

Nassau County School District

Yulee Elementary 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Yulee Elementary School

86063 FELMOR RD, Yulee, FL 32097

[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.

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.

The vision of Yulee Elementary School is to establish a positive collaborative work culture that promotes and fosters teaching and learning among the community of learners. The school's instructional focus will be centered on the use of small groups and include differentiation for all students as well as the integration of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) within literacy blocks. Classroom instruction will include a strong emphasis on the development of a model for vocabulary instruction as well as the teaching of fluency and comprehension skills in Reading and Math blocks. Curriculum will also be spiraled on a daily basis.

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
Albury, Rachael	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Chair
Cubbal, Bryce	Principal	
Franklin, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	ESE Lead Teacher
Goddard, Jessica	Reading Coach	
Jones, kellie	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Chair
Libby, Tara	Assistant Principal	
Page, Moya	School Counselor	
Paul, Kristi	Paraprofessional	
Szubelak, Gloria	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Chair
Tate, Jonathan	Teacher, K-12	PE Teacher

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.

The school leadership team is comprised of leaders in each job category at Yulee Elementary School. The leadership team is comprised of administration, grade level chairs, literacy coach, guidance, activity teacher, and paraprofessional. The school leadership team is involved in the analysis of data needed for the SIP. The leadership team also helps draft the SIP goals and action steps each year. This involvement is necessary as these members ensure that all action items are carried out with fidelity.

In addition, Yulee Elementary develops a School Advisory Committee according to state guidelines. Each year the SAC offer feedback and vote to approve the current SIP. They also review mid year data and work with the school to complete a Mid Year Reflection. Finally, the SAC also offer end of year feedback and insight into Title I funds and expenditures.

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))

Monitoring must occur regularly and continuously in order to ensure our strategies and interventions are being successful. Monitoring of our SIP goals and strategies begin at the classroom level. Teachers regularly complete test item analysis following the administration of each test. Useful information is gained from this, and is used to make instructional decisions to close gaps in learning. Planning teams complete a similar process to ensure we are appropriately covering material, and teaching it to the level of rigor the state standard was written to. Related trends by subgroups or demographics are analyzed during the instructional planning process. Revisions or adjustments to the plan are made as needed in order to ensure the plan remains relevant and effective.

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)	Elementary School 3-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	43%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
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	28	28	35	0	0	0	91	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	5	10	16	0	0	0	31	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	7	1	2	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	11	24	0	0	0	40	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	14	34	0	0	0	51	
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	0	0		

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	4	6	14	0	0	0	24

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	5	0	1	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	31	49	50	0	0	0	130	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	4	5	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	5	4	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	6	2	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	25	25	0	0	0	58	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	22	20	0	0	0	44	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	15	22	19	0	0	0	56	

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	8	17	23	0	0	0	48

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	8	1	2	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2

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	31	49	50	0	0	0	130	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	4	5	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	5	4	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	6	2	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	25	25	0	0	0	58	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	22	20	0	0	0	44	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	15	22	19	0	0	0	56	

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	8	17	23	0	0	0	48

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	8	1	2	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2

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*	67	69	53	67	69	56	71		
ELA Learning Gains				65			72		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			58		
Math Achievement*	72	77	59	78	53	50	83		
Math Learning Gains				68			84		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			77		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	63	69	54	66	81	59	73		
Social Studies Achievement*					70	64			
Middle School Acceleration					65	52			
Graduation Rate					70	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	30	50	59						

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	300
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
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	51			
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	50			
HSP	68			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	57			

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	43			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	50			
HSP	64			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	56			

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	67			72			63					30
SWD	51			46			44				4	
ELL	38			75							3	30
AMI												
ASN	50			100							2	
BLK	53			61			31				4	
HSP	66			74			65				4	
MUL	67			65			64				4	
PAC												
WHT	68			72			65				4	
FRL	55			64			55				4	

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	67	65	56	78	68	58	66					
SWD	39	55	52	43	42	44	29					
ELL	38	60		56	70							
AMI												
ASN	64	85		86	85							
BLK	49	46	55	65	54		29					
HSP	60	64		70	60							
MUL	70	70		78	70		80					
PAC												
WHT	69	66	56	79	68	58	68					
FRL	57	60	48	67	60	50	53					

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	71	72	58	83	84	77	73					
SWD	45	61	67	63	68	67	36					
ELL	38			62								

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
AMI												
ASN	65			76								
BLK	57	53		77	87		64					
HSP	67			77	80		60					
MUL	68	64		73	79		69					
PAC												
WHT	73	77	67	85	84	81	76					
FRL	63	65	58	77	77	70	61					

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
05	2023 - Spring	74%	73%	1%	54%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	71%	-2%	58%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	66%	69%	-3%	50%	16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	73%	76%	-3%	59%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	78%	-5%	61%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	78%	81%	-3%	55%	23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	63%	69%	-6%	51%	12%

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 22-23 School year indicated that school wide our ELA performance was lower than our Mathematics performance. According to our F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring 3 data, our school wide Mathematics proficiency rate was 73% compared to our ELA performance of 70%. It is important to note however that our ELA data is on the rise, increasing from 67% to 70% school wide. A contributing factor is related to the new B.E.S.T standards as well as the adoption of new curriculum. New standards can create learning curves for educators and educational gaps for learners due to missing foundational knowledge.

Our Students with Disabilities subgroup performs lower than our non-disabled students. Our 22-23 data indicates 45% of students performed at a proficiency level on the ELA F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring and 57% of students performed at a proficiency level on the Math F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring 3 assessment. A contributing factor is related to the new B.E.S.T standards as well as the adoption of new curriculum. New standards can create learning curves for educators and educational gaps for learners due to missing foundational knowledge. This previously mentioned factor is multiplied when combined with varying exceptionalities and learning disabilities.

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

Mathematics showed the greatest decline school wide. Our proficiency rate for the 22-23 school year was 73%. This is a 5% drop from the 21-22 school year where our proficiency was 78%. A deeper dive indicates the following decline in each grade level. 3rd Grade in the 21-22 school year had a proficiency rate of 73% and dropped to 72% for the 22-23 school year. 4th Grade in the 21-22 school year had a proficiency rate of 77% and dropped to 73% for the 22-23 school year. 5th Grade in the 21-22 school year had a proficiency rate of 80% and dropped to 78% for the 22-23 school year. One contributing factor was the release of new Mathematical Standards released from FLDOE. Although professional development was offered throughout the year, new standards bring on new challenges as gaps in learning from grade to grade become present. An additional contributing factor is the addition of new curriculum to go along with the previously mentioned new standards. New curriculum is not familiar to any teacher and comes with a learning curve. A final contributing factor is new teachers on grade level teams. They require additional support and take time to develop their pedagogy.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

All of the performance indicators have us above the State average. With that being said, 4th grade ELA was only 12% higher than state average scoring 69% compared to 57%. Remaining ELA grade levels scored as follows, 3rd ELA was 16% higher than the state average (66% vs 50%), 5th ELA was 20% higher than state average (75% vs 55%). Mathematics showed similar results. 3rd Math was 13% higher than the state average (72% vs 59%), 4th Math was 13% higher than the state average (73% vs 60%), and 5th math was 23% higher (78% vs 55%).

Overall, our ELA data is trending up. All grade levels increased proficiency 3%-4%. Unfortunately, our Math proficiency rate is trending down. We dropped 5% in 22-23 to 73% proficient from 78% in 21-22.

Our ESE County wide data is higher than the State average for 22-23.

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

Our ELA data has increased in all grade levels over the past year. 4th grade ELA and 5th grade ELA showed the most improvement with 4th grade increasing from 65% in 2022 to 69 in 2023 and 5th grade ELA increasing from 71% in 2022 to 75% in 2023. As a school we continue to develop our knowledge and understanding of the most recent B.E.S.T Standards and adopted curriculum. We also continue to perform data analysis activities to help guide instructional decisions.

Our Students with Disabilities subgroup showed improvement. Our 22-23 data indicates 45% of students with disabilities performed at a proficiency level on the ELA F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring 3 assessment compared to 39% in 21-22. Our 22-23 data indicates 57% of students with disabilities performed at a proficiency level on the Math F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring 3 assessment compared to 43% in 21-22. Yulee Elementary continues to meet the needs of our students at their academic level, offering differentiated instruction designed to close achievement gaps.

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

Attendance continues to be a focus in all grade levels. 91 students school wide missed 10% or more of the school year.

The proficiency rate of Math continues to be an area of focus. School wide 51 students received a level 1 on the PM3 Math Assessment compared to 40 on the ELA Assessment.

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

Yulee Elementary has identified 3 priorities for the 2023-2024 school year.

1. Increase Math Proficiency Rate
2. Increase ELA Proficiency Rate
3. Increase Teacher Retention Rate

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 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.

Yulee Elementary will decrease the percentage of students school wide performing below a proficiency level of 3 or higher on the 23-24 ELA PM3 F.A.S.T Assessment. Our overall ELA scores improved for the 22-23 school year compared to the 21-22 school year, but there is still a need to decrease the percentage of students performing below the proficiency level. Students becoming proficient readers is foundational for success in other subjects. If we continue to meet the needs of all learners, the percentage of students not proficient will continue to decrease.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Yulee Elementary will decrease the percentage of students school wide performing below a proficiency level of 3 or higher from 30% in the 22-23 school year to 27% in 23-24 on the F.A.S.T Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our progress by dissecting our results from the Beginning of Year STAR ELA Assessment. The STAR Assessment is taken quarterly and is a good indicator on how students will perform on the End of Year. According to our most recent STAR Assessment we have 37% of our students performing below the proficiency benchmark (3rd-35%, 4th-35%, 5th-40%).

Grade levels meet weekly to perform a test item analysis on the most recent assessment. The dissected data is then used to make instructional decisions for the next several weeks of instruction. Our literacy coach also has data chats in order to guide teachers through instructional grouping practices. Many students are also served through our MTSS process to help ensure they are successful in the general education classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bryce Cubbal (cubbalbr@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.)

We must first identify students who are performing below the proficiency level. From there, we examine current and additional instructional supports we can implement and put in place for our students. Most students receive multiple doses of instruction throughout the day. Differentiated small group instruction is a primary instructional strategy in which we find great success. The instruction must be standards based, differentiated, and based on the Science of Reading research. Additional professional development is also needed to ensure they are equipped with the tools and knowledge they need as professionals. Most recently teachers received PD on the practice profiles with emphasis on explicit and scaffolded Instruction.

3rd through 5th grade students received daily small group differentiated phonics instruction and standards-based remedial standards-based reading curriculum instruction as part of their 90-minute reading block. The Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) program, Freckle, and Sonday System are also used to provide Tier 3 interventions.

Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI)-(strong evidence-per Evidence for ESSA)

Sonday System program aligns with the IES Practice Guided recommendations. (Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 5th grade.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We must meet our students where they are academically. This will ensure learning gaps are filled so we can move forward toward on-level instruction. We must also continue to provide professional development for teachers in how to provide quality research-based instruction. Teachers must continue to develop skills in the areas of explicit and scaffolded instruction, and engagement strategies.

The purpose of small group instruction is to address learning deficits. When students are placed in small groups of 2 to 6 and provided direct instructional support, student success increases.

The use of the Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention program provides educators effective intervention resources and strategies that allow students to apply each concept in increasingly challenging situations to build accuracy, automaticity, and fluency within the five reading components.

By using the Sonday System to target crucial foundational skills to students who are exhibiting extreme deficits in phonics and phonemic awareness.

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.

1. Targeted in-school support with small group instruction
2. Tiered support as indicated in MTSS and supported by the A-Team
3. After school tutoring of our lower quartile with specific instruction based on area of need.
4. Intervention Time (Hornet Time) utilized with students needing support of specific skills and standards
5. Incorporating a more direct use of the Gradual Release Model in small group instruction, explicit instruction, and scaffolded instruction.
6. Incorporating researched-based Vocabulary Strategies.

Person Responsible: Bryce Cubbal (cubbalbr@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

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

Yulee Elementary will decrease the percentage of students school wide performing below a proficiency level of 3 or higher on the 23-24 Math PM3 F.A.S.T Assessment. Our overall Math scores decreased for the 22-23 school year compared to the 21-22 school year, and there is a need to decrease the percentage of students performing below the proficiency level. Students becoming proficient in Mathematics grades 3-5 is foundational for success in higher grades. If we continue to meet the needs of all learners, the percentage of students not will proficient will continue to decrease.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Yulee Elementary will decrease the percentage of students school wide performing below a proficiency level of 3 or higher from 27% in the 22-23 school year to 22% in 23-24 on the F.A.S.T Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our progress by dissecting our results from the Beginning of Year STAR Math Assessment. The STAR Assessment is taken 3 times per year and is a good indicator on how students will perform on the End of Year. According to our most recent STAR Assessment we have 24% of our students performing below the proficiency benchmark (3rd-27%, 4th-22%, 5th-22%).

Grade levels meet weekly to perform a test item analysis on the most recent assessment. The dissected data is then used to make instructional decisions for the next several weeks of instruction. Administration facilitates data chats in order to guide teachers through instructional grouping practices. Many students are also served through our MTSS process to help ensure they are successful in the general education classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bryce Cubbal (cubbalbr@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.)

We must first identify students who are performing below the proficiency level. From there, we examine current and additional instructional supports we can implement and put in place for our students. Most students receive multiple doses of instruction throughout the day. Differentiated small group instruction is a primary instructional strategy we find great success with. The instruction must be differentiated, standards based, and in line with the B1G M. Additional professional development is also needed to ensure they are equipped with the tools and knowledge they need as professionals. Most recently teachers received PD on Explicit Instruction and Scaffolded Instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We must meet our students where they are academically. This will ensure learning gaps are filled so we can move forward toward On Level instruction. We must also continue to provide Professional Development for Teachers in how to provide quality, research-based instruction. Teachers must continue to develop skills in the areas of explicit instruction, scaffolded instruction, and engagement strategies.

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.

1. Targeted in-school support with small group instruction
2. Tiered support as indicated in MTSS and supported by the A-Team
3. After school tutoring of our lower quartile with specific instruction based on area of need.
4. Intervention Time (Hornet Time) utilized with students needing support of specific skills and standards
5. Incorporating a more direct use of the Gradual Release Model in small group instruction, explicit instruction, and scaffolded instruction.

Person Responsible: Bryce Cubbal (cubbalbr@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

Continuing to increase teacher retention is vital to a school's success. Teacher retention has a direct correlation to student achievement. The retention of teachers allows them to further develop their pedagogy from year to year. As experience is obtained teachers become more familiar with effective instructional strategies as well as become more familiar with State Standards, curriculum, and content.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Yulee Elementary School will increase their teacher retention rate by 3% for the 24-25 school year to 94% compared to 91% for the 23-24 school.

Monitoring:

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

The monitoring of teacher retention will be ongoing throughout the school year. Administration will work directly with teachers to create a supportive work environment and positive culture to be part of. Administration attends weekly collaboration meetings, completes classroom walkthroughs, and has communicated an open-door policy to ensure constant and direct communication is had. Administration also conducted 30 Day Rounding interviews with all new hires to ensure the start of their experience has been positive and see how they can further assist those who were recently hired. These rounding interviews are completed with all staff but through a different timeline. Finally, administration distributes a Letter of Intent in the Spring to help ensure teachers intentions regarding resignation or retention are clearly communicated.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bryce Cubbal (cubbalbr@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.)

Yulee Elementary has created a supportive learning culture for all employees. All new staff participate in a Mentor/Mentee program. Staff members who require additional support are also permitted to participate. Participating staff participate in coaching cycles following observations. Feedback is then provided in person and face to face. The employee is then provided with time to implement suggestions and strategies prior to the next observation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All staff have different strengths, come from different backgrounds, and have varying levels of experience. A growth mindset and strong work ethic are all that are necessary to coach an employee to be the best version of themselves. Coaching cycles and feedback can and do look different for each person because it is important to remember we all learn at different rates and not necessarily in the same way. A high retention rate requires Yulee Elementary to invest in their employees and allow the adequate time for each to develop their skills.

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.

1. Hire qualified and interested applicants.
2. Complete observations of employees' performance
3. Provide face to face feedback and identify "glows" and "grows"
4. Plan a coaching cycle and PD plan.
5. Continue observations and adjust plan as necessary.

Person Responsible: Bryce Cubbal (cubbalbr@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Yulee Elementary analyzes subgroup achievement data to develop our Title I Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and School Improvement Plan (SIP). Both plans are discussed, evaluated, and voted on at our School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings. Our Title I CNA outlines how we plan to fund 1.) student needs (e.g., supplies, paraprofessionals, technology programs), 2.) parent and family engagement needs (e.g., parent nights, parent communication), 3.) curriculum development needs (e.g., data chats, planning days), and 4.) professional development needs (e.g., teacher walkthroughs, B.E.S.T. standards and Benchmark training). The CNA must be developed with participation from individuals that carry out school-wide program plans including teachers, administrators, parents, and as appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and district staff. Our CNA is available upon request. A paper copy of our SIP is available in our front office and a digital copy can be viewed on our school's website: <https://www.nassau.k12.fl.us/Domain/14>. Both the paper copy and digital copy are referenced on our monthly school calendars, so that all school stakeholders are aware of the various methods of dissemination. Translation services are available upon request for all documentation related to our School-Wide Program Plan.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Yulee Elementary continually strives to build positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders. To achieve our goal in fulfilling our school's mission for parent and family engagement, we follow a process that starts at our spring School Advisory Council (SAC) meeting. At this meeting, we evaluate the results of our current year's Title I Parent Survey and school-level Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP). Topics of discussion include flexible parent nights and meetings, progress monitoring of students, parent communication, barriers to parent involvement, and professional development to effectively train our staff on bridging the gap between school and home. Additionally, we reflect on parents' survey results indicating if they feel valued, respected, and welcomed at our school. The information gleaned at this meeting, along with insight gathered from weekly collaboration meetings, leadership team meetings, faculty meetings, and parent teacher meetings gives us a comprehensive look into our school's ability to build positive relationships with our school stakeholders. If an area of focus does not meet our level of expectations, we set goals and establish priorities for the upcoming school year and reassess them in the spring. Yulee Elementary's PFEP is available on our school website and in our front office. Our monthly calendars and newsletters state where this plan can be accessed. Our district PFEP is available on our Nassau County School District website. The Title I Handbook-Desk Reference is disseminated to all families at the start of each school year, and it outlines how to access the district PFEP. Translation services are available upon request for all documentation related to our School-Wide Program Plan.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The majority of Title 1 funds are used to hire additional personnel to assist in the classroom with small group ELA and Math instruction and provide academic remediation. This greatly reduces the student to adult ratio during instructional learning time. Technology programs such as STAR Reading and Math and well as Reflex Math Fact Fluency are utilized to strengthen students ELA and Math Skills. School-wide tutoring and intervention programs are also in place to provide additional intervention and remediation.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Yulee Elementary's School-Wide Program Plan is developed with participation from teachers, administrators, parents, and as appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and district staff. We work with our Title I department and Food Service department to determine our school's free and reduced lunch count, which dictates our Title I allocation. Yulee Elementary and the Title I department work closely with other federal programs, including Title II and Title III to pinpoint staff development opportunities and to improve the achievement of our ELL student population. We collaborate with Head Start programs to effectively transition our preschool children to kindergarten. We work with our Director of Intervention Prevention, and Safety Services to ensure interventions are in place for our homeless students, foster care students, and neglected and delinquent students. We collaborate with our ESE department to provide specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of our students.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The district utilizes the tiered process to provide support to students in need of school-based mental health services and specialized support services in order to help them to access the educational environment. In addition, if a student is experiencing an acute crisis, the mental health provider which is typically the school social worker can connect with the student through a system of care process to determine what supports, if any, may be needed either in or out of the school environment.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

NA

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

The district utilizes the MTSS approach to prevent and address problem behavior. With PBIS, the school teams provide preventative support. If this is not sufficient, the school based problem solving team will convene to determine additional intervention supports. If these supports need to be ongoing and continuous or significantly differ in intensity and duration from what can be provided solely through general education resources to make or maintain sufficient progress, then the team will consider the need for services via IDEA (e.g., consider need for a psychoeducational evaluation, monitor the need for specialized instruction, etc.).

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

District level PD includes:
Rethinking Behavior/Flip It
Power Struggles
Explicit/Scaffolded Instruction
Specially Designed Instruction

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Nassau County School District works in collaboration with other early childhood education agencies to ensure a smooth transition to our local school programs. (ie. Head Start, Child Find)

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$141,657.60
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	120	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$4,851.36
			<i>Notes: Salaries Teacher</i>			
	5100	150	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$91,339.49
			<i>Notes: Salaries Para</i>			
	5100	210	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$13,053.10
			<i>Notes: Retirement</i>			
	5100	220	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$7,358.60
			<i>Notes: Social Security</i>			
	5100	230	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$15,100.00
			<i>Notes: Insurance</i>			
	5100	510	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$9,955.05
			<i>Notes: Supplies</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$141,657.60
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	120	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$4,851.36
			<i>Notes: Salaries Teacher</i>			
	5100	150	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$91,339.49
			<i>Notes: Para Salaries</i>			
	5100	210	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$13,053.10
			<i>Notes: retirement</i>			
	5100	220	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$7,358.60
			<i>Notes: Social Security</i>			
	5100	230	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$15,100.00
			<i>Notes: insurance</i>			
	5100	510	0102 - Yulee Elementary School			\$9,955.05

			<i>Notes: supplies</i>			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment				\$19,468.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6300	120	0102 - Yulee Elementary School			\$4,000.00
			<i>Notes: Curriculum Development Stipends</i>			
	6300	210	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,121.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement</i>			
	6300	220	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$613.00
			<i>Notes: Social Security</i>			
	6400	120	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$4,000.00
			<i>Notes: Professional Development Stipends</i>			
	6400	210	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,121.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement</i>			
	6300	750	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$4,000.00
			<i>Notes: Curriculum Development Subs</i>			
	6400	220	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$613.00
			<i>Notes: Social Security</i>			
	6400	750	0102 - Yulee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$4,000.00
			<i>Notes: PD Subs</i>			
Total:						\$302,783.20

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No