Fernandina Beach High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fernandina Beach High School

435 CITRONA DR, Fernandina Beach, FL 32034

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Chris Webber

Start Date for this Principal: 9/25/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	34%
2018-19 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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (66%) 2014-15: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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.

Table of Contents

Fernandina Beach High School

435 CITRONA DR, Fernandina Beach, FL 32034

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	33%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	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.

Fernandina Beach High School's 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.

Fernandina Beach High School will provide a safe and productive learning environment in which students can communicate effectively, think critically, solve problems and are technologically literate through a variety of curricular and extra-curricular activities. Through a challenging course of study with high standards, students will become responsible learners who can not only work collaboratively, but also be accountable for their own academic and developmental progress.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mazzella, John	Principal	Principal
Coombs, Sarah	School Counselor	
Hicks, Robert	School Counselor	
Webber, Chris	Assistant Principal	
Romack, Carol	Teacher, K-12	
Snyder, Valerie	Teacher, K-12	
Talbert, Shane	Teacher, K-12	
Rathmann, Steven	Teacher, K-12	
Avila, Janel	Teacher, ESE	
Glackin, James	Teacher, K-12	
Monaghan, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	
Schreiber, James	Teacher, K-12	

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	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	268	230	248	203	954
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	29	27	39	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	9	8	10	40
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	34	25	17	85
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	32	37	23	118

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	0	0	0	14	22	19	23	78

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
55

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 9/25/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	71%	65%	56%	70%	62%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	55%	51%	58%	54%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	38%	42%	42%	41%	41%
Math Achievement	71%	64%	51%	64%	54%	49%
Math Learning Gains	56%	54%	48%	46%	46%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	52%	45%	32%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	93%	84%	68%	74%	72%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	80%	73%	79%	80%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	268 (0)	230 (0)	248 (0)	203 (0)	949 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	28 (0)	29 (0)	27 (0)	39 (0)	123 (0)
One or more suspensions	13 (0)	9 (0)	8 (0)	10 (0)	40 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	9 (0)	34 (0)	25 (0)	17 (0)	85 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	26 (0)	32 (0)	37 (0)	23 (0)	118 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
09	2019	72%	65%	7%	55%	17%	
	2018	74%	66%	8%	53%	21%	
Same Grade Comparison		-2%					
Cohort Comparison							
10	2019	67%	64%	3%	53%	14%	
	2018	59%	64%	-5%	53%	6%	
Same Grade Comparison		8%					
Cohort Comparison		-7%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	91%	84%	7%	67%	24%
2018	76%	80%	-4%	65%	11%
Compare		15%			

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

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	82%	-3%	70%	9%
2018	79%	81%	-2%	68%	11%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	74%	-14%	61%	-1%
2018	61%	77%	-16%	62%	-1%
Compare		-1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	68%	9%	57%	20%
2018	68%	59%	9%	56%	12%
Compare		9%			

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	46	48	38	42	64		100	96		95	33
ELL											
BLK	42	44	20	61	64	80	80	65		69	55
HSP	53	47	44	52	47			63		71	58
MUL	66	70		55	62		100			91	70
WHT	78	65	53	77	56	59	92	88		94	80
FRL	58	57	38	53	49	62	85	67		79	65
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	58	69	63	70	58		70			75	22
ELL	27	50	46	23			20				
BLK	40	68	67	53	42		45	70		79	58
HSP	49	56	45	52	64		56			86	68
MUL	67	43		50	55		70			71	90
WHT	77	62	58	72	53	49	86	85		91	70
FRL	49	61	63	54	51	42	62	77		77	52
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	48	52	42	48	44		50	70		82	29
ELL	10	21	25	18							
BLK	39	51	40	38	43	45	47	47		100	71
HSP	46	39	38	50	35		50	64		90	83
MUL	50	29		53	47						
WHT	77	63	48	67	46	30	78	83		97	77
FRL	49	46	38	46	40	30	58	68		98	65

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	741
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	62
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	74
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The lowest data component that showed the lowest performance was the ELA Lowest 25 percentage students.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year was the ELA Lowest 25 percent students. The contributing factors were a lack of students understanding in the "key ideas and details" strand of the FSA ELA asssesment.

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.

We did not have any large deficiency gaps when compared to the state average. Our lowest component was tied with the state average at 42%. On a positive note, the largest positive gap was in our math lowest 25th percentile as we were 20% higher than the state average and a 19% improvement from last years scores.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in our math lowest 25th percentile as we were 20% higher than the state average and a 19% improvement from last years scores. Some of the actions were that we provided more support facilitation in these classes, we offered more tutoring times, and we assigned some of our veteran teachers to these classes.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Two potential areas of concerns are attendance and student level one on statewide assessments and course failures in ELA for our lowest 25 percentile.

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

1. Improve the learning gains in our ELA Lowest 25 percentile
2. Improve our overall math learning gains
3. Reduce the amount of Level 1 on Statewide assessments
4. Improve our ELL in achieving English Language proficiency
5. Improve our attendance below 90%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25 percentile
Rationale	We dropped from 58% to 42% on our ELA learning gains of our lowest 25 percentile. We need to refocus on our instructional strategies, adapt to different learning styles, and provide additional support for these students.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Some measurable outcomes are benchmark assessments to evaluate where each student is. Provide extra instruction in each strand deficiency. Include strategies to summarize, analyze, and contextualize complex informational text.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	John Mazzella (mazzelljo@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Benchmark assessments, close reads, sample writings, determine lexile levels
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Benchmark assessments can help determine individual student learning gains. These allow for more specific instruction on deficient areas.

Action Step	
Description	1. Determine lexile levels and reading comprehension 2. Determine writing deficiencies based upon sample writing prompts. 3. Start planning lessons and activities periodically based upon the standards and these deficiencies 4. After certain set timelines, give benchmark assessment on previous taught standards. 5. Plan future lessons on the upcoming standards with an emphasis on benchmark assessment deficiencies
Person Responsible	John Mazzella (mazzelljo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	English Language Learners Proficiency
Rationale	Our ELL student population was below 41% is their proficiency level.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Improvement in lexile levels, improvement in proficiency based upon the FSA ELA asssessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	John Mazzella (mazzelljo@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Achieve 3000, ESOL class, new Spanish-English translator program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Using Achieve 3000 with a translatable platform, we hope to increase the students proficiency level. By using this platform as another tool, we are able to conduct periodic level set tests where we can measure any improvements.

Action Step	
Description	1. Assign all ELL students to an ESOL class 2. Assign all ELL students in the Achieve 3000 platform 3. Perform first level/lexile test 4. Base future instruction/classes on these test results 5. Continue instruction and hold periodic benchmark/level set tests.
Person Responsible	John Mazzella (mazzelljo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Attendance below 90%
Rationale	Students who have an attendance level below 90% typically do not perform well academically.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Keep the student attendance above 90%. Monitor student attendance on a bi-weekly basis.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	John Mazzella (mazzelljo@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilize our attendance intervention team more frequently, make more frequent contact with the student to show support of their time in school, make more frequent contact with parents or guardians to provide the support and explain the importance of their student being in school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students who are chronically absent tend to not have the support at home. This rationale is to give the students support from teachers who want to see them succeed. We want to emphasize the importance of school but also lend them the support to get work completed if they do miss

Action Step	
Description	1. Identify students who are below 90% 2. Establish a student attendance team and put together a plan of success for the students 3. Monitor the attendance on a bi-weekly basis 4. Meet with students every 2 weeks 5. Give rewards/incentives for coming to school and performing well in classroom. Identify barriers that are keeping the students from coming to school.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 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.

School staff, faculty, and administrators strive to strengthen family involvement and family empowerment in the school. The school will coordinate and integrate parental involvement strategies with School Improvement, Strategic Planning, Title I, Title II, Title IV, Title VI, Community Involvement Programs, Business Partnerships, and other community involvement activities.

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 in school, 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
• School web page
• Focus
• Newsletters communicating classroom and school news to parents
• Parent phone calls, School Messenger, and face-to face meetings
• College and Career Fairs
• School Matters Publication
• Nassau County School District App

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.

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.)

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.

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

Several initiatives and programs have been established to foster college-going culture and to support and assist students as they work toward achieving college and career readiness.

Students receive daily instruction and support to prepare them for college and careers. These academic strategies impact students school-wide as strategies like writing to learn, inquiry, collaboration, organizational skills, and critical reading are taught in all classes. In class students learn organizational skills, study skills, and work on critical thinking skills that will better prepare them for college and career readiness.

Initiatives include: AP and Dual Enrollment courses, SAT school day test administration, College and Career Fairs, college and career field trips, on campus college and career center and assemblies with guest speakers.

The Nassau County Economic Development Board conducts soft-skills training and seminars on employment seeking to the district's students as a component of their partnership with the district. Other business partners assist in career education curriculum development and placement efforts through their participation in program area advisory boards. Partners include trade organizations such as the First Coast Manufacturing Association and the Northeast Florida Builders Association, and numerous employers in the area.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25 percentile	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: English Language Learners Proficiency	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Attendance below 90%	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**