Nassau County School District

Yulee Primary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Yulee Primary School

86426 GOODBREAD RD, Yulee, FL 32097

https://www.nassau.k12.fl.us/domain/15

Demographics

Principal: Vicki Grubbs

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-2
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	52%
2019-20 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: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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 Primary School

86426 GOODBREAD RD, Yulee, FL 32097

https://www.nassau.k12.fl.us/domain/15

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-2	Yes	%

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

School Grades History

Year

Grade

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.

At Yulee Primary School, we adopt the Nassau County Mission Statement which is the following:
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.

Yulee Primary School will collaborate with all stakeholders by actively engaging all learners through a rigorous differentiated curriculum, aligned with state and district standards, in a respectful, age appropriate and safe environment.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Boatright, Kerri	Principal	
Green, Lilley	Teacher, K-12	
Lippelman, Christine	Teacher, ESE	ESE Grade Chair
Moore, Emily	Teacher, K-12	
Foose, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Miller, Tracy	Assistant Principal	
McNally, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Vicki Grubbs

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
51

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-2
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	52%
2019-20 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: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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](#).	

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	196	191	222	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	609
Attendance below 90 percent	27	16	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	5	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/19/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	240	237	222	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	699
Attendance below 90 percent	14	36	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	13	23	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	
Number of students enrolled	240	237	222	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	699
Attendance below 90 percent	14	36	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	13	23	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0%	76%	57%	0%	73%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	65%	58%	0%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	53%	0%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	85%	63%	0%	82%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	77%	62%	0%	71%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	67%	51%	0%	64%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	75%	53%	0%	73%	51%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	K	**1**	**2**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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**

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

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

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	39	36	33	64	58	48	42				
ELL	42			75							
BLK	56	72		72	64		50				
HSP	67	54		76	57		68				
MUL	71	70		76	79	64	67				
WHT	72	62	41	81	68	51	74				
FRL	61	55	37	72	61	44	63				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
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**

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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	448
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	63
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	71
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Based on the most recent set of data, (2018-2019) we showed a decline in ELA with second grade Standford 10 dropping from 84 to 78 and first grade dropping from 72 to 64. Kindergarten increased from 73 to 72, but is still below the district benchmark of 80.

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

First grade ELA showed the greatest decline dropping from 72-64. The kindergarten SAT 10 scores for this group of students was 63. More than a years worth of growth was needed.

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.

n/a

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

Kindergarten ELA showed the most improvement moving from 63 to 72. Students in the bottom quartile were offered either after school ir in school tutoring services. Grade level collaboration focused on raising scores for the bottom quartile

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance contines to be an area of concern for YPS.

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

1. K-2 ELA Scores
2. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2018-2019 school year, the average of YPS ELA Standford 10 scores were were 71%. We want to increase the school wide average percentile rank in ELA on Stanford 10.
Measurable Outcome:	Average percentile rank will increase by 3-5 percent on ELA Stanford 10.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kerri Boatright (kerri.boatright@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To implement intentional differentiated ELA instruction based on diagnostic data (phonics screeners, Lexia and STAR Literacy).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The current data (phonic screeners, Lexia, and STAR Literacy) shows studemts at varying levels of need in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Differentiated small group instruction
2. After school tutoring program
3. Tiered support through MTSS process
4. Collaborative Planning
5. Targeted ELA Professional Development

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2019 attendance data, 11 percent of YPS students did not maintain a 90 percent attendance rate. According to the first quarter attendance data for 2020-2021, YPS is demonstrating that 11 % of the students are not maintaining a 90% attendance rate. It appears that our attendance is maintaining, however the 2020 enrollment has decreased by 90 students.
Measurable Outcome:	At the end of the 20-21 school year, the goal of YPS is to decrease the percentage of students absent for more than 10% of the school year by 2%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Miller (millertr@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will increase parent and student communication of attendance policy and progress towards goal.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	It is evident that parent/student communication and reinforcement is needed to stress the importance of attendance and the correlation to student acheivement data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. 2 day absent follow up calls
2. Positive celebrations for studens who maintain perfect attendance
3. Increase parent awareness of attendance policy
4. Parent teacher conference regarding poor attendance.
5. Tiered system of support including letters, phone calls and relationships.

Person Responsible	Kerri Boatright (kerri.boatright@nassau.k12.fl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

YPS identified ELA as the focus this year, but will continue to monitor math acheivement data, based on diagnostic assessments based on iReady.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

YPS will target increased participation in volunteer activities and attendance at school wide events. The School Advisory Council invites parents to attend meetings and be a part of the school's decision making process. The Parent Teacher Organization encourages parental involvement in school events, fundraising, volunteering, and providing additional support to students and teachers. The school uses additional events such as family nights, Chick-Fil-A Spirit nights, grade level programs, PTO meetings, and a Volunteer Orientation/ Training to help build positive relationships with families. Teachers conference with parents in addition to sending home progress reports and report cards to help keep families apprised of students' progress. Weekly grades are uploaded by teachers to Focus to keep parents informed on a regular basis.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00