

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Yates Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Yates Elementary School

301 KINGSWAY RD, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
	Assistant Principal	As assistant principal, Mr. Hutcherson assists 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. He 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.
Sims, DeVara	Reading Coach	As our onsite reading coach, Ms. Sims 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.
Creel, Shana	Science Coach	As our onsite science 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.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Summer meeting including the leadership team, students services, and teachers were held to discuss data and problem solve possible next steps. This conversation was continued into pre-planning with whole staff.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Data dives are conducted after each formal progress monitoring assessment as well as quarterly curriculum based assessments. Performance is drilled down to the individual teacher and student level in each given subgroup. Based on this data, adjustments are made.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	80%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	3	29	34	38	30	30	0	0	0	164
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	4	3	30	0	0	0	40
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	35	26	0	0	0	61
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	47	39	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	47	31	38	0	0	0	116
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	68	43	48	0	0	0	159
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	20	69	38	24	26	0	0	0	177

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	2	27	16	0	0	0	47

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	45	38	36	27	31	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	6	3	5	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	42	24	29	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	38	35	26	0	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	18	9	14	0	0	0	41

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	7	10	2	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	45	38	36	27	31	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	6	3	5	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	42	24	29	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	38	35	26	0	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	18	9	14	0	0	0	41

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	7	10	2	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	30	50	53	42	53	56	51		
ELA Learning Gains				56					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37					
Math Achievement*	29	56	59	49	50	50	39		
Math Learning Gains				64			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			36		
Science Achievement*	29	50	54	41	59	59	24		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					56	52			
Graduation Rate					48	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	49	59	59	55			49		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	162
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	11	Yes	2	2
ELL	24	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	23	Yes	1	1
HSP	29	Yes	1	1
MUL	18	Yes	3	3
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	26	Yes	1	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	1	1
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	30	Yes	2	2
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	47			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	30			29			29					49
SWD	6			18			10				3	
ELL	16			25			15				5	49
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			24			20				4	
HSP	27			24			21				5	50
MUL	18			18							2	
PAC												
WHT	43			43			50				4	
FRL	24			25			22				5	43

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	42	56	37	49	64	51	41					55
SWD	12	29	31	13	44	38	14					
ELL	34	62	27	49	67	38	48					55
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	30	52	50	39	63	73	12					
HSP	42	55	25	49	63	40	46					56
MUL	42			18								
PAC												
WHT	51	58		54	70		63					
FRL	40	54	38	45	60	50	38					50

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	51			39	39	36	24					49
SWD	33			17	35		26					
ELL	26			33	50		11					49
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45			35	50		27					
HSP	37			35	35		18					49
MUL				23								
PAC												
WHT	64			53	47		41					
FRL	43			35	39	38	23					48

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	33%	53%	-20%	54%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	34%	54%	-20%	58%	-24%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	22%	46%	-24%	50%	-28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	20%	55%	-35%	59%	-39%
04	2023 - Spring	37%	59%	-22%	61%	-24%
05	2023 - Spring	34%	53%	-19%	55%	-21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	25%	47%	-22%	51%	-26%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

On the 2023 FAST Assessment, ELA Proficiency was 29% (down from 42 in 2022 on FSA). Math proficiency was 30% on the FAST Assessment in 2023 (down from 49% in 2022). Science proficiency also declined when comparing 2022 (41%) to 2023 (25%). Yates had numerous teacher vacancies during the 2022-2023 school year in all grade levels which impacted the instruction the students received. In addition, to a large number of vacancies, there were many new teachers who lacked content knowledge due to being new to teaching, new to the grade level or new to the state/county.

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

While all content areas in grades 3-5 had declines in proficiency, fourth grade had the greatest loss of 17% in ELA. In math, there were significant declines in proficiency in third (19%) and fifth (16%) grade. Science proficiency decreased by 13% when comparing 2022 to 2023. Yates had numerous teacher vacancies during the 2022-2023 school year in all grade levels which impacted the instruction the students received. In addition, to a large number of vacancies, there were many new teachers who lacked content knowledge due to being new to teaching, new to the grade level or new to the state/county.

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.

At Yates, both ELA and math have large gaps when comparing the school average to the state average. Yates had numerous teacher vacancies during the 2022-2023 school year in all grade levels which impacted the instruction the students received. In addition, to a large number of vacancies, there were many new teachers who lacked content knowledge due to being new to teaching, new to the grade level or new to the state/county.

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

Significant area of improvement was not noted in ELA or math.

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

Students who are absent 10% or more days.

The number of Level 1 students in both reading and math on the state assessment.

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

Increase ELA proficiency by 10%.

Increase math proficiency by 10%.

55% of students will demonstrate learning gains in ELA.

55% of students will demonstrate learning gains in math.

65% of LPQ students will demonstrate learning gains in both ELA and math.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Regular, on time attendance is critical to student success. We will continue to focus on reducing barriers with families related to student attendance. Additionally, core positive incentives will be put in place as we celebrate those students with regular attendance. Focus groups will also be identified as we work to improve student connectivity to the school which will increase their desire to be present.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 on the FAST assessment will decrease by 25% in both reading (a decrease of 19 students) and math (a decrease of 20 students). The number of students absent 10% or more days will decrease by 50% (a decrease of 90 students).

Monitoring:

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

The administrative team and site based coaches will collect and analyze data regularly to measure the student's understanding of the benchmarks. The data will be used to make adjustments to the lessons as needed.

The administrative team will review attendance weekly to monitor the students who have consistent absences and implement interventions for those identified students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The administrative team and site-based coaches will collect and analyze data regularly to measure the student's understanding of the benchmarks. The data will be used to make adjustments to the lessons as needed.

Identified level 1 students will receive additional support through ELP with certified teachers.

Identified Level 1 students will receive additional small group interventions from an instructional coach during the school day.

Parents will be contacted for students who have consistent absences. An attendance plan will developed and monitored.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The number of students scoring at a Level 1 on the FAST assessment in reading was 95 and 99 students in math. 179 students were absent 10% or more days during the 2022-2023 school year.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The administrative team and site-based coaches will collect and analyze data regularly to measure the student's understanding of the benchmarks. The data will be used to make adjustments to the lessons as needed

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

By When: Monthly

Identified level 1 students will receive additional support through ELP with certified teachers. Individual data will be used to design individual lessons for both reading and math.

Person Responsible: Eunice ZeaEncarnacion (eunice.zeaencarnacion@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Identified Level 1 students will receive additional small group interventions from an instructional coach during the school day. Current data will be used to design lessons that will increase achievement.

Person Responsible: DeVara Sims (devara.sims@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

A school-based team will create an attendance plan that includes strategies and interventions to improve attendance. The team will meet weekly to review attendance.

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

By When: Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We will continue to focus on building teachers understanding of the BEST Standards through collaborative planning. Teachers will attend planning weekly and develop targeted questions with clear monitoring techniques to make in the moment lesson adjustments. Data collection and data chats 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 all content areas in grades 3-5 had declines in proficiency, fourth grade had the greatest loss of 17 % in ELA. In math, there were significant declines in proficiency in third (19%) and fifth (16%) grade. Science proficiency decreased by 13% when comparing 2022 to 2023. While there is no data from 2023 for learning gains and LPQ gains, Yates will include these groups as a focus.

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 10% in ELA, Math and Science as measured by the 2024 state assessments. 55% of students will demonstrate learning gains in both reading and math and 65% of LPQ students will demonstrate learning gains as measured by the 2024 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 assess the implementation of the planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Varnum (lisa.varnum@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Content area coaches will support teachers through weekly collaborative planning as well as intensive one on one coaching cycles to ensure the teachers have a clear understanding of the grade level content and benchmarks.

Students will receive instruction based on their individual needs that are identified through ongoing data analysis.

Students who have a deficit in phonics will receive small group intervention using UFLI curriculum. Content area coaches will support small groups of students who have an identified deficit.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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 lesson studies increase knowledge development, collaboration routines and transfer this learning got best

practices in the classroom and develop highly effective teachers. UFLI is a research-based program that closes the achievement gap in phonological awareness.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Common planning will occur weekly with a focus on standards-aligned tasks and discussion questions that will be used to help build understanding. Tasks and Questions will align with Benchmarks and Achievement Level Descriptors and will promote student discourse.

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

By When: Ongoing

Common lesson plans with common B.E.S.T. assessments will be implemented daily by teachers. Assessment data will be regularly collected and reviewed by the Academic Leadership team to determine trends among students. Next steps will be developed at the core and sub group level.

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

By When: Ongoing

Site-based coaches will complete coaching cycles with identified teachers to strengthen content knowledge and to implement new instructional practices in order to increase teacher's efficacy which will lead to increased student achievement.

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

By When: Ongoing beginning in September

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: DeVara Sims (devara.sims@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Based on the number of new teachers, vacancies, and teacher observation and walk through data from the previous year, the purchase of coaches in the areas of ELA, Math and Science was determined as our primary expenditure for school improvement funds. Student performance data from all three content areas are an area of focus for improvement.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

-

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

-

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

-

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

-

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

K-5 data dives will occur after ELA, Math and Science assessments to celebrate growth and determine instructional moves needed in response to the data. Administration, in conjunction with the academic

coaches, will also be monitoring the student data to determine classrooms or individual students in need of additional support. Resources (small group with coaches, daytime tutor, ELP, etc) will be shifted throughout the year in response to this data.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hutcherson, Justin, justin.hutcherson@sdhc.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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?

-

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

-

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

-

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Information related to our school improvement plan is shared through various means during the school year. In addition to being published on the school website, our goals and budget is shared during our Annual Title 1 meeting and PTA meeting. Additionally, progress on our goals is shared during monthly SAC meetings and biannual PAC meetings.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Student success is strongest when teachers, students, parents, and volunteers have a clear vision. Open-ended communication is vital to student success. At Yates, it comes in a variety of forms from parent conferences, "Remind" messages, Class "DoJo", school-wide messaging from our Blackboard system, newsletters, family nights and individual phone calls and meetings with families. We take proactive measures to make sure that as many parent voices are heard when surveying for needs and feedback. In addition to "barriers to participation" surveys, a parent survey is conducted at the conclusion of each family night in order to ensure the time of day and focus meets the needs of the families. This information is used to continually improve what and when we offer events in the future.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The addition of a science academic coach for the 23-24 school year will allow intentional planning, coaching and in class support in the area science. We are also strengthening our focus in 3-5 reading to incorporate a stronger balance of non-fiction text within the ELA classroom.

Primary daytime tutor has been hired to support K-3 foundational skills. Groups are fluid in response to ongoing progress monitoring around foundational skills.

In ELA, Math and Science, small groups plans are developed for remediation, reinforcement and enrichment. These are implemented in response to mid lesson checks to obtain a pulse of the students learning during whole group.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

-