Yulee Elementary School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Yulee Elementary School

86063 FELMOR RD, Yulee, FL 32097

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School 3-5	Yes	51%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	21%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	B	B	A	A*

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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 create a community of learners where students and teachers become lifelong learners so they are citizens of good character and contribute to society.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Raysor, George	Principal
Loudermilk, Celena	Assistant Principal
Watkins, Jessica	Teacher, K-12
Francis, Lindsey	Teacher, K-12
Franklin, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE
Norfleet, Rachel	Instructional Coach
Gio, Kim	School Counselor
Page, Moya	School Counselor
Renzelman, Robyn	Teacher, K-12
Wiggins, Emily	Teacher, K-12
Reid, Leslie	Teacher, K-12

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The school-based leadership team is responsible for disaggregating and analyzing data to determine areas of deficit. The team is to identify problems within the general population of students and within subgroups of students, analyze why the problems are occurring, formulate an intervention plan and then measure the effectiveness of the interventions through regular progress monitoring. Their plan to address and remediate areas of deficit becomes their MTSS and forms the basis for the school improvement plan.
The MTSS core team consists of: administrator, school counselor, literacy coach, department heads, and instructional coach. The MTSS leadership team is responsible for ensuring that the school has in place a system that provides increasingly intense and individualized interventions, resources and supports needed to meet the unique needs of its students.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
				Grade Level										
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	27	34	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	32	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected
Friday 9/28/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	40	51	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	37	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	40	51	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	37	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

ELA lowest 25th percentile performed the lowest in 2018. However, the previous year, it was our 25th percentile in math who performed the lowest.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

According to our 2018 FSA ELA results, our learning gains declined by 13%. In 2017, our learning gains were 62% and in 2018 we declined to 49%.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

In comparing our data to the state percentages, our ELA lowest 25th percentile was 12% below the state average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Our math learning gains improved 9% compared to our 2017 math learning gains. Typically, our school performs better in math.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Teachers were more intentional in providing students with rich experiences consisting of more hands-on activities and incorporating more active engagement. Students tend to soar when they are exposed to more engaging tasks which ultimately leads to growth.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	66%	72%	56%	64%	70%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	59%	55%	61%	66%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	49%	48%	59%	57%	46%
Math Achievement	76%	82%	62%	74%	78%	58%
Math Learning Gains	71%	72%	59%	74%	72%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	62%	47%	68%	60%	46%
Science Achievement	63%	74%	55%	70%	71%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	27 (40)	34 (51)	34 (39)	95 (130)
One or more suspensions	2 (3)	1 (5)	2 (5)	5 (13)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 (1)	1 (2)	1 (3)	3 (6)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	4 (5)	32 (37)	39 (52)	75 (94)

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
03	2018	71%	76%	-5%	57%	14%
	2017	79%	78%	1%	58%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	64%	69%	-5%	56%	8%
	2017	64%	68%	-4%	56%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2018	60%	71%	-11%	55%	5%
	2017	62%	70%	-8%	53%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	75%	80%	-5%	62%	13%
	2017	79%	81%	-2%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2018	80%	83%	-3%	62%	18%
	2017	72%	78%	-6%	64%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2018	67%	79%	-12%	61%	6%
	2017	68%	78%	-10%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	61%	72%	-11%	55%	6%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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				
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	35	36	33	47	42	28	24				
BLK	58	65	65	70	78	70	32				
HSP	70	57	55	82	73		59				
MUL	75	67		72	60		88				
WHT	70	62	41	74	60	37	66				
FRL	62	56	44	65	56	41	55				

Part III: Planning for Improvement
Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	The percentage of students in our lowest 25th percentile making learning gains.
Rationale	According to our 2018 FSA Reading results, the percentage of students in our lowest 25th percentile making learning gains was 36%.
Intended Outcome	To improve our reading learning gains of our lowest 25% from 36% to 50% on FSA Reading in 2019.
Point Person	George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	The action steps below are areas of focus consistent with our action plan for improving the percentage of students in our lowest 25th percentile making learning gains on FSA reading 1. After School Tutoring Program 2. Differentiated Instruction in Small Group 3. Professional Development for Paraprofessionals/Tutors 4. Implementation of the Leveled Literacy Intervention system in our reading lab. 5. ESE Support Facilitation: Guided Reading Model for gap instruction
Person Responsible	George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	We used data from the Next Step to Guided Reading Assessment kit to establish a baseline. Students will be progress monitored every 9 weeks and teachers will use the data to modify their instructional focus. At the end of each quarter, teachers will be required to submit their tracking document to administration quarterly to show where the interventions are being implemented. Also, our reading coach provides the principal with a list of professional development focus areas to support our action steps.
Person Responsible	George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

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

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

Yulee Elementary will involve parents through SAC, parent/teacher conferences,Open House/Title I Parent Night, Meet and Greet, parent workshops, and as volunteers in the classroom to support instruction.

PFEP Link

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

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

School based teams meet to discuss students with barriers to academic and social success.
Mentors are assigned to students identified with concerns.
Offer instruction and various campus activities that address social/emotional needs of students.
Connect students to agencies who have Cooperative Agreements or are on campus.
School counseling program with dedicated time to: 1. Assess the needs of the students and the barriers blocking their success (Data-Driven Decision Making), 2. Identify interventions that the research suggests works to remove the barrier to success (Evidence-Based Intervention), and 3. Evaluate your intervention (Evaluation)
Engage with identified staff (i.e. school counselor, school-based team leader) to provide a differentiated delivery of services based on student/school need. (Include core, supplemental, and intensive supports.)
Each class receives twice monthly guidance lessons with school counselors reinforcing school wide expectations for all students.

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

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

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

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

In order to identify those needs, the team must analyze data to determine deficits and other areas in need of improvement. The team looks at academic, attendance and behavior related data. As the team disaggregates the data, it is identifying which students are meeting grade level expectations and which are not. It is looking for patterns and trends in the data.

Leading questions: Is our core instruction meeting the needs of 75-80 % of our students? If not, is it a curriculum or instruction issue? Are certain groups of students failing to meet expectations in certain subjects? Or, are there certain groups who have other non-academic barriers to achievement that must be addressed before they will be able to meet academic success? Are there trends in achievement within specific subgroups that need to be addressed? Have resources (funding and staffing) been allocated in the most effective and efficient manner to meet the needs of all stakeholders?

Once those areas of need have been identified, the leadership team disseminates this information to the departments, literacy teams and other school based teams. The teams will provide input to the leading

questions and assist in determining appropriate research based interventions to remediate specific deficits and identify other available resources to meet individual student needs. The departments/teams oversee the implementation of the interventions and monitor student progress through regularly scheduled meetings. The progress monitoring information will be shared with the leadership team and departments/teams together will monitor the effectiveness of interventions through student progress monitoring data and fidelity checks.

The Problem Solving/Response to Intervention model is a decision making process based on the scientific method of problem solving. Florida has embraced the problem solving methodology and incorporated it into its Response to Intervention model.

The Problem Solving process requires the following steps: Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design/ Implementation, and Evaluation: Response to Intervention.

* For Title I, Part A, The school needs assessment process that is included in the Title I Part A project requires an extensive self analysis of student performance data, attitudinal and quantitative data from all areas of the school self evaluative process. The results of this self study drive the goals and activities as reflected in the Title I Part A project as well as providing the basis for all expenditures. The School Improvement Plan is the state reporting mechanism to reflect the required federal elements as the federal assurances state.

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

The strategies used to advance college and career awareness consist of an after-school robotics club, a science club, and musical programs provided by Arts Alive.

Part V: Budget	
Total:	**$91,524.69**