

School Board of Levy County

Yankeetown School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Yankeetown School

4500 HIGHWAY 40 W, Yankeetown, FL 34498

<http://www.levyk12.org/schools>

Demographics

Principal: Dorenda Westfall

Start Date for this Principal: 1/31/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/27/2020.

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 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Yankeetown School

4500 HIGHWAY 40 W, Yankeetown, FL 34498

<http://www.levyk12.org/schools>

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)
Combination School PK-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	5%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/27/2020.

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.

The mission of Yankeetown School is to collaborate with all stakeholders (community, staff, educators, families and students) to promote rigorous academics and social growth in order to prepare students to be career or college ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Collaboratively cultivating a career and college ready community.

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
Hurst, Denee	Principal	<p>The Principal facilitates weekly faculty meetings to help set goals, communicate schoolwide needs, problem solve for solutions, and assist teachers in planning strategies for meeting the goals recorded in the SIP. She monitors curriculum and observes teachers via ongoing informal walk-throughs as well as required formal observations. The principal assists the Instructional Coach in reviewing student data and monitoring MTSS decision making and oversees the review of progress in meeting school goals through bi-monthly data chats, Differentiated Accountability Report, and the Mid-Year Narrative.</p>
Watson, Sandra	Instructional Coach	<p>The Instructional Coach monitors student data and participates in the decision-making progress and the need for interventions in all subject areas. She provides curricular support to teachers and plans professional development based on needs decided by the administrative and facilitator teams. She models best practices and assists in the analysis of data and tracking of student progress. The MTSS Team coordinates within a problem-solving unit, to identify students with gaps in learning and to decide on appropriate interventions. They monitor and document the progress of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. The ESE teacher provides support to the classroom teachers in providing interventions and continuing Tier 3 interventions.</p>
Prescott, Candy	School Counselor	<p>The School Counselor oversees ESOL and provides counseling to individual students and classes as needed or as written in their IEP. The School Counselor helps provide mental health services for students, as needed. She also coordinates and request additional services from outside contracted agencies as appropriate. She also works with the leadership team on the MTSS process with students that need Tier 2 or Tier 3 supports. She helps to facilitate students moving through Tier 3 to provide further student services if needed. Together all team members work closely to monitor student learning and to provide support to students who do not yet show mastery of skills. She is responsible for 504 development and distribution to appropriate teachers, making sure they understand how to provide support to these students.</p>
Dorminey, Raven	Teacher, K-12	<p>Academic Administrative Team - Science Cadre leader (intermediate representative) will return and chair debriefing meeting with respective subject areas.</p>
Dillon, Denise	Teacher, K-12	<p>Academic Administrative Team - Math Cadre leader (intermediate representative) will return and chair debriefing meeting with respective subject areas.</p>
Bartello, Caitlyn	Teacher, K-12	<p>Academic Administrative Team - K-5 PE teacher, 6th Grade AVID, School Improvement Plan Coordinator, Title 1 School Coordinator, mentor to new teachers.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 1/31/2017, Dorenda Westfall

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.*

0

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

16

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	6	5	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	7	8	0	0	0	0	28

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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

Friday 7/24/2020

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	26	24	32	23	21	28	16	29	16	0	0	0	0	215	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	7	6	2	3	4	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	39	
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	3	1	1	11	4	0	0	0	0	24	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	7	3	3	2	3	13	7	0	0	0	0	40	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	5	7	7	12	7	0	0	0	0	41	

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	1	4	2	2	2	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	24

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	5	2	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	11	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	

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	26	24	32	23	21	28	16	29	16	0	0	0	0	215	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	7	6	2	3	4	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	39	
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	3	1	1	11	4	0	0	0	0	24	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	7	3	3	2	3	13	7	0	0	0	0	40	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	5	7	7	12	7	0	0	0	0	41	

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	1	4	2	2	2	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	24

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	5	2	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	11	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	

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	49%	46%	61%	46%	41%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	48%	59%	42%	45%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	46%	54%	30%	39%	51%
Math Achievement	44%	51%	62%	41%	44%	58%
Math Learning Gains	48%	51%	59%	44%	47%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	42%	52%	26%	38%	50%
Science Achievement	44%	54%	56%	61%	52%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	78%	78%	92%	80%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	48%	52%	-4%	58%	-10%
	2018	56%	48%	8%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	48%	9%	58%	-1%
	2018	33%	41%	-8%	56%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	48%	44%	4%	56%	-8%
	2018	39%	44%	-5%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
06	2019	38%	41%	-3%	54%	-16%
	2018	71%	35%	36%	52%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-33%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
07	2019	47%	37%	10%	52%	-5%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	39%	41%	-2%	51%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
08	2019	45%	36%	9%	56%	-11%
	2018	57%	48%	9%	58%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	55%	-9%	62%	-16%
	2018	63%	55%	8%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	59%	-2%	64%	-7%
	2018	68%	59%	9%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	29%	53%	-24%	60%	-31%
	2018	29%	53%	-24%	61%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
06	2019	28%	45%	-17%	55%	-27%
	2018	47%	41%	6%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
07	2019	44%	55%	-11%	54%	-10%
	2018	56%	56%	0%	54%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	50%	29%	21%	46%	4%
	2018	40%	38%	2%	45%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	49%	-14%	53%	-18%
	2018	21%	48%	-27%	55%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	50%	43%	7%	48%	2%
	2018	67%	44%	23%	50%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		29%				

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	83%	72%	11%	71%	12%
2018	83%	73%	10%	71%	12%
Compare		0%			
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					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	8			25							
WHT	48	53	48	43	48	39	45	93			
FRL	43	45	47	34	40	38	38	92			

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	17			8	40						
WHT	46	58	61	47	56	37	41	83			
FRL	42	51	61	48	52	39	41				
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	13	25		18	38						
WHT	45	41	30	41	43	22	59	90			
FRL	40	43	32	37	47	22	52	91			

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	52
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	47
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.

Math BQ (39% compared to district at 42% and state at 52%). Yes, this is a trend. Last year, with data, (2018-2019) we had new teachers who participated in district cohorts. However, being a small school, our teachers have few opportunities for grade-level collaboration.

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

ELA BQ dropped 13%. Our intervention plan was primarily delegated to paraprofessionals and was not followed with fidelity. The resources used were not consistent. While utilizing iReady to work on closing gaps in student achievement, we focused more on time on task and discovered toward the end of the year our focus should have been on lessons passed.

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.

Math achievement 18% gap. While utilizing iReady to work on closing gaps in student achievement, we focused more on time on task and discovered toward the end of the year our focus should have been on lessons passed.

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

Social studies achievement increased 10%. Civics teacher was motivated to find as many resources as possible, including curriculum guides/maps from other Florida districts. Students were engaged with their content through debate and lively classroom discussion.

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

1. Attendance
2. Course Failure

Our attendance below 90% and course failures are strongly correlated, especially in the FSA tested grade levels. As a school, we want to reduce our EWS attendance numbers, hoping that will then decrease our course failure numbers.

YTS is participating in Dr. Costantino's professional developments. We are hoping this leads to a better mindset for all stakeholders.

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

1. ELA BQ
2. Math BQ
3. Attendance (EWS)
4. SWD
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA BQ Group

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ELA was component that had great impact on our overall school grade dropping us from a "B" to a "C" as measured by our School Grade Predictor Worksheet utilizing iReady D2 and 2019 FSA data.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020-2021 school year, students in our BQ will show at least 65% growth on FSA ELA grades 3-8 and on iReady grades K-2.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sandra Watson (sandra.watson@levyk12.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	30 minutes daily of intensive Tier 2 instruction in small, fluid, groups with classroom teacher. Tier 2 instruction will focus on skills identified by 2019 FSA ELA scores and 2020 iReady D1, and late D2, using intervention kits distributed by the reading coach as well as regular fluency practice and monitoring. Additional strategies may include audiobooks, Reader Theater, choral reading, snap and read, and other research based strategies for increasing student fluency. Along with Tier 2, Tier 3 instruction in small groups with the classroom teacher and Mrs. Watson for 20 minutes, three times a week. Tier 3 gives more support to these students, focusing on closing their learning gaps. Intervention kits used include ESGI, Blast Phonics, SRA Early Interventions in Reading, and iReady path.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In addition to regular daily Tier 1 instruction, students in our BQ and SWD have gaps in their learning that must be filled in order for them to catch up to their on-grade level peers. These students were identified and their needs assessed using FSA ELA Points Earned/Points Possible by Content Area as well as iReady Placement by Domain results from diagnostic testing. Tiered supports, 30 minutes for Tier 2 and 20 minutes for Tier 3, is expected of students below grade level, based on student data and individual need. This small group intervention is completed by the classroom teacher and Mrs. Watson.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students with learning gaps
2. Collaboration through MTSS problem-solving team to decide on appropriate, research-based interventions.
3. Classroom teacher will provide Tier 2 instruction and assess through progress monitoring.
4. Problem-solving team will meet every 6 weeks for Data Chats to determine if interventions are working.
5. If working, continue; if now working, team will make decision on new strategy or move to Tier 3. Standards mastery and iReady data will be used for progress monitoring as well as classroom assessments.

Person Responsible Sandra Watson (sandra.watson@levyk12.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math BQ Group

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Math BQ was one component that had great impact on our overall school grade, dropping us from a "B" to a "C" as measured by our School Grade Predictor Worksheet utilizing iReady D2 and 2019 FSA data. Our iReady 2020 D1 diagnostic shows the gaps that we still have and math is showing deficits in mastery. This data shows that our BQ students are two or more grade levels below where they should be.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020-2021 school year, students in our BQ will show at least 65% growth on FSA Math grades 3-8 and on iReady Math Diagnostic 3 grades K-8.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sandra Watson (sandra.watson@levyk12.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Thirty additional minutes daily of intensive Tier 2 instruction in small groups with classroom teacher. Tier 2 instruction will focus on skills identified by iReady Math BOY diagnostic (August 2020) and 2019 FSA scores using intervention kits with manipulatives distributed by the reading coach as well as regular fluency practice and monitoring. Reflex Math and students iReady path will be used for interventions. iReady data and classroom administered fluency will be used to monitor student progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In addition to regular daily Tier 1 instruction, students in our BQ and SWD have gaps in their learning that must be filled in order for them to catch up to their on-grade level peers. These students were identified and their needs assessed using FSA Math Points Earned/ Points Possible by Content Area as well as iReady Placement by Domain results from diagnostic testing. Tiered supports, 30 minutes for Tier 2 and 20 minutes for Tier 3, is expected of students below grade level, based on student data and individual need. This small group intervention is completed by the classroom teacher and Mrs. Watson.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students with learning gaps
2. Collaborate through MTSS problem-solving team to decide on appropriate, research-based interventions
3. Classroom teacher will provide Tier 2 instruction and assess through progress monitoring
4. Problem-solving team will meet every 6 weeks for Data Chats to determine if interventions are working
5. If working, continues; if not working, team will make decisions on new strategy or move to Tier 3
iReady data and classroom administered fluency will be used to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible Sandra Watson (sandra.watson@levyk12.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Student absences will be tracked and monitored by Candy Prescott, School Counselor, using monthly attendance reports, parent contact for students above 10% absent, in an effort to problem-solve how to increase student attendance.

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.

A survey is conducted yearly regarding times of meetings that work best for our families to come to events at our school and which type of communication style works best for them. We use a variety of communication methods to try to reach all parents; paper notices, phone calls, social media, Class Dojo, Remind 101 and Skyward call-outs. Events are also listed on our school website calendar. Parents are required to attend two parent conferences a year after the first nine weeks and third nine weeks. More conferences are held as needed based on the needs of the child. Teachers are encouraged to hold parent workshops to invite families to the table and build a school to home bridge where families can gain knowledge and insight into the standards, expectations, strategies, and other ways they can assist and encourage their students at home. The School Advisory Council meets monthly as well. SAC is involved in making decisions for the school and are vital in creating a positive school culture.

Parent/family involvement - constantly seeking new and innovative ways to engage our families through building relationships and offering opportunities for them to feel valued as integral members of the educational team; workshops highlighting standards and expectations to help families feel more comfortable in being able to provide assistance in their child's learning process; helping families understand the value in consistent school attendance. YTS is participating in Dr. Costantino's professional developments. We are hoping this leads to a better mindset for all stakeholders and an increase in parent involvement.

Student mindset - Sanford and Harmony SEL kits in each classroom; Seven Habits of Highly Successful People (Leader in Me) language is promoted to help students practice personal accountability and cooperation; encouraging consistent school attendance through healthy competition (classroom trophy cycled quarterly to class with highest percentage of attendance); training students in personal organizational habits and notetaking strategies; setting high expectations school wide

Additionally, YTS has become an AVID school to help prepare our students to be college and career ready. AVID helps close the learning gap by teaching students organization skills, note-taking skills, reflection skills, and leadership skills. It will give our students and greater community a set of tools to use to show more growth and build positive relationships throughout.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA BQ Group	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math BQ Group	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00