

Nassau County School District

# Yulee Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Yulee Middle School

85439 MINER 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 build up strong children and educators in a way that brings joy, purpose, and passion for the journey ahead.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

At Yulee Middle School, we envision that all who enter our doors will listen and learn, encourage the heart, and do their job.

## 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
Middleton, Tara	Principal	
Alvare, Charles	Assistant Principal	
Elwell, Chrissy	School Counselor	
Glover-Crosby, Debra	Teacher, K-12	
Halpin, McKenzie	Teacher, ESE	
Hightower, Deondra	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Koenig, Ricci	Teacher, K-12	
Rhodes, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Anna	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Susan	Assistant Principal	
Way, Kyanne	Assistant Principal	

**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.

At the end of the 22-23 school year, the school's Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) met and determined our next steps for school improvement for the following school year. Instructionally, the team determined that we would continue our focus on improving student ELA outcomes with the new BEST standards. This includes monitoring of subgroups. The two areas we are focusing on are: 1) PLCs (structured and aligned school-wide), 2) Small Group Instructional Model for all content areas (formerly specifically for ELA and Math, now branching into all core subject areas).

**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 discussed with the Instructional Leadership Team each time we meet to review and record real-time student data and progress toward our individual school, teacher, class, and student goals.

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	28%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	42%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	44	61	70	175
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	8	21
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	1	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	6	3	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	82	85	197
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	32	31	102
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	2	12

**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	25	25	29	79

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

**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	60	74	60	194
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	21	25	60
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	44	73	144
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	36	51	116
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	50	60	145

**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	23	27	38	88



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

**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	60	74	60	194
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	21	25	60
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	44	73	144
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	36	51	116
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	50	60	145

**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	23	27	38	88

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

**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*	59	61	49	66	64	50	62		
ELA Learning Gains				52			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			39		
Math Achievement*	79	80	56	78	34	36	75		
Math Learning Gains				60			68		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			54		
Science Achievement*	69	69	49	71	77	53	59		
Social Studies Achievement*	79	81	68	81	58	58	77		
Middle School Acceleration	80	83	73	78	44	49	48		
Graduation Rate					69	49			
College and Career Acceleration					83	70			
ELP Progress		35	40		82	76			

\* 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	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	366
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	569
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	97
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	46			
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	62			
HSP	73			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	64			

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	41			
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	64			
HSP	63			

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%
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	54			

**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	59			79			69	79	80			
SWD	27			47			43	49	63		5	
ELL	55			75							2	
AMI												
ASN	85			100							2	
BLK	50			70			51	63	75		5	
HSP	58			75			60	80	94		5	
MUL	66			73			59	81	71		5	
PAC												
WHT	59			80			73	81	80		5	
FRL	50			68			58	70	72		5	

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	66	52	34	78	60	49	71	81	78			
SWD	29	42	28	48	50	37	39	51	44			
ELL	50	40		67	63							
AMI												
ASN	91	80		100	75							

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
BLK	61	53	50	74	65	50	57	86	79			
HSP	64	49	36	73	61	48	71	78	83			
MUL	68	48	44	76	61	48	77	79	81			
PAC												
WHT	66	52	29	79	59	49	72	80	76			
FRL	52	47	33	65	54	44	61	66	61			

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	62	57	39	75	68	54	59	77	48			
SWD	27	37	25	43	53	45	26	45	36			
ELL	36			50	55							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53	53	42	60	58	46	25	61	41			
HSP	55	51	33	70	67	55	50	65	44			
MUL	63	60	33	68	56	36	59	59	31			
PAC												
WHT	64	57	39	78	70	57	66	81	50			
FRL	49	46	35	64	60	52	43	62	33			

**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	55%	58%	-3%	47%	8%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	55%	59%	-4%	47%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	84%	85%	-1%	54%	30%
07	2023 - Spring	83%	83%	0%	48%	35%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	53%	-6%	55%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	68%	67%	1%	44%	24%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	58%	34%	50%	42%

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 ELA data component for all grade levels 6-8 showed the lowest performance for the new 2022-23 SY proficiency data as defined by the BEST standards. Considering the 2021-22 SY data, learning gains were of focus for both mathematics and ELA overall and for the lowest quartile, further evidencing our need to focus-in on our ESE subgroup and the systems by which our small group instructional model is delivered to assure students with disabilities are being served in the most effective and efficient way.

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

ELA overall showed the greatest decline from the prior year. With the new BEST standards, it is critical that the PLCs know and understand the standards as applied to the curriculum and daily instructional model.

**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.**

Only one of our data components showed a gap as compared to the state average. This area was in 8th grade mathematics. Our school promotes all level 3+ students in their 7th grade year to be accelerated to Algebra. Therefore, we did have a gap between our data and the state, but this was due to us accelerating every student who was proficient in the prior year.

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

While we cannot compare the Florida Standards to the BEST Standards and the FSA to FAST, we saw great improvement in mathematics proficiencies overall. This is attributed to the small group instructional model and our spiral review systems. Additionally, our subgroups continue to trend upward since 2018-19.

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

Concerns are 1) attendance and 2) suspensions.

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

1. Fidelity of the Small Group Instructional Model
2. PLC alignment and collaborative planning that is efficient and effective
3. ESE Support Facilitation systems for teacher table direct, explicit instruction
4. ELA focusing on learning and unpacking the BEST standards
5. Continued work with Practice Profiles: Explicit Instruction & Scaffolding

**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 Small Group Instruction****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.

All teachers in ELA and mathematics will be trained on the BEST standards, unpacking the standards, and understanding how to articulate the BEST standards within the small group instructional model.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our ELA scores by grade level will each increase by 3% overall from the cohort's prior year.

Goals:

6th ELA: 60% proficiency

7th ELA: 58% proficiency

8th ELA: 62% proficiency

Our Mathematics scores by grade level will each increase by 3% overall from the cohort's prior year:

6th Math: 86%

7th Math: 86%

8th Math: 50%

Algebra 1: 95%

**Monitoring:**

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

We will progress monitor using STAR and FAST PM 2.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tara Middleton (middletonta@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.)

Teacher training for the following areas: 1) Small-group instructional model (grouping with leading data), and PLC alignment training for PLC activators and members, 3) teachers being trained to differentiate and scaffold their teacher table depending on leading student data (and student groupings).

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If teachers are trained effectively to leverage their leading data, then they will group students according to their unique needs. When teachers understand the BEST standards and the students who need intervention, then each student can realize a learning gain. When each student can realize a learning gain, proficiency and learning gains will increase overall for ELA and mathematics.

**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. Continued training for ELA and Math teachers on the small group instructional (SGI) model.

**Person Responsible:** Tara Middleton (middletona@nassau.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** December 22, 2023

Take teachers to observe high-level SGI at the feeder pattern elementary schools.

**Person Responsible:** Tara Middleton (middletona@nassau.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** October 31, 2023

Continued training and modeling of scaffolding and differentiation at the teacher table using leading student data points associated directly to the BEST standards.

**Person Responsible:** Tara Middleton (middletona@nassau.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** April 30, 2024