

Nassau County School District

# Yulee Middle School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Yulee Middle School

85439 MINER RD, Yulee, FL 32097

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Tara Middleton

Start Date for this Principal: 9/25/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	42%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: B (59%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Yulee Middle School

85439 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)
Middle School 6-8	No	44%
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	B	B	B	C

### 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.

At Yulee Middle School, our vision is to promote, support, and afford students with the opportunity to become productive members of society and life-long learners.

### 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
Raysor, George	Principal	
Middleton, Tara	Assistant Principal	
Norfleet, Rachel	Instructional Coach	
Fletcher, Kelly	School Counselor	
Hightower, Deondra	School Counselor	
Smith, Anna	Dean	SAC- Co-Chair
Davidson, Heather	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Head
Koenig, Ricci	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair
Schinella, Patrick	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Head

### 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	357	364	331	0	0	0	0	1052	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	50	39	0	0	0	0	116	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	4	0	0	0	0	28	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	34	0	0	0	0	54	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	76	60	0	0	0	0	179	
	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	8	23	20	0	0	0	0	51

**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	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	5	

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

69

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
Students with two or more indicators															

**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	46	55	44	0	0	0	0	145
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	73	58	0	0	0	0	150
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	43	76	60	0	0	0	0	179

**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	21	48	37	0	0	0	0	106	

## 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	59%	64%	54%	61%	63%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	53%	54%	62%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	44%	47%	46%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	71%	74%	58%	63%	68%	56%
Math Learning Gains	65%	62%	57%	56%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	56%	51%	43%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	65%	64%	51%	60%	68%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	72%	72%	70%	73%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	357 (0)	364 (0)	331 (0)	1052 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	27 ( )	50 ( )	39 ( )	116 (0)
One or more suspensions	6 ( )	18 ( )	4 ( )	28 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	6 ( )	14 ( )	34 ( )	54 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	43 ( )	76 ( )	60 ( )	179 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

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
06	2019	56%	63%	-7%	54%	2%
	2018	60%	64%	-4%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	55%	59%	-4%	52%	3%
	2018	52%	57%	-5%	51%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	63%	65%	-2%	56%	7%
	2018	63%	68%	-5%	58%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	61%	71%	-10%	55%	6%
	2018	52%	64%	-12%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	74%	76%	-2%	54%	20%
	2018	67%	70%	-3%	54%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
08	2019	67%	62%	5%	46%	21%
	2018	68%	60%	8%	45%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	63%	60%	3%	48%	15%
	2018	56%	60%	-4%	50%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	72%	-3%	71%	-2%
2018	77%	67%	10%	71%	6%
Compare		-8%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	74%	25%	61%	38%
2018	100%	77%	23%	62%	38%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	59%	-59%	56%	-56%

### 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	23	33	24	31	44	45	40	24	8		
ELL		30			50						
ASN	80	69		87	62						
BLK	35	39	34	55	61	61	45	68			
HSP	50	51	40	67	65	67	41	62			
MUL	57	34	50	72	66	64	62	85			
WHT	62	56	40	72	65	57	68	71	49		
FRL	48	47	38	62	59	54	55	59	33		

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	17	37	37	29	44	38	21	41			
ELL		43	55	33	36	36					
ASN	80	64		80	55						
BLK	51	49	39	45	49	38	39	45	36		
HSP	46	60	71	66	56	50	36	80	18		
MUL	60	54	40	65	47	60	50	62			
WHT	60	53	43	66	59	48	60	74	34		
FRL	48	51	46	54	52	41	46	63	26		
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	23	39	31	18	35	34	31	31			
ELL		70			50						
ASN	100	60		92	50						
BLK	48	62	57	43	53	42	37	57	29		
HSP	64	74	58	63	60	36	82	45	39		
MUL	68	74	45	51	50		60				
WHT	61	60	44	65	57	45	61	73	30		
FRL	50	56	39	52	54	43	52	61	18		

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	533
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
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	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
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	55
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	61
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	60
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	51
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.

Our SWD subgroup performed the lowest based on our 2018-2019 FSA results. Scheduling and clear expectations in regards to effective " gap instruction" were the primary barrier for YMS last year. However, our scores did reflect a 6% improvement from the previous year.

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

Our greatest decline was our Black subgroup with a 16% decrease in reading high achievement. Time was a critical issue as teachers did not have sufficient time to hit the complexity level of the standards. In addition, supplemental resources were limited for teachers.

#### 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.

All grades 6-8 performed higher than the state average in both reading and math. However, our Civics EOC was 1% below the state's average. Resources and time have been a barrier for Yulee Middle School.

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

Our percentage of 6th graders performing at or above grade level improved by 7% from the previous year. We contribute our success to planning more collaboratively within our grade level as well as teachers implementing lessons that consistently reflects the complexity of the standards.

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

One or more suspensions in 7th grade is an area of concern. Last year, there were 78 one or more suspensions.

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

1. Increasing the percentage of students scoring at or above grade level on FSA Reading.
2. Percentage of ESE students scoring at or above grade level.
3. Improve our FCAT Science by 7% from previous year.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1

<b>Title</b>	FSA Reading Proficiency
<b>Rationale</b>	YMS 2018-2019 FSA Reading data in reading for 6th and 7th grade was below 60%. Our 7th grade students have performed below 60% for the last 5 years as a whole.

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve**

This year in 6th, 7th and 8th (intensive classes) grades we have a 90 minute instructional block with emphasis on a small group model. This model has proven to be effective and provides teachers with the opportunity to meet with students daily in a small group. The approach enables teachers to hone in on students' deficiencies with fidelity.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy**

Teachers will be using Ready books during whole group instruction, selecting anchor text that aligns more to the complexity of the standard(s), and using small groups to differentiate instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**

The complexity level of text in the Ready book aligns closer to the text students will be exposed to during state testing. Intentionally selecting resources that correlate closer to the standards provides teachers with the best opportunity to assist their students in maximizing their potential. Based on data from the past 5 years, it is evident changes needed to be made.

#### Action Step

**Description**

1. Longer Instructional block in ELA/Reading.
2. Implementation of iReady Diagnostic for Level 1's and 2's.
3. Increased time for ESE teacher in ELA block.
4. Data from STAR, iReady, Leveled Literacy Intervention to prescribe differentiated instruction.
5. Professional Development for ESE and ELA teachers.

**Person Responsible**

George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2	
<b>Title</b>	Students With Disabilities
<b>Rationale</b>	For two consecutive years, our ESE population has performed below 41%.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	42% percent of our ESE population will score at or above a level 3.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Utilizing data to provide prescribed gap instruction. ESE teachers scheduled to be in class with ESE students for 45 minutes each day to provide services to students.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	For two consecutive years, our ESE population has performed below expectations. Reviewing schedules and observations determined a change was essential.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	1. Strategically scheduling ESE teachers 2. Professional Development 3. Specific expectations in regards to planning and classroom responsibilities. 4. 5.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#### 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).**