

Nassau County School District

# Yulee High School



2022-23 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Yulee High School

85375 MINER RD, Yulee, FL 32097

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Lori Amos**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
<b>2021-22 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>	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (65%)
<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>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Yulee High School

85375 MINER RD, Yulee, FL 32097

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	35%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	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.

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Amos, Lori	Principal	
Jackson, Donna	Assistant Principal	
Norfleet, Rachel	Assistant Principal	
Jones, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair
Murray, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	English Department Chair
Hilliker, Samantha	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Chair
Harris, Ashley	Teacher, ESE	Avid Teacher
Crosby, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	CTE Department Chair
Burch, Joshua	Teacher, K-12	Athletic Director
Blake, Thomas	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair and Social Studies Department Chair
Faulk, Natalie	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
VanDelinder, Janice	Teacher, K-12	Fine Arts Department Chair

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 6/8/2022, Lori Amos

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

80

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,411

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

11

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

23

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	0

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/7/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	322	326	329	312	1289
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	61	59	84	268
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	42	29	20	119
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	9	10	10	61
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	23	28	6	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	37	45	36	160
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	322	326	329	312	1289
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	61	59	84	268
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	42	29	20	119
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	9	10	10	61
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	23	28	6	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	37	45	36	160
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	56%	60%	51%				63%	65%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						52%	55%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						31%	38%	42%
Math Achievement	52%	43%	38%				68%	64%	51%
Math Learning Gains	36%						55%	54%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	26%						54%	52%	45%
Science Achievement	67%	57%	40%				84%	84%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	42%	48%				80%	80%	73%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	87%	84%	3%	67%	20%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	85%	82%	3%	70%	15%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	67%	74%	-7%	61%	6%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	64%	68%	-4%	57%	7%

## Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	22	40	42	24	23	20	37	45		88	32
ELL				18							
ASN				40							
BLK	45	58	61	33	33	33	53	52		100	50
HSP	48	45	47	44	29	22	52	81		94	65
MUL	63	63		60	38		67	81		95	71
WHT	58	53	44	55	37	26	71	79		93	72
FRL	52	50	57	47	35	36	57	67		89	63
2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	23	37	34	35	35	30	52	54		93	25
ELL											
BLK	42	43	33	37	36	17	32	65		93	54
HSP	46	45	31	43	41		64	74		92	91
MUL	52	48		59	70					94	88
WHT	57	50	43	56	43	37	66	85		91	67
FRL	45	53	47	49	45	28	56	75		87	55
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

## ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	578

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	18
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	40
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	59
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

The lowest 25th percentile students struggle across all content areas with a high emphasis on reading and mathematics.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Our lowest 25th percentile in English Language Arts and Algebra 1 demonstrated the greatest need.

**What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

Our lowest 25th percentile in English Language Arts and Algebra 1 consist of a large percentage of students with ,an Individual Education Plan which causes many challenges. However, we can address this by using incentives to generate interest in students who are not intrinsically motivated about learning as well as selecting high interest text to address complex standards. In addition to incentives and high interest text, teachers across all content areas have to consistently embraced reading strategies to assist students with improving their comprehension skills which will ultimately lead to building confidence and improving performance on both the ELA and Algebra 1 state assessments.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Based on our most recent FSA data, YHS' data showed marginal growth compared to 2021 FSA data. However, the following data components did reflect an increase in students scoring a Level 3 or higher: English Language Arts 10th grade, Geometry 9th, 10th, and 11th grade, Biology 9th grade, and U.S. History 11th grade maintained the percentage of students performing at a Level 3 or higher.

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

During the 2021-22 school year, YHS continued to implement a 90-minute ELA and Mathematics block across the school year as a result of the 4x4 block, as well as providing teachers with specific guidance regarding instruction.

During the 2022-23 school year YHS transitioned to 7-period school day and embraced the new BEST Standards. The Intensive Reading course focuses on the fundamental reading skills used in reading with a support facilitator or paraprofessional pushing in two-three days a week to provide support. Small group instruction is embedded a minimum of two days each week in the lesson plans. All Algebra 1 courses have a support facilitator assigned to push in two days a week to provide support within the classroom. In addition, staff development days for both ELA, Geometry, and Algebra 1 have been set aside for discussion, classroom observation of superb veteran teachers, data review, and to unpack the new standards.

**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

Teachers will need to be consistent with the following:

1. Utilize data to drive their instruction.
2. Use standard based resources.
3. Implement effective engagement strategies to reach all learners.
4. Scaffold their lessons.
5. Build knowledge and vocabulary.
6. Prioritizing standards.
7. Diagnosing essential missed learning.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Teachers will consistently receive feedback from administration. Administration will work with district level personnel to provide guidance to ensure teachers have the support needed. All new teachers will participate in professional development meetings.

The Principal will participate in monthly Principals' meetings, Assistant Principals will participate in Professional Learning Communities. All administration will attend "Training Tuesdays" which provides staff development training for administration.

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

Data will continue to be used to determine professional development needs at Yulee High School. All first year teachers will be required to participate in school level and district provided meetings.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** YHS 2021-2022 FSA ELA Learning Gains of the lowest 25th percentile was at or below 47%.

**Measurable Outcome:  
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

The Learning Gains of our lowest 25th percentile in ELA will improve by 3%.

**Monitoring:  
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

The area of focus will be monitored through data analysis of Lexia, STAR Reading, and FAST PM diagnostic reports. In addition, administration walk-throughs will be conducted to monitor instructional practices and student activities.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lori Amos (amoslo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:  
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Teachers use Lexia to guide instructional to guide instruction provided. Whole-group lessons are delivered based off the BEST Standards, small-group instruction is designed based off individual Lexia, STAR Reading, and FAST PM diagnostics targeting reading deficit of the student. Our small group model will allow teachers to scaffold their instruction to meet the needs of all students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:  
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

In the Spring of 2022, Nassau County School District created the High School Intensive Reading Framework Visual that outlines the format of expected instructional design of the classroom model. Through this framework, an outline of how the BEST standards for Intensive Reading are taught and the needs of the individual student are met based off of data analysis.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Increased time for ESE teacher/Paraprofessional in ELA block.
2. Data from Lexia, FAST PM, and Star will be used monthly for monitor progress.
3. Professional development for teachers.

**Person Responsible**

Lori Amos (amoslo@nassau.k12.fl.us)



**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

In 2022, our ESE population has performed below 41% (37% of our SLD population were proficient in 2021).

**Measurable Outcome:**  
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

42% of our ESE population will score at or above a level 3.

**Monitoring:**  
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students performance on Star data, Lexia, and FAST PM.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lori Amos (amoslo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Our ESE teachers are using activities developed from Lexia and Sonday program with our ESE students when working in small groups.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

These systems are researched-based with proven success regarding closing the achievement gaps specifically focusing on foundational skills.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Continue educator training with Sonday System.

**Person Responsible**

Lori Amos (amoslo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** Based off of the ELL performance of the 2022 FSA, 18% of ELL students demonstrated proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** 42% of the ELL students will perform at or above a level 3 on the FSA ELA assessment.

**Monitoring:**  
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** Students will be monitored on their performance utilizing monthly STAR Data, Lexia, FAST PM, and classroom assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Lori Amos (amoslo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** Utilizing data from WIDA and/or the IPT assessment, the ELA teacher will implement the LEP Plan and deliver individualized instruction to the ELL students that will help improve the students understanding and use of the English language.

For the past year, ELL students have performed below expectations.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** Providing instruction that helps students diminish the language barrier will allow the ELL students to understand the English language text and instruction. As a result, ELL student performance levels will improve.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Ensure all teachers are provided a copy of the current LEP for the ELL students.

**Person Responsible** Lori Amos (amoslo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Asian**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based off of the ELL performance of the 2022 FSA, 40% of ELL students demonstrated proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

42% of the ELL students will perform at or above a level 3 on the FSA ELA assessment.

**Monitoring:**  
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Students will be monitored on their performance utilizing monthly STAR Data, Lexia, FAST PM, and classroom assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lori Amos (amoslo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Utilizing data from WIDA and/or the IPT assessment, the ELA teacher will implement the LEP Plan and deliver individualized instruction to the ELL students that will help improve the students understanding and use of the English language.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

For the past year, ELL students have performed below expectations.

Providing instruction that helps students diminish the language barrier will allow the ELL students to understand the English language text and instruction. As a result, ELL student performance levels will improve.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Ensure all teachers are provided a copy of the current LEP for the ELL students.

**Person Responsible**

Lori Amos (amoslo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based off the 2022 FSA results, FSA Math Learning Gains of the lowest 25th percentile was at or below 26%.

**Measurable**

**Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

The Learning Gains of our lowest 25th percentile in Math will improve by 3%.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Student progress on classroom based assessments will be used to track student progress towards proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lori Amos (amoslo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Algebra 1 teachers will use Math Nation to assist instudent deficits in mathematic concepts. Lessons and activities will incorporate BEST Standards while providing remediation for areas that demonstrate weaknesses.

**Rationale for  
Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

This summer administration participated in an Unpacking the Standards Workshop for the new Math BEST Standards. Math Nation will be utilized to supplement the classroom curriculum providing additional instructional videos and step-by-step problems over the lesson taught. This information has been shared and discussed with the Algebra 1 teachers through Professional Development Days paid by the School Advisory Committee.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Ensure all teachers know how to access and use the Math Nation website and are able to share this information with their students.

**Person Responsible** Lori Amos (amoslo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

## 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Yulee High School hosts strategically planned events throughout the school year such as:

- \* Back to School Meet and Greet
- \* Open House
- \* Homecoming Events
- \* Weekly Faculty and Staff Hornet Huddle to share positive classroom success stories.
- \* Monthly Gathering for Faculty and Staff
- \* Utilizes variety of communication formats to all stakeholders including: Facebook, updated school website, Remind, School Reach, and FOCUS (parent/teacher/student portal for the reporting of grades, attendance,
- \* Notifications posted on the school marquee for upcoming events.
- \* Reward for students for positive behaviors each nine weeks

### Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

\* Yulee High School employs three School Counselors and one School Social Worker who collaborate daily and work cohesively to promote positive mental health among the students, faculty, and staff.

\* The School Advisory Committee meets throughout the year to discuss student performance, events, and progress towards meeting goals outlined in the School Improvement Plan.

Part V: Budget

\*Yulee High School's Leadership team meets monthly to collaborate on key factors that directly impact the operation of the organization.