

Nassau County School District

Fernandina Beach Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Fernandina Beach Middle School

315 CITRONA DR, Fernandina Beach, FL 32034

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Crawford, Anna	Principal	
Matricardi, Mandi	Assistant Principal	
Mattox, Nicki	Instructional Coach	
Jones, Bailee	Teacher, K-12	
Owens, Greg	Attendance/Social Work	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Development of the school improvement plan (SIP) consists of input from the school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents and community leaders. The school leadership team disaggregates pertinent data included in the SIP. The data is discussed with the teachers, SMART goals are formulated and the SIP is created. Once a draft of the plan is created, it is shared with our parents, families, community leaders for their input. Additionally, the plan is also shared with our C.R.E.W. Leaders, a group of student leaders, for their input.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards through monthly monitoring of struggling students, through monitoring data gained from pre and mid year FAST and STAR testing, as well as by monitoring the academic progress of all students. Additionally, the school will follow the K-12 Reading plan set forth by the district in an effort to further increase the achievement of students. Quarterly "data digs" will occur involving all teachers, and from those meetings, we will revise the plan as needed to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	40%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	57	50	134	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	40	37	87	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	41	41	102	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	15	16	47	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	32	3	50	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	42	31	86

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	40	51	132	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	20	27	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	15	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	39	51	110	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	26	39	78	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	67	44	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		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	17	38	64

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	40	51	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	20	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	39	51	110
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	26	39	78
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	67	44	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	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	17	38	64

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	66	61	49	63	64	50	63		
ELA Learning Gains				51			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				27			28		
Math Achievement*	78	80	56	72	34	36	65		
Math Learning Gains				55			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				28			34		
Science Achievement*	65	69	49	62	77	53	69		
Social Studies Achievement*	79	81	68	79	58	58	79		
Middle School Acceleration	85	83	73	87	44	49	69		
Graduation Rate					69	49			
College and Career Acceleration					83	70			
ELP Progress	25	35	40	37	82	76	52		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	398

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	561
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL	39	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	55			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	2	1
ELL	32	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	46			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	66			78			65	79	85			25
SWD	32			41			25	31			4	
ELL	27			46			33	64			5	25
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			55			41	50			4	
HSP	50			62			42	64	87		6	25
MUL	64			77							2	
PAC												
WHT	72			83			71	83	84		5	
FRL	51			64			42	60	85		6	30

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	51	27	72	55	28	62	79	87			37
SWD	27	27	13	35	28	5	42	43				
ELL	22	34	22	39	36	24	29	43				37
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	25	15	35	31	21	28	56				
HSP	42	42	20	51	40	22	38	55				39
MUL	61	62		73	62							
PAC												
WHT	70	54	32	78	60	29	69	85	88			
FRL	45	42	28	53	42	23	46	67	76			40

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	63	52	28	65	50	34	69	79	69			52
SWD	25	29	19	29	27	32	45	43				
ELL	23	30	18	26	23	25						52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	38	22	34	41	33	56	75	46			
HSP	44	47	28	41	34	31	40	55	67			50
MUL	43	43		50	45							
PAC												
WHT	70	56	33	73	54	35	74	82	71			
FRL	47	43	21	47	41	34	55	65	52			52

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	60%	60%	0%	47%	13%
08	2023 - Spring	64%	58%	6%	47%	17%
06	2023 - Spring	64%	59%	5%	47%	17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	83%	85%	-2%	54%	29%
07	2023 - Spring	85%	83%	2%	48%	37%
08	2023 - Spring	32%	53%	-21%	55%	-23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	64%	67%	-3%	44%	20%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	58%	31%	50%	39%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	54%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	79%	-2%	66%	11%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest performing data component was 8th grade pre algebra. The students in this class consisted mainly of our lowest quartile and ESSA subgroups.

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

Eighth grade pre algebra showed the greatest decline when compared to the previous year. Contributing factors for this decline include the number of 8th grade students placed in Algebra. Students placed in pre algebra mainly consisted of lowest quartile students. Additionally, a teacher new to middle school was placed in pre algebra.

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.

Eighth grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Students in pre-algebra were mainly in the lowest quartile and had learning gaps which contributed to the greatest decline. The district average for 8th grade math was 53%, placing Nassau county at 22nd in the state. FBMS was at 32% proficient.

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

Seventh grade math showed the most improvement. FBMS scored at 69% proficient in the 21/22 school year and had an increase of 15% in 22/23 scoring at 84% proficient. Teachers focused on small group instruction. Teachers analyzed data from PM1 and PM2 and discussed standards which needed more of an emphasis in instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

One area of concern is attendance. FBMS had 134 students who missed 10 or more school days last year. Another area of concern is the number of students with a significant reading deficiency. The school has 114 students identified as having a reading deficiency.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement for the 23-24 school year include:

Increasing the percent of students scoring at or above proficiency in the identified ESSA groups to a 41% proficiency or higher in reading and math.

Increasing student proficiency in 8th grade pre algebra.

Decreasing absences of 10 or more among students in 23/24 school year.

Improve student performance and learning gains for our lowest quartile.

Increasing the amount of time spent actually teaching grade level standards.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

During the 22/23 school year, 134 students missed 10% or more of school. FBMS encourages students to attend school by having multiple positive school activities planned such as; PBIS celebrations, classroom incentives, mentors on campus who regularly check students with attendance issues.

Measurable Outcome:

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

FBMS will decrease the number of student absences by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

Student attendance will be monitored through MTSS and will be an added component to attending our PBIS celebrations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bailee Jones (jonesba2@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

After three consecutive days of being absent per class period, teachers are expected to call home and document the attempted contact through the school wide parent communication document. If absences continue for more than 8 days per nine weeks, teacher will contact parent and have a conference to discuss attendance issues.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

20% of students have an attendance below 90%. Attendance has a direct correlation to student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Create a centralized document, separate from the school-wide communication log, to identify, monitor, and document communications and interventions with students demonstrating a lack of attendance.

- Identify/Assign a single teacher (suggest 1st period teacher) to be the primary contact for monitoring, communicating, and documenting in regards to identified students.

Person Responsible: Bailee Jones (jonesba2@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly.

The school will explore options for establishing an email address for submitting excuses for absences.

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

By When: The end of quarter two.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Low-performing subgroups:

Students with Disabilities (SWD)

English Language Learners (ELL)

African Americans

Hispanics

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome for the subgroups: SWD 28%, ELL 32%, African Americans 30%, and Hispanic 39% proficiency rate to be moved to at least 41% proficiency for each subgroup. Students in these subgroups will be targets for the school tutoring program. The support facilitators and paraprofessionals have been strategically placed to support all students in the subgroups. ELL students have been placed in an ELL reading class.

Monitoring:

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

The desired outcome will be monitored with the state PM1, PM2, and PM3 data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicki Mattox (mattoxni@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students identified in the ESSA groups will participate in the LLI reading program during tutoring and the Sonday System for intensive reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for this specific strategy is to close the learning gaps.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

*Identify students in each ESSA group.

*Support facilitators and teachers are using data to drive instruction.

*Students are being placed in appropriate tutoring groups, small group instruction, and additional courses to achieve learning gains.

*Unit/District Assessments, in addition to PM FAST data, will be disaggregated to identify specific standards, or content within the standard, to direct small group or tutoring time instruction and practice

Person Responsible: Nicki Mattox (mattoxni@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: The end of 2023/2024 school year.

Identify students in each ESSA group and identify previous grade level interventions.

Person Responsible: Nicki Mattox (mattoxni@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: To be completed by the end of quarter two.

Review data with teachers at a minimum of once per quarter per year.

Person Responsible: Nicki Mattox (mattoxni@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Our school district directors work in conjunction with our finance director to review our school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. School improvement funding is a district level decision.