Yates Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Yates Elementary School

301 KINGSWAY RD, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Varnum

Start Date for this Principal: 4/8/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

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

Yates Elementary School

301 KINGSWAY RD, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	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	80%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

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.

Building Character, Building Leaders

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life. Our vision is for all staff and students to work together as a community to ensure success both academically as well as socially.

School Leadership Team

Membership
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Varnum, Lisa	Principal	As principal, Ms. Varnum oversees the day to day operations of the school and ensures procedures are in place to create a safe and optimal learning environment for all. She also provides support through professional development, walk through feedback and side by side coaching as she supports teachers in their journey to provide quality instructional for all students.
Suarez, Emilia	Assistant Principal	As assistant principal, Ms. Suarez assist the principal with the day to day operations of the school and ensures procedures are in place to create a safe and optimal learning environment for all. She also provides support through walk through feedback and side by side coaching to support teachers as we reach the needs of all students.
ZeaEncarnacion, Eunice	Math Coach	As our on site math coach, Ms. Zea supports the vision of the school by providing planning support, side by side coaching, professional development and data chats with teachers. She also serves a vital role on the leadership team through data analysis of trends and areas of needs as she focuses her supports where the needs arise.
Goodwin, Chantel	Reading Coach	As our on site reading coach, Ms. Goodwin supports the vision of the school by providing planning support, side by side coaching, professional development and data chats with teachers. She also serves a vital role on the leadership team through data analysis of trends and areas of needs as she focuses her supports where the needs arise.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 4/8/2019, Lisa Varnum

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Total number of students enrolled at the school

644

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	98	106	103	98	106	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	607
Attendance below 90 percent	2	45	38	36	27	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	6	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	42	24	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	38	35	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	18	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	0	7	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	6	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 9/10/2022

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	100	96	97	101	93	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	576
Attendance below 90 percent	44	43	36	36	33	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	32	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	44	36	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	100	96	97	101	93	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	576
Attendance below 90 percent	44	43	36	36	33	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	227
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	36	32	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	44	36	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	53%	56%				43%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						54%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						55%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	49%	50%	50%				44%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	64%						62%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						63%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	59%	59%				44%	50%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	38%	52%	-14%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	55%	-10%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	28%	54%	-26%	62%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	57%	-13%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	41%	51%	-10%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	12	29	31	13	44	38	14				
ELL	34	62	27	49	67	38	48				
BLK	30	52	50	39	63	73	12				
HSP	42	55	25	49	63	40	46				
MUL	42			18							
WHT	51	58		54	70		63				
FRL	40	54	38	45	60	50	38				

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	33			17	35		26				
ELL	26			33	50		11				
BLK	45			35	50		27				
HSP	37			35	35		18				
MUL				23							
WHT	64			53	47		41				
FRL	43			35	39	38	23				

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	32	61	75	27	68	73	42				
ELL	17	39	46	27	60	53	7				
BLK	33	43	33	33	57	69	36				
HSP	34	55	59	41	60	64	35				
MUL	29			29							
WHT	62	59	73	54	66	58	63				
FRL	40	48	49	42	58	58	42				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
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	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	30
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	59
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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

On the 2022 FSA Assessment, ELA Bottom quartile gains in 3rd - 5th grade was 37 (down from 55 in 2019).

While gains were made on the 2022 5th grade Science Assessment (41 % proficiency), we are still below the district and state average.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

5th Grade science, 3rd - 5th grade ELA bottom quartile and ELA proficiency.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Science: A stronger K-4 focus is needed to build foundational knowledge related to science.

ELA: Intentional progress monitoring of our bottom quartile students, multi racial, ESE and ELL with instructional adjustments and supports implemented based on the data.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

3rd - 5th grade math proficiency increased by 10 points from 39 to 49. Math gains also increased by 25 points from 39 to 64.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Weekly math planning with the coach, data dives with next step planning and small group interventions by the math coach. These interventions resulted in positive success for student and will be continued this year with an even stronger focus on mid lesson adjustments in response to students' progress towards standards mastery.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Our priorities for 22-23 school year is to focus on Science as well as maintaining learning gains for math and ELA. Teachers response to students mastery and struggles will be the focus of planning and professional development.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Planning support with school based or district coaches around the new standards will be a weekly focus with an intentional lens on anticipating misconceptions and preparing for timely lesson adjustments.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Job embed coaching support in math and ELA will be conducted during planning and side by side coaching. This builds the capacity of our new and returning teachers.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	We will focus on building teachers understanding of the BEST Standards through collaborative planning. Teachers will plan targeted questions with clear monitoring techniques to make in the moment lesson adjustments. Data collection will be used to plan core and small group instruction with an intentional focus on ELL, ESE, Multi Racial and Socio Economically Disadvantage students. While 2021 ELA data was not available due to late reporting scores, 2019 ELA proficiency compared to 2022 proficiency only increased by 1% with ELA bottom quartile decreasing by 18% points. With strong collaborative planning occurring in math during the 2021-2022 school year, Math proficiency increased by 10 % and gains increased by 25%. Science proficiency increased from 24% to 41% however this remained below the district and state average.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Through the use of instructional coaches to support weekly collaborative planning, job embedded professional development and data dives, proficiency scores will increase by at least 4% in ELA, Math and Science as measured by the 2023 state assessments.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Monthly progress monitoring data received through school wide and district assessments will be reviewed. Walk through data and informal observation data will be used to access the implementation of the planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will use job embedded professional development to support implementation of the plans.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this	According to research found in the article, "Job-embedded Professional Learning Essential to Improving Teaching and Learning in Early Education" by Debra Pacchiano, PHD., Rebecca Klein, and Marsha Shigeyo Hawley, outlines research based evidence of the importance of job-embedded learning to increase teacher performance and student achievement. Peer learning groups, coaching cycles, and

specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	lesson studies increase knowledge development, collaboration routines and transfer this learning got best practices in the classroom and develop highly effective teachers.

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.

Provide common planning time for each grade level to collaboratively plan with the instructional coaches. Focus will be on supporting the core while also planning for small group differentiation and acceleration.

Person Responsible	Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)

Conduct grade level data dives to determine areas of strength and needs related to the standards. Next steps will be developed at the core and sub group level.

Person Responsible	Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)

Provide job embedded professional development in the forms of fish bowls, modeling, or side by side coaching based on the needs of the individual teachers.

Person Responsible	Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)

Conduct routine data tracking of bottom quartile and identified ESSA subgroups to ensure interventions are resulting in increased student achievement. Timely adjustments will be made as needed.

Person Responsible	Emilia Suarez (emilia.suarez@hcps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

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 Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on the Spring 2022 i-Ready data, 25% of students in kindergarten, 19% of students in 1st grade and 19% of student in second grade scored at the mid, late, or above grade level on the spring assessment. These percentages are indicators of the percentage of students on tract for scoring a level 3 or above on statewide assessments.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Based on the 2022 ELA FSA scores, 42% of students in grades 3-5 scored at proficiency (level 3 or higher). This score was affected by students entering their respective grade already below level which impacted their on grade level performance. This shows a need for acceleration to close the existing achievement gap.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percent of students in grade K-2 scoring proficient will increase to 50% or higher as measured by the Spring 2023 ELA assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percent of students in grades 3-5 scoring proficient (level 3 or higher) will increase to 50% or higher as measured by the 2023 ELA state assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Students progress in ELA will be monitored through monthly and quarterly assessments. This data will be used to plan for core and small group instruction while setting individual goals with monitoring towards those goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Varnum, Lisa, lisa.varnum@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Common planning structures coupled with job embedded professional development will provide the opportunity for teachers to unpack the B.E.S.T ELA Standards while building their content knowledge to support students understanding of the standards with clear instructional strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

In 2019 to 2022 ELA proficiency decreased by 1% (43%-42%) of the FSA ELA assessment. The focus strategy of building teacher content knowledge and understanding of the standards will provide students with strategic, content rich core lessons with clear instructional strategies that student can apply across a variety of text.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
The reading coach will facilitate weekly planning sessions that provides clarity of the standard as well as instructional strategies to use for the corresponding standard. Teachers will incorporate opportunities to model the strategy followed by gradual release to the students. Administration will attend these planning sessions to support the learning while also reinforcing the implementation process in the classrooms.	Varnum, Lisa, lisa.varnum@hcps.net
Ensure clear standard task alignment exist through core, small group and independent task that support the focus standard(s).	Varnum, Lisa, lisa.varnum@hcps.net
The reading coach, AP and principal will conduct walk throughs that focus on providing teachers will feedback clarity of standard based instructional targets as well as gradual release. This data collection and feedback will be used to determine additional teacher support.	Varnum, Lisa, lisa.varnum@hcps.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Relationships with families begins with the first time they step foot on campus. Creating a welcoming environment for all families is a top priority of the school.

Yates promotes a positive school culture by providing a safe and caring environment where stakeholder voices are elicited and heard. Parent teacher conferences are held four times per year, the remind app or class DoJo is incorporated in many classrooms with home to school communication planners provided to all students. Newsletters are provided in print as well as electronic format to ensure access to all families.

Our SAC committee includes community partners, parents and faculty members working together to elicit a variety of perspectives and gain input from all stakeholders.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

With the support of local business partners and community agencies, our school focused on supporting the whole child with on site contract mental health services, uniform and clothing support, and dental health preventative care services. Through strong community relationships with our business partners, rent and food assitnace is provided to ensure basis needs are meet for all our families.

Our school works under the premise that when you can, you give. When you need, you receive. Our school

participated in support our local ECHO food distribution center where we give back but also refer families as needed. This partnership is a perfect example of reciprocal support that occurs within a family. Our Eaglet Nation is a family.