Yulee High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Yulee High School

85375 MINER RD, Yulee, FL 32097

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lori Amos
Start Date for this Principal: 9/30/2019

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)	35%
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* Asian Students* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: A (62%) 2014-15: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Nassau County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Yulee High School

85375 MINER RD, Yulee, FL 32097

[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	40%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

School Grades History

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

Our vision for all members of Yulee High School is to provide a safe environment, maintain and model professionalism and high expectations which will result in continuous academic growth, excellence, and increased post graduation opportunities.

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
Drake, Natasha	Principal	
Joinville, Yvon	Assistant Principal	
Jackson, Donna	Assistant Principal	
Perry, Donna	Instructional Media	
Schweitzer, Richard	Teacher, K-12	
Harris, Blair	School Counselor	
Scarberry, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	
Blake, Thomas	Teacher, K-12	
Patterson, Brianna	Teacher, K-12	
Pinckney, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Lacand, Caroline	Teacher, K-12	
Hicken, Candace	Instructional Coach	
Matricardi, Mandi	Dean	
Crosby, Kathy	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Murray, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Eckman, Jessi	Teacher, K-12	
Grunewald, Amnesty	Teacher, ESE	
VanDelinder, Janice	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	348	346	326	316	1336
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	35	42	69	179
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	6	4	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	47	32	38	146
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	60	48	50	224

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	31	34	24	34	123

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
77

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 9/30/2019

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	63%	65%	56%	59%	62%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	55%	51%	52%	54%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	38%	42%	39%	41%	41%
Math Achievement	68%	64%	51%	51%	54%	49%
Math Learning Gains	55%	54%	48%	41%	46%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	52%	45%	32%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	84%	84%	68%	73%	72%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	80%	73%	82%	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	348 (0)	346 (0)	326 (0)	316 (0)	1336 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	33 (0)	35 (0)	42 (0)	69 (0)	179 (0)
One or more suspensions	7 (0)	11 (0)	6 (0)	4 (0)	28 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	29 (0)	47 (0)	32 (0)	38 (0)	146 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	66 (0)	60 (0)	48 (0)	50 (0)	224 (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	62%	65%	-3%	55%	7%	
	2018	63%	66%	-3%	53%	10%	
Same Grade Comparison		-1%					
Cohort Comparison							
10	2019	63%	64%	-1%	53%	10%	
	2018	63%	64%	-1%	53%	10%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison		0%					

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	87%	84%	3%	67%	20%
2018	88%	80%	8%	65%	23%
Compare		-1%			

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	85%	82%	3%	70%	15%
2018	80%	81%	-1%	68%	12%
Compare		5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	74%	-7%	61%	6%
2018	80%	77%	3%	62%	18%
Compare		-13%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	68%	-4%	57%	7%
2018	52%	59%	-7%	56%	-4%
Compare		12%			

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	31	35	28	35	45	46	42	42		86	29
BLK	46	49	17	57	58		63	72		97	61
HSP	60	44	38	66	39	36	88	90		94	67
MUL	57	35		64	33		92	93			
WHT	65	54	37	69	58	58	84	79		92	69
FRL	55	47	27	60	52	47	77	73		87	57

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	28	49	37	32	72	50	32	39		91	26
BLK	55	52	39	39	52	27	63	48		85	45
HSP	80	69	60	76	59		67	82		100	58
MUL	66	53		79	50			83			
WHT	62	53	48	70	64	68	71	80		91	55
FRL	53	49	43	61	58	60	64	68		87	40

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	13	22	17	17	28	27	41	41		75	13
BLK	32	36	39	27	25	30	46	54		93	31
HSP	65	49		49	42	40	83	79		89	69
MUL	63	47		58	47		83				
WHT	61	54	39	53	42	32	75	86		89	60
FRL	48	44	35	41	35	29	66	77		85	45

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	648
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
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	67
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	58
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 ELA 9th and 10th grade performed at 63% proficiency on the 2018-2019 assessment vs. the district average of 65%. The 9th grade declined 1% when compared to previous year's data. Our lowest 25% dropped from 47% in 2017-2018 to 31% in 2018-2019.

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

The 2018-2019 Algebra EOC data (67%) declined 13% from the 2017-2018 school year (80%). This was the first year that Algebra 1-B students from the 2016-2017 cohort tested. Overall learning gains as well as Lower Quartile learning gains declined slightly as well.

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.

YHS is above state average in all areas.

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

YHS showed the most improvement in the area of Geometry moving from 52% in 2017-2018 to 64% in 2018-2019.

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

The greatest area of concern is 17% of our population (224 students) is identified as a Level 1 on statewide assessment. In the 2018-2019 school year, only 31% of the lowest quartile made learning gains compared to the 42% state average.

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

1. Improve ELA learning gains among our lower quartile students
2. Improve our Algebra scores
3. Improve our overall ELA pass rate
4. Improve overall attendance below 90%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	ELA Lowest 25th Percentile dropped from 47% to 31% learning gains in the 2018-2019 school year. We are refocusing our instructional strategies, increasing small group instruction, and ensuring teacher created questions, assignments and assessments are at the same level of rigor as the standard.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA Lowest 25th Percentile will improve from 31% learning gains to 36% learning gains for the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Natasha Drake (natasha.drake@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence-based strategies include implementation of a progress monitoring assessment based on assessed ELA standards. Administration will take place in December. Evaluative data will be disseminated and used for differentiated lesson planning to include extra instruction in each strand deficiency. Benchmark assessments, close reads, sample writings, and a determination of student lexile levels will also drive curriculum and instruction.
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 individual student lexile levels and reading comprehension 2. Determine writing deficiencies based on previous years data and current writing prompt samples. 3. Develop Common Boards as a standards based planning assessment, ensuring that tasks align to the rigor of the standards 4. Intensive teachers create and administer a progress monitoring assessment based on assessed ELA standards. Administration will take place in December. 5. Plan future lessons based on data collected from the progress monitoring assessment
Person Responsible	Ashley Murray (murrayas@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Algebra EOC
Rationale	The number of students passing the Algebra EOC in the 2018-2019 school year dropped from 80% to 67% in the 2018-2019 school year. Students must pass the EOC in order to earn a high school diploma. We are refocusing our instructional strategies, increasing small group instruction, and ensuring teacher created questions, assignments and assessments are at the same level of rigor as the standard.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The number of students passing the Algebra EOC in the 2018-2019 school year will improve from 67% proficiency to 70% for the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Donna Jackson (donna.jackson@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Throughout the year, we will be using small groups for instruction and remediation, district created spiral review, and benchmark assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction allows for more specific instruction on deficient areas.To ensure the level of rigor is addressed, we will use Algebra Nation 'Test Yourself,' and 'Check for Understanding,' as well as the videos and workbook to reinforce concepts. In addition, we will use a combination of a 10 week review packet, Mastery Sheets, Concept Quizzes, and released test questions in class, as well as in boot camp review. Benchmark assessments can help determine individual student learning gains.

Action Step	
Description	1. Determine individual math achievement and comprehension scores 2. Determine math deficiencies based on previous year's date and summative assessments 3. Develop Common Boards as standards-based planning assessment, ensuring tasks align to the rigor of the standards 4. Create lessons that promote one-on-one or small group learning 5. Monitor student progress through Algebra Nation, Test Yourself Reports, an Math XL Reports
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Attendance Below 90 Percent
Rationale	17% of the students at Yulee High School had annual attendance below 90 percent during the 2018-2019 school year. Consistent attendance is an indicator of student success and achievement in school.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	YHS will increase student attendance to reduce the attendance below 90 percent to 15% for the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mandi Matricardi (matricardi.ma@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Yulee High School Leadership team will develop a check-in, check-out system for students in Tier 1 of attendance - 5 absences in 30 days. For students in Tier 2 the Administrative Problem Solving Team will meet with parents and guardians to troubleshoot and propose interventions along with continuing Tier 1 supports.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research shows that students who have connections or find connectivity to school are more likely to attend and improve patterns of attendance. By partnering with parents and providing additional resources, we will more likely remove or minimize barriers to student attendance and decrease absenteeism.

Action Step	
Description	1. Identify all former and current Tier 1 and potential Tier 2 students with less than 90% attendance 2. Assign students to faculty members for check-in, check- out system 3. Current ISD teacher will make weekly phone calls for all Tier 1 and Tier 2 students who are absent 4. The Administrative Problem Solving Team will meet monthly to review and discuss current Tier 2 students 5. The Dean of Students and Resource Officer will conduct home visits for all Tier 3 students (15 absences in 90 days) 6. Conduct monthly celebration and recognition of students with perfect attendance for the month
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).