Nassau County School District

Fernandina Beach Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fernandina Beach Middle School

315 CITRONA DR, Fernandina Beach, FL 32034

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Anna Crawford

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	40%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Fernandina Beach Middle School

315 CITRONA DR, Fernandina Beach, FL 32034

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	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	27%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		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.

The mission of the Nassau County School District and at Fernandina Beach Middle School 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 at Fernandina Beach Middle School is to promote, support, and afford students the opportunity to become productive members of society and life-long learners.

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
Crawford, Anna	Principal	
Matricardi, Mandi	Assistant Principal	
Mellin, Sandra	Reading Coach	
Bunch, Brenda	School Counselor	
Jones, Bailee	Teacher, K-12	Math teacher, math department chair
Jones, Tymira	Teacher, K-12	ELA teacher, ELA department chair
Owens, Greg	Attendance/Social Work	Lic Clinical Social Worker, Member of school leadership team

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Anna Crawford

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
43

Total number of students enrolled at the school
685

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
8

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	224	218	243	0	0	0	0	685
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	40	51	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	20	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	39	51	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	26	39	0	0	0	0	78
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	67	44	0	0	0	0	114
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	9	17	38	0	0	0	0	64

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/11/2022

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	203	236	232	0	0	0	0	671
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	60	60	0	10	0	0	174
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	7	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	19	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	20	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	55	68	0	0	0	0	176
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	31	61	0	0	0	0	129
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	10	28	36	0	0	0	0	74

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	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	8

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	203	236	232	0	0	0	0	671
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	60	60	0	10	0	0	174
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	7	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	19	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	20	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	55	68	0	0	0	0	176
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	31	61	0	0	0	0	129
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	10	28	36	0	0	0	0	74

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	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	8

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	63%	64%	50%				69%	64%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						56%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	27%						46%	44%	47%
Math Achievement	72%	34%	36%				78%	74%	58%
Math Learning Gains	55%						64%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	28%						56%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	77%	53%				66%	64%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	58%	58%				74%	72%	72%

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**
06	2022					
	2019	67%	63%	4%	54%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	64%	59%	5%	52%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
08	2022					
	2019	72%	65%	7%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019	69%	71%	-2%	55%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	81%	76%	5%	54%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
08	2022					
	2019	58%	62%	-4%	46%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	65%	60%	5%	48%	17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	77%	72%	5%	71%	6%

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

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	97%	74%	23%	61%	36%

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

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	27	27	13	35	28	5	42	43			
ELL	22	34	22	39	36	24	29	43			
BLK	25	25	15	35	31	21	28	56			
HSP	42	42	20	51	40	22	38	55			
MUL	61	62		73	62						
WHT	70	54	32	78	60	29	69	85	88		
FRL	45	42	28	53	42	23	46	67	76		

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	25	29	19	29	27	32	45	43			
ELL	23	30	18	26	23	25					
BLK	36	38	22	34	41	33	56	75	46		

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
HSP	44	47	28	41	34	31	40	55	67		
MUL	43	43		50	45						
WHT	70	56	33	73	54	35	74	82	71		
FRL	47	43	21	47	41	34	55	65	52		

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	34	44	36	31	48	41	36	26			
ELL	24	38	33	40	45	33	30				
BLK	56	61	54	56	55	50	40	61	58		
HSP	51	52	39	64	58	47	57	68	54		
MUL	67	52		70	82	58		65			
WHT	73	56	45	83	64	61	71	77	66		
FRL	53	51	47	65	63	54	54	59	45		

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	37
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	561
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
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	63
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	46
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?

After reviewing the data points from the 21-22 SY, FBMS:
scored above the state in 6 of the 8 categories reported
remained the same or increased percentages in ELA achievement (same, 63), math achievement (+7 to 72), math Learning Gains (+5 to 55) and social studies (same, 79)
decreased (-1) in ELA LG (51) and ELA bottom 25th (27)
decreased (-6) in Math Lowest 25th (28)
decreased (-7) in science achievement

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

Based off of data components and trend data for FBMS, the greatest need for improvement is science proficiency (-7 from 2021 to 62), as well as improvement in proficiency of our SWD (28), ELL (30), AA (30), and Hispanic (39) sub groups. For the 2nd year, SWD (28%) and ELL (30%) students fell below the overall federal index target of 41% proficient. Achievement/proficiency data of lowest quartile students (bottom 25th) indicates an area of improvement needed, as well.

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

The contributing factors for the school's need for improvement include the following:
There was a lack of consistent use of evidence based instructional practices by our staff working with subgroups falling below the federal index, lack of strategies used to engage students, and science standards tested on the NGSS were not taught at the level intended and/or taught to mastery.

To improve:
1. FBMS must become masters of the BEST standards by developing a deep understanding of them.
2. Small group instruction must be taught utilizing the newly adopted Math Nation and Savvas texts at the level intended, and a greater emphasis must be placed on scaffolding and differentiation to insure that all students maintain or increase their proficiency in all core subjects.
3. Greater emphasis must be placed on teaching grade level standards at the level intended and tested in all core subjects; this will improve Tier I instruction for all students.
4.Progress monitoring data must be utilized to provide prescriptive instruction for struggling learners.
5. Bring back review days prior to testing

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

Despite being 5 points below the district (77), math achievement increased 7 percentage points (72) in 2022 and was 18 percentage points above the state (54). Additionally, despite dropping 1% in ELA achievement (63), FBMS scored 13 percentage points above the state (50). Middle school acceleration points also showed tremendous improvement.

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

The contributing factors to improvement included but were not limited to:
1. evidence based instructional strategies were utilized in many classrooms, by our support staff, and during before and after school tutoring.
2. seeing the potential in students and providing them the support needed to be successful in accelerated courses.
3. progress monitoring data was utilized to better define areas where students needed additional support in core subject areas.

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

True differentiation strategies, as well as scaffolding, must be in place for small group math and ELA classrooms to maintain and grow students in key areas. Teachers must know exactly which students are in their lowest quartile, they must employ differentiated strategies with differing outcomes for students depending on their current and past data, and teachers must utilize differentiation strategies directly from the Savvas and Math Nation resources. Additionally, science and social studies standards must be taught at the grade level and level intended.

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.

1. Continued development of key school leaders, including principal, ast. principal, and literacy coach, on the science of reading with the assistance of the regional directors from the Florida State Literacy Team.

2. Train the trainer model on creating school based Literacy Leadership Teams.

3. Maximizing instruction by implementing ELA, Math, and Science Professional Learning Communities with intentional collaboration and intentional lesson planning at all grade levels.

4. Intensive professional learning for team leads for Math and ELA on the newly adopted instructional materials from Math Nation and Savvas as related to the BEST standards.

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

1. Continued professional learning for key school leaders on ELA and Math standards
2. Ongoing Train the Trainer model provided to the literacy coach on ELA Best Standards and the science of reading
3. Ongoing PLCs led by literacy coach and admin in all core subject areas with a focus on improvement year over year and beyond.
4. Ongoing PLCs led by literacy coach and admin to support teachers so that every teacher knows how to read and unpack the BEST standards and select instructional materials from our latest adoption to support all learners in ELA and Math.
5. Ongoing PLCs with a focus on the utilization of high yield strategies in classrooms, as well as teaching grade level standards at the the grade and level intended.

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 Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	2022 FSA data indicated improvement is needed in the areas of learning gains for math and ELA lowest quartile learners, as well as math and ELA learning gains for all learners. ELA Learning gains for students in the lowest quartile fell below the state (-11), below the district (-7), and 1 point from 2021 to 2022 to 27%. ELA learning gains for all students remained +3 above the state, but FBMS scored -1 point below the district and fell -1 from the previous year to 51%. Math gains for lowest quartile learners fell below the state (-3), below the district (-17), and -6 points from 2021 to 2022 to 28%. Math Learning Gains for all students was above the state (+3), but -3 below the district (+58). However, math Learning Gains did increase +5 from 2021 to 2022 to +55.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	FBMS will increase learning gains for ELA and math, both overall and for the lowest quartile by three percentage points. ELA: 51% to 54% ELA LQ: 27% to 30% Math: 55% to 58% Math LQ: 28% to 31%
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will utilize the STAR Renaissance and the FAST assessment to monitor and predict student outcomes related to learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anna Crawford (crawfordan@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will identify each student on their roster and determine their needs for differentiation at the teacher table/small group instruction using formative and summative measures. Teachers will track and monitor the projected performance of each student with beginning of the year, middle of the year, and end of the year STAR assessments. FAST will be an additional measure to track projected performance and movement of students toward their individual desired outcomes for proficiency. Evidence based strategies that will be utilized for both reading and math will be differentiated small group instruction with differentiated outcomes for each student utilizing a gradual release model for small and whole group direct, systematic instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this	When teachers know and understand their student's data, and they respond to the needs indicated by the data, student outcomes will increase for learning gains and learning gains of the lowest quartile. This process begins with awareness and change only occurs when teachers properly respond to the needs indicated by the data.

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

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 able to retrieve, data-mine, and understand their student data from STAR and FAST utilizing the Renaissance Place and FLfast.org platforms.

Person Responsible Anna Crawford (crawfordan@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Provide professional development on the literacy instructional model using data to drive whole and small group instruction unique to differentiated learners.

Person Responsible Anna Crawford (crawfordan@nassau.k12.fl.us)

ELA teachers will implement the new literacy framework provided by the Regional State Literacy Directors. Math teachers will implement unit planning and PLC structures provided by Math Nation consultants.

Person Responsible Anna Crawford (crawfordan@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Although FBMS scored +13 points above the state on the State Science Assessment (NGSSS), the school dropped -7 points from the previous year and scored -7 points below the district.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Increase proficiency on the NGSSS from 62% to 65%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This area of focus will be monitored through grade book checks, collaborative PLCs, and quarterly data disaggregation of district provided common assessments administered quarterly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anna Crawford (crawfordan@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Through quarterly common assessments, teachers will identify questions, standards that data indicates has not been mastered by students and will reteach this information for mastery. Instruction should be differentiated and scaffolded as needed during initial delivery and redelivery of information. High engagement instruction should also be evident and aligned to the curriculum pacing guide. Vertical planning between grade levels for all science teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	If each science teacher knows their student data and is proficient with teaching grade level science standards to the appropriate grade and to the appropriate level intended, the school should see an increase in science proficiency.

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 retrieve data from quarterly science assessments in order to identify students who have not mastered certain science standards.

Person Responsible Anna Crawford (crawfordan@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#3. 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.	ESSA Subgroup - Achievement for Students with Disabilities decreased from 31% in 2021 to 28% in 2022. The 28% is below the required Federal Index of 41%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Proficiency for the sub group population will increase 5-7%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The Areas of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome using progress monitoring data from STAR reading assessments given monthly to students in the lowest 25% and for all students at the beginning, middle, and end of year. In addition, this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome using STAR math assessments for all students at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. The FAST assessment will also be administered three times per year and used to monitor progress in both reading and math. Lastly, the school will monitor evidence-based strategies in teacher lesson plans and during classroom observations. Teachers will be expected to monitor and report on the progress of the subgroup quarterly and adjust instruction as needed to meet the needs of students within the subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anna Crawford (crawfordan@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The evidence-based strategies being implemented for the Areas of Focus include the following: Provide and ensure ESE teachers have common planning with their general education teammates, allowing them to understand the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) method of planning. This will also permit ESE teachers to develop a better understanding of the BEST standards, how to use data points and formative and summative assessments to drive instruction, and share best teaching practices with their general education counterparts.

	Additionally, provide and ensure that grade level departments have common planning, allowing them to better understand BEST standards, plan for engaging lessons to meet the needs of Students with Disabilities as well as all subgroups, and to have standards based discussion on instructing and assessing students at each grade level and within each core subject area.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The rationale for this evidence-based strategy is that all teachers must be knowledgeable about reading instruction and understand that struggling readers need a systemic reading approach to help them decode challenging text. In addition to the literacy framework, the UDL will provide support to struggling readers. Solid literacy based instruction will benefit all subgroups and learners in all subject areas. Additionally, teachers will spiral back to previously taught concepts to help build automaticity with skills including but not limited to math concepts. These strategies will focus on SWD subgroups, but will benefit all learners.

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. Refine the instructional model for reading and math to enhance differentiated instruction to meet the needs of students with disabilities and Black/African American Students
2. Provide ESE teachers with collaborative planning time to model and discuss evidence-based practices, co-plan standards-based lessons, and analyze data with the general education teacher(s) to which they are assigned.
3. Enlist ESE teachers in professional development to a) enhance their understanding of the new BEST standards; and b) teach them how to design lesson plans that focus on spiraling and reinforcing standards covered by the general education teacher.
4. Administer Literacy intervention programs such as Sonday to help bridge the gap between current reading level and on-grade reading level of students with disabilities.
5. Employ math spiral review as part of daily routine in support of the general education teacher.
6. Progress monitor students with disabilities and make necessary adjustments based on varying needs.

Person Responsible Anna Crawford (crawfordan@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Achievement for Black/African American Students decreased from 42% to 30% in 2022. The 30% is below the required Federal Index of 41%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Proficiency for the sub group population will increase 5-7%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The Areas of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome using progress monitoring data from STAR reading assessments given monthly to students in the lowest 25% and for all students at the beginning, middle, and end of year. In addition, this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome using STAR math assessments for all students at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. The FAST assessment will also be administered three times per year and used to monitor progress in both reading and math. Lastly, the school will monitor evidence-based strategies in teacher lesson plans and during classroom observations. Teachers will be expected to monitor and report on the progress of the subgroup quarterly and adjust instruction as needed to meet the needs of students within the subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anna Crawford (crawfordan@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The evidence-based strategies being implemented for the Areas of Focus include the following: Provide and ensure teachers have common planning with their grade level, subject area teammates, allowing them to develop a better understanding of the standards, how to use data points and formative and summative assessments to drive instruction, and to share best teaching practices within their grade level and subject area. This also allows them to plan for engaging lessons to meet the needs of Black/African American students as well as all subgroups, and to have standards based discussion on instructing and assessing students at each grade level and within each core subject area.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for this evidence-based strategy is that all teachers must be knowledgeable about

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	reading instruction and understand that struggling readers need a systemic reading approach to help them decode challenging text. In addition to the literacy framework, the UDL will provide support to struggling readers. Solid literacy based instruction will benefit all subgroups and learners in all subject areas. Additionally, teachers will spiral back to previously taught concepts to help build automaticity with skills including but not limited to math concepts. These strategies will focus on Black/African American subgroups, but will benefit all learners.

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. Refine the instructional model for reading and math to enhance differentiated instruction to meet the needs of Black/African American Students
2. Provide teachers with collaborative planning time to model and discuss evidence-based practices, co-plan standards-based lessons, and analyze data
3. Enlist subject and grade level expert teachers in professional development to a) enhance understanding of the new BEST standards; and b) teach them how to design lesson plans that focus on spiraling and reinforcing
standards covered by the general education teacher.
4. Administer Literacy intervention programs such as Sonday to help bridge the gap between current reading level and on-grade reading level of students with disabilities.
5. Employ math spiral review as part of daily routine in support of the general education teacher.
6. Progress monitor Black/African American students and make necessary adjustments based on varying needs.

Person Responsible Anna Crawford (crawfordan@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.

Fernandina Beach Middle School builds positive school culture through the following ways:
*School-wide implementation of Positive Behavior Management Systems (PBIS)
*Welcome Back to School night for students
*6th Grade and New Student Orientation night for students and parents
*Annual Open House held in Fall

*Homecoming events
*Battle of the Bridge to create camaraderie with sister school
*Before and After School clubs
*Spring orientation visit to FBMS' campus for incoming 6th graders
*Spring orientation visit by CREW leaders and principal at feeder school to speak with current 5th graders
*Band concerts (free to all family) held 2-3 times per year
*Annual theater productions free to families
*Annual Meet the Author event
*Monthly breakfast prior to faculty meetings
*Notifications posted on school marquee for upcoming events
*Student mentoring programs
*Various staff recognition programs
*Various student recognition programs
*School mental health services and resources
*Various PTO family events held throughout the year
*Various communication formats including robo-calls via Blackboard Connect, updates to school website, weekly facebook announcements, Remind 101, and Focus SIS platform

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

*Administration assures committees and clubs are active to promote and nurture student interests on campus, providing a safe and educational space for students during and after school.
*School counselors, school mental health counselor, and outside mental health agencies collaborate to promote positive mental health among students, staff, and faculty.
*School Advisory Committee meets throughout the year to discuss student performance, gains toward performance measures.
*PBIS coordinator and committee ensures that all students know and understand the school-wide expectations and positive rewards for meeting and exceeding positive behavior goals.