement of our work with our students with disabilities.

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

The eighth grade math scores showed the greatest decline from 2018-2019. Our math department was revamped due to teachers retiring and new teachers with fewer years of math experience were hired in eighth grade. Additionally, a larger percent, as compared to the previous year, of our eighth grade students took the Algebra 1 assessment with a 97% pass rate.

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.

The ELA lowest 25th percentile was 1 percent lower than the state average. A major factor was the growth of our ELL population that made up a portion of our lower percentile.

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

Math achievement overall and the math scores of the lowest 25th percentile showed the greatest improvement. Our new actions included more professional development in best management practices paired with intentional small group instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Students whose attendance is below 90% is our greatest area of concern due to lost instructional time.

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

1. Students with disabilities passing statewide test at or above 41%
2. ELL student population passing statewide test at or above 41%
3. Decreasing the number of students missing greater than 10% of instructional time
4. Overall ELA scores

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In 2019 our students with disabilities fell below a 41% passing rate on statewide testing. ELA achievement was 34% and math 31%.

Measureable Outcome: To improve the passing rate of our students with disabilities on statewide testing to 41% or above.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kathryn Benson (bensonka@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our evidence-based strategies include collaborative planning with our ESE teachers to help improve instruction and the use of IReady diagnostic program to identify levels to provide gap instruction . We will also use LLI and other teacher tool box kits, small group instruction and the constant monitoring of iReady and STAR data to ensure that our students with disabilities are making progress toward our 41% passing rate goal.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Better diagnostics tools will be used to better identify the specific needs of our students and provide gap instruction. The collaborative planning will allow our teachers to plan instruction that includes small groups to accommodate for gap instruction while following the district pacing guides.

Action Steps to Implement

- More Instructional support
- 2. Diagnostic testing
- 3. Increased progress monitoring
- 4. More gap instruction

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our growing ELL population is below the 41% on statewide testing. In 2019 our ELL student achievement was 24% on the statewide ELA test and 40% on the statewide math test.

Measureable Outcome: To improve passing rate of statewide testing of ELL students to above 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Edward Brown (edward.brown@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The implementation of a dedicated ELL reading course to improve reading proficiency. Diagnostic programs will be used to track progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our increased population of new ELL students who have not been exposed to any English education. The new course will be used as dedicated time to bridge the language gap.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use of Microsoft translator
2. More ELL instructional support
3. Increased diagnostic monitoring

Person Responsible Edward Brown (edward.brown@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

By creating a positive learning environment that is encouraging to students as well as providing enjoyable activities throughout the school year through our PBIS. Promote fun activities within the learning environment to motivate students to attend through positive events and programs.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The Fernandina Beach Middle School (FBMS) has a number of organizations devoted to positive school culture.

The School Advisory Council (SAC) meets once per month. Members include administrators, faculty, parents, students and community members. All parents and students are encouraged to come to the SAC meetings if they have questions or concerns about the the school. FBMS also has an active Parent Teacher Organization (PTO). During a typical year the PTO hosts a fall barbeque and desserts fundraiser for the community and All A luncheons and A/B honor roll donut parties to reward student effort. The PBIS team encourages positive student behavior with rewards for completing all assigned work and for a lack of disciplinary referrals. Additionally, the Student Council creates community awareness by hosting food and toy drives, raising money for breast cancer, and selling t-shirts to promote school spirit, which raises money for school improvement projects, including a new water bottle refilling station in 2020.

FBMS Faculty also participate in grade level, subject area and leadership teams. In grade level teams the faculty members have the opportunity to explore solutions to issues unique to that group on campus such as challenges facing sixth graders new to middle school. Subject area teams allow for common planning time for vertical planning and sharing resources. Lastly, our Team Leadership Committee (TLC) looks at the big picture and works on overall problem solving.

FBMS also has a number of faculty that provide support to students and other faculty members. Our guidance department and school social worker works one on one with students. Some students are assigned a special teacher for a "check-in/ check-out" intervention. This policy allows for additional daily emotional and academic support for at-risk students identified through the schools "A-Team" members. New teachers to FBMS are assigned mentors and participate in Pirate Pride Induction program.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

	Total: \$0.00
--	----------------------