Yulee High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Yulee High School

85375 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 develop each student as an inspired life-long learner and problem-solver with the strength of character to serve as a productive member of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision for all members of Yulee High School is to provide a safe environment, maintain and model professionalism and high expectations which will result in continuous academic growth, excellence, and increased post graduation opportunities.

School Leadership Team, 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
Amos, Lori	Principal	
Jackson, Donna	Assistant Principal	
Norfleet, Rachel	Assistant Principal	
Faulk, Natalie	Teacher, K-12	
Crosby, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	
Murray, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Avila, Janel	Dean	
Mortier, Ralph	Teacher, K-12	
Matricardi, Frederick	Teacher, K-12	
Repanshek, John	Teacher, ESE	
Harris, Ashley	Teacher, ESE	
Burch, Joshua	Teacher, K-12	
Blake, Thomas	Teacher, K-12	
VanDelinder, Janice	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Susan	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.

The School Improvement Plan for Yulee High School was developed by the input of various stakeholders including the Leadership Team, School Advisory Committee, Administrative Team, and District Office personnel. These individuals reviewed the school data and plan draft and collaborated to make changes as warranted.

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 School Improvement Plan will be monitored by administrators, department chairs, teachers, and the School Advisory Committee through the analyzation of progress monitoring data gathered throughout the school year and observations. In the event modifications are needed to the plan, all stakeholders will reconvene to amend the plan presented.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	35%
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)* 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: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	57	58	50	56	60	51	55		
ELA Learning Gains				53			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			41		
Math Achievement*	41	43	38	52	43	38	52		
Math Learning Gains				36			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				26			36		
Science Achievement*	77	74	64	67	57	40	62		
Social Studies Achievement*	76	75	66	78	42	48	81		
Middle School Acceleration					31	44			
Graduation Rate	94	94	89	94	73	61	91		
College and Career Acceleration	67	69	65	69	76	67	68		
ELP Progress	20	45	45				67		

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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	432

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	94

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	578
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	94

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	45			
ELL	15	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN	40	Yes	2	
BLK	60			
HSP	65			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	61			

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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	18	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	40	Yes	1	
BLK	52			
HSP	53			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	55			

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	57			41			77	76		94	67	20
SWD	23			22			40	58		31	6	
ELL	10			14							3	20
AMI												
ASN				40							1	
BLK	53			27			70	68		45	6	
HSP	44			40			70	70		67	6	
MUL	57			37			78	88		69	6	
PAC												
WHT	59			45			78	78		71	6	
FRL	48			33			69	72		56	6	

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	56	53	47	52	36	26	67	78		94	69	
SWD	22	40	42	24	23	20	37	45		88	32	
ELL				18								
AMI												
ASN				40								
BLK	45	58	61	33	33	33	53	52		100	50	
HSP	48	45	47	44	29	22	52	81		94	65	
MUL	63	63		60	38		67	81		95	71	
PAC												
WHT	58	53	44	55	37	26	71	79		93	72	
FRL	52	50	57	47	35	36	57	67		89	63	

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	55	49	41	52	43	36	62	81		91	68	67
SWD	23	37	34	35	35	30	52	54		93	25	
ELL												67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	43	33	37	36	17	32	65		93	54	
HSP	46	45	31	43	41		64	74		92	91	
MUL	52	48		59	70					94	88	
PAC												
WHT	57	50	43	56	43	37	66	85		91	67	
FRL	45	53	47	49	45	28	56	75		87	55	

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
10	2023 - Spring	55%	57%	-2%	50%	5%
09	2023 - Spring	63%	61%	2%	48%	15%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	58%	-36%	50%	-28%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	54%	-3%	48%	3%

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	74%	4%	63%	15%

HISTORY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	74%	4%	63%	15%

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.

In review of the 2022-2023 proficiency percentages for all subject areas, Algebra 1 demonstrated the lowest performance rate. In Nassau County, students performing at a level three or higher on the 7th grade FSA are eligible to take Algebra 1 in 8th grade. Therefore, when the cohort arrives in high school as 9th graders, most of the Algebra 1 courses are made up of students who perform at a level 1 or level 2 on the B.E.S.T. Mathematics exam. Additionally, Yulee High School experienced personnel issues throughout the school year and long-term substitute teachers were placed in the class.

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

The data point showing the greatest decline was the Algebra 1 subject test. In 2021-2022 the overall proficiency average was 26%. For the 2022-2023, the overall proficiency average was 22%. As previously shared, in Nassau County students performing at a level three or higher on the 7th grade FSA are eligible to take Algebra 1 in 8th grade. Therefore, when the cohort arrives in high school as 9th graders, most of the Algebra 1 courses are made up of students who perform at a level 1 or level 2 on the B.E.S.T. Mathematics exam. Additionally, Yulee High School experienced personnel issues throughout the school year and long-term substitute teachers were placed in the class.

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.

The data point showing the greatest gap when compared to the state was the Algebra 1 with a -28% discrepancy. As previously shared, in Nassau County students performing at a level three or higher on the 7th grade FSA are eligible to take Algebra 1 in 8th grade. Therefore, when the cohort arrives in high school as 9th graders, most of the Algebra 1 courses are made up of students who perform at a level 1 or level 2 on the B.E.S.T. Mathematics exam. Additionally, Yulee High School experienced personnel issues throughout the school year and long-term substitute teachers were placed in the class.

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

Three areas showed the most improvement with a 15% increase in all areas: ELA 9th grade, Biology, and US History. Gains in all subject areas can be attributed to collaborative planning across all subject areas. All subject areas met to plan lessons that target the standards being taught. After each assessment or quiz that was given, educators would meet to discuss how the students performed on the standards assessed. For ELA, small group instruction was provided a minimum of two days each week. Staff development days for ELA was provided for discussion, classroom observation of superb veteran teachers, data review, and to unpack the new standards. In addition, ESE teachers worked collaboratively to provide support and accommodations for students throughout to ensure student success.

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

N/A

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

Yulee High School's highest-ranking priorities for the upcoming school year are to improve the Algebra 1 EOC proficiency rate and the ELA proficiency rate for Students With Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Asian English Language Learners.

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 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.

For the 2022-2023 school year the teacher retention rate was 81%. For the 2023-2024 school year, the goal will be to improve to 85% retention rate.

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, the goal will be to improve to 85% retention rate.

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

Based on the rounding conversations and feedback received from department chairs, administration will monitor the climate temperature of the faculty and staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Amos (amoslo@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.)

Administration fill work to build a positive culture across all settings. Each month the administration will provide a culture building gathering. Administration will conduct rounding meetings to with all faculty and staff to adjust support to better meet the needs of our staff throughout the school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rounding strategies were provided to distrcit administrators in a staff development training through the Studer Huron corporation.

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 monthly calendar for events.

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

By When: August 2023

Develop rounding schedule for faculty and staff.

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

By When: August 2023

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

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

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

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

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

Students performance on Star, Lexia, and FAST PM.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Amos (amoslo@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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

The ELA Department Chair will be used as an Instructional Coach to provide resources through modeling instruction including scaffolding strategies, providing feedback, and serving as the MTSS Co-chair.

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

By When: Continuously throughout the school year.

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Based off of the ELL performance of the 2022 FSA, 18% of ELL students demonstrated proficiency.

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

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

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Amos (amoslo@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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

For the past year, ELL students have performed below expectations. Providing instruction that helps students diminish the language barrier will allow the ELL students to understand the English language text and instruction. As a result, ELL student performance levels will improve.

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.

The ELA Department Chair will be used as an Instructional Coach to provide resources through modeling instruction including scaffolding strategies, providing feedback, and serving as the MTSS Co-chair.

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

By When: Countuously throughout the school year.

Consultation with the district ESOL Coach to provide strategies and resources.

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

By When: As needed.

https://www.floridacims.org

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Asian

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.

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

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

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

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Amos (amoslo@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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

For the past year, ELL students have performed below expectations. Providing instruction that helps students diminish the language barrier will allow the ELL students to understand the English language text and instruction. As a result, ELL student performance levels will improve.

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.

The ELA Department Chair will be used as an Instructional Coach to provide resources through modeling instruction including scaffolding strategies, providing feedback, and serving as the MTSS Co-chair.

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

By When: Continuously throughout the school year.

Consultation with the district ESOL Coach to provide strategies and resources.

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

By When: As needed.

#6. 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.

Based off the 2022 FSA results, the percentage of students demonstraing proficiency on the FSA Algebra 1 was 42%. For the 2023 B.E.S.T. Algebra 1 EOC results, the percentage of students demonstraing proficiency was 22%.

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

The percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency will increase to 30%.

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

Student progress on classroom-based assessments and quarterly Edge XL assessments will be used to track student progress towards proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Amos (amoslo@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.)

Algebra 1 teachers will use Math Nation, IXL Math, Math XL, and USA Test Prep to assist in student deficits in mathematic concepts. Lessons and activities will incorporate BEST Standards while providing remediation for areas that demonstrate weaknesses.
Explicit Instruction Training for all Math Teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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.

Ensure all Math educators know how to access and use Math Nation, IXL Math, Math XL, USA Test Prep and can share this information with their students.

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

By When: During the first four weeks of school.

The ELA Department Chair will be used as an Instructional Coach to help the math instructors by providing resources through modeling instruction including scaffolding strategies, providing feedback, and serving as the MTSS Co-chair.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Continuously throughout the school year.

The use of Math Leaders to coach new teachers in instructional practices.

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

By When: Continuously throughout the school year.

Explicit Instruction Training for Math Teachers.

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

By When: December 2023.

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).

The Nassau County School Distrcit funds all programs utilized within the School Improvement plan.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Asian	$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**

Budget Approval

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

No