

Nassau County School District

Yulee Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	15
Budget to Support Goals	15

Yulee Elementary School

86063 FELMOR RD, Yulee, FL 32097

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Bryce Cubbal

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	[Data Not Available]
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: B (59%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]

* 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

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
Cubbal, Bryce	Principal	Instructional leader of Yulee Elementary School. Facilitates monthly leadership meetings.
Grubbs, Vicki	Assistant Principal	Supports and assumes the role of the principal in his absence. A second instructional leader on campus
Watkins, Jessica	Reading Coach	Supports English Language Arts instruction and teachers at YES.
Scott, Carey	Teacher, K-12	Grade Chair.
Jones, kellie	Teacher, K-12	Grade Chair
Albury, Rachael	Teacher, K-12	Grade Chair
Page, Moya	Guidance Counselor	Support Testing and Student Services
Tate, Jonathan	Teacher, K-12	
Franklin, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	ESE Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Bryce Cubbal

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.*

2

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

687

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

9

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

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/24/2021

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	229	221	220	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	17	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	23	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	229	221	220	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	17	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	23	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

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	2021					
	2019	75%	75%	0%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	68%	-6%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	75%	-2%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	81%	83%	-2%	62%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	74%	81%	-7%	64%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2021					
	2019	82%	86%	-4%	60%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	70%	73%	-3%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady will be used to monitor Math and ELA. Edulastic MOY and EOY assessments will be used for Science.

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	119	174	197
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	103	173
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67	129	140
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42	118	174
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	81	130	155
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52	116	157
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	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				
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	36	43	41	52	58	41	41				
ELL	45			70							
BLK	56	38		64	73	60	29				
HSP	65	57		73	73						
MUL	64	41	27	78	63		73				
WHT	67	50	37	77	71	51	66				
FRL	58	49	35	69	68	54	51				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
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	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	518
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
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	50
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	71
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	68
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	71
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	71
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	
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	78
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	67
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?

Our lower quartile students in ELA performed the lowest school-wide, but more specifically 4th grade. It has been a trend over the last three years. Math achievement, learning gains and learning gains of lower quartile is significantly higher than ELA.

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

ELA Learning Gains of our lower quartile demonstrates the greatest need for improvement.

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 lower quartile students were not responding to our current instructional practices. We have revamped our instructional practices to better meet the needs of our lower quartile of students. We have begun looking at data closer and ever before to target our instruction. We are continuing Professional Development to our teachers to help support this instruction.

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

Our overall Math Learning Gains for Yulee Elementary have increased since 2019 at 68%, to 2021 at 84%. The Lowest Quartile Gains have increased since 2019 at 50% to 77%.

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

We completed weekly and monthly data analysis to better understand our students and their performance data. We completed weekly test item analysis, monthly data chats, and improved our instructional practices as they relate to planning and modeling for other teachers.

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

Targeted in-school support with small group instruction Tiered support as indicated in MTSS and supported by the A-Team. After school tutoring of our lower quartile with specific instruction based on area of need. Intervention Time (Hornet Time) utilized with students needing support of specific skills and standards

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 differentiation and instruction of vocabulary and comprehension for our ELA teachers. 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 to ensure we are progressing academically. We will also continue our weekly collaborative grade level meetings where teaching best practices are modeled and discussed.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

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.

According to the safeschoolsforAlex.org data, Yulee Elementary ranks significantly low compared to other elementary schools in the state of Florida. YES uses PBIS to provide each student with expectations, rewards, and consequences. School discipline data is analyzed each month during our A-Team meetings using our School Discipline Notices and Discipline Referrals from FOCUS. Students are provided interventions based on the data that include: "Check-In Check-Out", " Check & Connect." If the behavior elevates beyond the use of a Tier 2 intervention, other resources are provided which may include a behavior plan, meetings with the counselor/ school psychologist, family support, community outreach, etc.

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.

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, Remind.

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

Stakeholder groups include instructional staff and non-instructional staff, students, and families of students, volunteers, Student 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.

Part V: Budget

Total:	\$118,997.00
---------------	---------------------