# Yearling Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Yearling Middle School

925 NW 23RD LN, Okeechobee, FL 34972

http://yearlingmiddleschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

## Demographics

### Principal: Patricia Mccoy

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2018

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Middle School<br>6-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (50%)<br><br>2017-18: C (49%)<br><br>2016-17: C (46%)<br><br>2015-16: C (46%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |

> \* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click here</u>.

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/13/2020.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Table of Contents

## Yearling Middle School

### 925 NW 23RD LN, Okeechobee, FL 34972

### http://yearlingmiddleschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

### School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2019-20 Title I School** | **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Middle School 6-8 | Yes | 100% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 64% |

### School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | C | C | C | C |

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/13/2020.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

Yearling Middle School's mission is to deliver standards-based, student-centered, authentic learning opportunities that guide all students to be able to work collaboratively and individually while demonstrating mastery of standards.

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

Yearling Middle School will guide all students to deepened levels of thinking and real-world applications of knowledge and skills to prepare them for success in college and/or careers.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Krakoff, David | Principal | Serving as instructional leader while creating and aligning systems to support the deepening of learning and social/emotional development for all students. |
| Carpenter, Cathleen | School Counselor | |
| Caves , Walt | Dean | |
| Heineman, Carrie | Other | |
| Letcher , Cindy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Maxwell, Rebecca | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Shells, Jerrime | Assistant Principal | |
| Campbell, Kellyann | Instructional Coach | Providing research-grounded professional development and coaching to guide teachers to mastery of their instructional planning, strategic delivery, and monitoring of student achievement. Also, providing support to close learning gaps among our students. |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Sunday 7/15/2018, Patricia Mccoy

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
11

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
42

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (46%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |

| Support Tier | |
|---|---|
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#). | |

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 177 | 224 | 212 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 613 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 18 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 30 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 19 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 25 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 43 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 41 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 50 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**
Tuesday 9/29/2020

### Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 274 | 243 | 240 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 757 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 64 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 227 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 21 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

## Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 274 | 243 | 240 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 757 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 64 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 227 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 21 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**School Data**
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 40% | 42% | 54% | 40% | 40% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 47% | 48% | 54% | 46% | 50% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 41% | 43% | 47% | 35% | 43% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 58% | 61% | 58% | 45% | 48% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 60% | 60% | 57% | 46% | 52% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 58% | 56% | 51% | 44% | 50% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 35% | 43% | 51% | 40% | 38% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 51% | 60% | 72% | 51% | 54% | 70% |

| **EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Indicator** | **Grade Level (prior year reported)** | | | **Total** |
| | **6** | **7** | **8** | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

**Grade Level Data**
**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 49% | 47% | 2% | 54% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 41% | -2% | 52% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 35% | 38% | -3% | 52% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 32% | 32% | 0% | 51% | -19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 36% | 37% | -1% | 56% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 41% | 40% | 1% | 58% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 51% | 54% | -3% | 55% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 56% | -9% | 52% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 54% | 55% | -1% | 54% | 0% |
| | 2018 | 52% | 46% | 6% | 54% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 49% | 51% | -2% | 46% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 54% | -8% | 45% | 1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 36% | 41% | -5% | 48% | -12% |
| | 2018 | 37% | 37% | 0% | 50% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 51% | 59% | -8% | 71% | -20% |
| 2018 | 41% | 50% | -9% | 71% | -30% |
| Compare | | 10% | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 88% | 52% | 36% | 61% | 27% |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 100% | 54% | 46% | 62% | 38% |
| Compare | | -12% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 90% | 47% | 43% | 57% | 33% |
| 2018 | 96% | 44% | 52% | 56% | 40% |
| Compare | | -6% | | | |

## Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 19 | 33 | 29 | 35 | 55 | 57 | 20 | 34 | 46 | | |
| ELL | 31 | 44 | 49 | 51 | 57 | 53 | 13 | 41 | 58 | | |
| BLK | 25 | 37 | 33 | 42 | 51 | 42 | 8 | 60 | | | |
| HSP | 36 | 46 | 41 | 56 | 60 | 57 | 29 | 47 | 60 | | |
| MUL | 25 | 21 | | 47 | 43 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 50 | 48 | 62 | 62 | 61 | 45 | 58 | 64 | | |
| FRL | 37 | 43 | 36 | 54 | 61 | 59 | 29 | 49 | 58 | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 14 | 37 | 44 | 27 | 52 | 46 | 8 | 20 | 33 | | |
| ELL | 26 | 50 | 57 | 45 | 55 | 48 | 30 | 19 | | | |
| BLK | 11 | 43 | 50 | 24 | 52 | 41 | | 8 | | | |
| HSP | 34 | 48 | 48 | 49 | 61 | 49 | 35 | 38 | 54 | | |
| MUL | 55 | 58 | | 43 | 52 | | 45 | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 51 | 55 | 63 | 71 | 53 | 48 | 54 | 63 | | |
| FRL | 35 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 63 | 49 | 32 | 41 | 49 | | |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 10 | 29 | 24 | 17 | 38 | 33 | 6 | 23 | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 34 | 38 | 31 | 45 | 46 | 14 | 38 | | | |
| BLK | 15 | 33 | 30 | 19 | 34 | 39 | 18 | 16 | | | |
| HSP | 35 | 42 | 33 | 38 | 48 | 45 | 35 | 52 | 46 | | |
| MUL | 32 | 29 | | 42 | 38 | | | 57 | | | |
| WHT | 50 | 54 | 47 | 56 | 47 | 47 | 48 | 55 | 78 | | |
| FRL | 36 | 44 | 34 | 41 | 46 | 44 | 38 | 47 | 55 | | |

## ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 51 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 57 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 511 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 36 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 45 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Native American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Asian Students** | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 37 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 49 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Multiracial Students** | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 34 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Pacific Islander Students** | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **White Students** | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 55 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Economically Disadvantaged Students** | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 48 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Yearling's science proficiency rate was 36% and ELA was 40% overall. This reflects a deficiency in reading skills and vocabulary and continued a trend of struggling reading performance over the past decade.

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

Grade 8 ELA was; the only math or ELA grade-level team that had a decline in proficiency rate, dropping from 41% to 36%. The primary factors were staff turnover in mid year, one classroom was

filled by a long-term sub all year, and another was new to our school. Also, this team struggled to adapt to our new PLC of planning, instructional delivery, and monitoring of student learning.

**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.**

Our civics score is 20% below the state average. Grades 7 and 8 ELA are both 17% below the state average. We consider our reading deficit as the primary contributing factor to this issue as our reading performance has continued to decline or be stagnate over the past decade.

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

Grade 6 ELA increased proficiency by 10% and Civics grew by 9%. Our grade 6 ELA team and Civics team each worked well during our Collaborative Learning Team work to effectively unwrap standards, plan units of instruction, and monitor student mastery. Also, these two teams led our school-wide movement toward level 4 work on Marzano's taxonomy using project-based learning as the catalyst.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Our data indicates a trend of concerns in the area of attendance, suspensions, and state testing data with regard to at risk students. With this data, we have developed a plan to help students gain traction as successful students by conducting grade-level social-emotional restorative discussions and assigning mentors to all students who have 20 or more unexcused absences from school.

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

1.ELA proficiency and growth
2. Science proficiency
3. Civics proficiency
4. Reduction of behavior referrals by changing student behavior and by supporting our staff in building positive, supportive relationships with all students and in embracing the AVID mindset that opportunities truly are limitless for all students.
5. Growth in proficiency in subgroup areas including our ESE, multi-raical, and African-American populations. This will include work to strengthen our cultural competency.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Our ELA proficiency rates have declined or remained stagnate over the past decade and our low level of performance is also impacting proficiency rates in science and civics. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | e are focused on improving our ELA proficiency rate by 10% from 40% to at least 50% in 2020. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | David Krakoff (david.krakoff@okee.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | We will focus on Tier 2 vocabulary using strategies based on Marzano's research on vocabulary acquisition. We will work to increase reading comprehension and analysis-level student work by building a campus-wide system for annotating text, using close reading strategies, and a text-based writing approach across our curriculum. AVID's WICOR strategies will be used as a support to this work. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Our students' ability to work with text on deeper levels of Marzano's taxonomy and to develop writing skills in response to texts will be supported by a uniformed, campus-wide approach to reading and writing. |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Campus-wide professional development of AVID strategies
2. Campus-wide professional development of text annotations, contextual vocabulary growth, and RACE writing.
3. Monitoring of implementation of strategies during CLT work and classroom instruction using walk-thru tool
4. Teachers will use deliberate practice plans to support growth in reading and writing instruction and will be monitored during administrative evaluations.

**Person Responsible**   David Krakoff (david.krakoff@okee.k12.fl.us)

| #2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Cultural competency with approach to subgroups including African-American students, ESE students, and multi-racial students. The subgroups including our African-American students, multi-racial students, and ESE students have performed a lower level than is acceptable, reflecting a disconnect with our approach and connection with these groups of students. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | We will work to reduce suspensions by 50% with these subgroups compared to the 2018-19 school year. We will also work to reduce increase proficiency rates by 10% for each of these subgroups. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | [no one identified] |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | We will form a cultural competency committee and analyze our subgroup data and anecdotal evidence and then find research-based approaches to train students and staff on cultural competency. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | We want to make this a community initiative and gain buy-in so that we can make a systemic change in our approaches and the results for our subgroups. |

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Guiding Coalition will analyze subgroup data
2. Cultural competency committee formed
3. Research done by committee on cultural competency training
4. Action plan developed and implemented to train staff and students
5. Data will be monitored quarterly and analyzed throughout the year to determine impact

**Person Responsible**     David Krakoff (david.krakoff@okee.k12.fl.us)

| **#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups** | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | We have noticed a disconnect with our SWD students as well as our Black and Multiracial students when it comes to literacy. The data has revealed this trend. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | We are targeting for 70% of SWD students and Black and Multiracial students to demonstrate growth in reading during the 2020-2021 school year. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | David Krakoff (david.krakoff@okee.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | We have unleveled our ELA classrooms and scheduled students in a balanced way so that choral and collaborative learning support fluency and comprehension gains. Also, based on AVID and Marzano research, we are utlizing higher-performing readers as student aids in ELA classes to peer mentor in the area of reading. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | We have many readers who are below grade level and need higher level readers to learn from. This will enable all students to gain access to rigor. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Our guiding coalition is working to support the differentiated instruction needed to support our unleveled classes through professoinal learning sessions. This is being monitored with walk-thrus and coaching sesssions.

**Person Responsible**  David Krakoff (david.krakoff@okee.k12.fl.us)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**We will prioritize mental health, student and staff mindset, and school culture by using AVID strategies, collaborative learning teams, an enhanced PBIS system, and Growth Mindset as a foundation for this work. AVID strategies will be modeled during staff development sessions followed by collection of data during classrooms walks to monitor and adjust implementation. We will use Dr. Carol Dweck's research on Growth Mindset to drive mental health and mindset development during our mid-day lunch period. Our PBIS system will work to support positive social behavior and relationships between staff and students. Our CLTs will help to support instructional planning that supports collaborative learning and high expectations for all students while deliberately planning for differentiated instruction to result in equity. Also, to support our African-American subgroup, we will form a cultural comptency committee and visit data and research-based practices to examine and revise our approach to support learning among this subgroup. This will result in an action plan for professional development for staff and students to increase our cultural competency to close gaps with our African-American subgroup.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Members of Yearling Middle School's Guiding Coalition will routinely communicate with all stakeholders via our school's Facebook page, school website, and via school newsletter. An open house will be held for parents to visit students' classrooms and teachers. In addition, the Guiding Coalition will hold quarterly Summits to discuss school initiatives and respond to concerns from the community.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.