Yearling Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Yearling Middle School

925 NW 23RD LN, Okeechobee, FL 34972

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

Demographics

Principal: Patricia Mccoy

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 (43%) 2020-21: (38%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/11/2022.

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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
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
McCoy, Pat	Principal	
Campbell, Kellyann	Assistant Principal	
Stanley , Krista	Instructional Coach	
Carpenter, Cathleen	Guidance Counselor	
Caves , Walt	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Patricia Mccoy

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.*
17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
39

Total number of students enrolled at the school
673

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
23

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	229	233	0	0	0	0	688
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	89	84	0	0	0	0	244
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	77	67	0	0	0	0	209
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	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
Monday 8/15/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	215	236	232	0	0	0	0	683
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	83	69	0	0	0	0	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	30	56	0	0	0	0	110
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	71	38	0	0	0	0	132
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	49	56	0	0	0	0	140
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	23	20	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	23	16	0	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	37	26	0	0	0	0	86

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	22	35	25	0	0	0	0	82

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	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	215	236	232	0	0	0	0	683
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	83	69	0	0	0	0	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	30	56	0	0	0	0	110
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	71	38	0	0	0	0	132
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	49	56	0	0	0	0	140
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	23	20	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	23	16	0	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	37	26	0	0	0	0	86

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	22	35	25	0	0	0	0	82

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	

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	36%	39%	50%	33%			40%	42%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	44%	48%	30%			47%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	33%	38%	24%			41%	43%	47%
Math Achievement	48%	49%	54%	46%			58%	61%	58%
Math Learning Gains	60%	58%	58%	37%			60%	60%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	46%	55%	33%			58%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	36%	49%	36%			35%	43%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	35%	50%	71%	42%			51%	60%	72%

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
06	2022					
	2019	49%	47%	2%	54%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	35%	38%	-3%	52%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
08	2022					
	2019	36%	37%	-1%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	55%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	54%	55%	-1%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2022					
	2019	49%	51%	-2%	46%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	36%	41%	-5%	48%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	51%	59%	-8%	71%	-20%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	88%	52%	36%	61%	27%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	90%	47%	43%	57%	33%

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	16	35	31	22	46	37	8	15			
ELL	23	37	36	41	54	33	9	19	31		
BLK	31	31		25	40		17				
HSP	36	40	32	49	59	36	28	31	55		
MUL	24	41		29	56						
WHT	39	50	39	50	63	46	37	44	67		
FRL	31	39	30	44	56	36	23	28	52		
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	10	20	21	11	20	29	11	23			
ELL	26	26	19	35	33	37	28	40	46		
BLK	29	38	18	37	36		45	27			
HSP	30	30	23	43	34	29	34	38	63		
MUL	23	15		18	9						
WHT	38	31	31	54	43	47	38	54	63		
FRL	28	29	24	42	33	28	34	37	62		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	19	33	29	35	55	57	20	34	46		
ELL	31	44	49	51	57	53	13	41	58		
BLK	25	37	33	42	51	42	8	60			
HSP	36	46	41	56	60	57	29	47	60		
MUL	25	21		47	43						
WHT	48	50	48	62	62	61	45	58	64		
FRL	37	43	36	54	61	59	29	49	58		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	31
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	48
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Across grade levels, 6th and 8th grade increased in both reading and math achievement while 7th grade decreased in both reading and math. In core content areas, YMS decreased in achievement in both 8th grade science and 7th grade civics. All Subgroups decreased in achievement in science and civics. In ELA, all subgroups except ELL students increased in achievement. In Math, black and white students decreased in achievement.

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

Civics achievement was 33% below the state average. 7th grade ELA achievement was 18% below the state average.

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

In civics, both teachers were new to civics and one was new to YMS. In ELA, all grade levels scored below the state average.

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

6th grade math scored above the state average by 4% and a 15% increase over the previous year. 6th grade ELA scored 11% over the previous year. 8th grade ELA and math scored 4% higher than the previous year.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement included: experienced teachers in both math and ELA for these grade levels, a concentrated focus on classroom management, parent communication, and differentiated instruction.

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

To accelerate learning the school will implement remediation and enrichment during the school day, three times per week; required tutoring during the school day 1-2 times each week; continue to improve differentiated instruction in all classes; strategically plan interventions for students who need additional support behaviorally as well as academically; and continue to monitor progress and makes timely adjustments in instruction.

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.

Teachers will receive professional development in : classroom management, differentiated instruction, collaborative teaching, PLC collaborative planning, and the MTSS system.

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

The school will work closely with the district to ensure the practices are aligned with the district vision, mission and strategic plan.

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	SWD scored 26% points on the federal index. ELL students scored 31% points on the federal index. Black/African America Students scored 29% points on the federal index. Hispanic Students scored 40% points on the federal index. Multiracial students scored 38% points on the federal index. Economically disadvantaged students scored 37% points on the federal index.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	All subgroup will increase its proficiency rate by 5% in the 22-23 SY.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	FAST progress monitoring will be completed three times in the SY.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Pat McCoy (mccoyp@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Evidence based strategies which will be used include: direct instruction, small group instruction, advanced organizers, extended practice, self-regulation and self-monitoring.
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.

Title IA funds allocated for this area of focus include:
Salaries for paraprofessionals, migrant advocate, instructional coach, substitutes, technology specialist, Math Bowl coach
Tech related rentals for NewsELA, Reflex Math, Edmentum Study Island Science, Flocabulary, USA Test Prep
Supplies and other consumable materials to support classroom instruction: paper, pens, post-it notes, highlighters, markers, math manipulatives, lab materials for science, guided reading books.
Consumable workbooks from Curriculum Associates Reading Florida ELA, Top Score Writing, Acaletics Math, Acaletics Science
Instructional Technology: computer hardware and supplies
Library Books: Battle of the Books
Supplies and other consumable materials necessary to support family engagement events. Examples: folders, paper, pens, highlighters, post-it notes, markers, foam board, dry erase boards, chart paper, and items for make-and-take academic practice.
Student agendas / planners for home to school communication

Person Responsible	Pat McCoy (mccoyp@okee.k12.fl.us)

Title IA funds allocated for this area of focus include:
Supplies and other consumable materials for the instructional coaches to conduct professional development on effective teaching strategies.

Stipend for Electronic Student Portfolio creation
Stipend for Grade Level Guide creation
Stipend for Hand Scheduling Students
Stipend for PLC outside contracted day
Local Kagan Training and training handbooks
Registration and travel for teachers to attend AVID Summer Institute in Orlando, FL
Copies of the book Learning by Doing: A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work
Registration and travel for teachers to attend SolutionTree PLC At Work Summer Institute and additional PD during school year

Person Responsible   Kellyann Campbell (kellyann.campbell@okee.k12.fl.us)

#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 critical need from the data reviewed.**	Create a cohort of subject area experts who have the ability to lead weekly PLC's.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Create a cohort of subject area experts who have the ability to lead weekly PLC's. Outcome measures will include: a cohort of teachers will participate in the PLC at Work summer training institute; funding to provide a PLC leader stipend will be set aside in Title I; PLC Leads will be identified and trained through Global PD; PLC leads will conduct weekly PLC session in subject alike groups.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This focus are will be monitored through monthly review of the SIP by staff, SAC committee and school leadership.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Empower educators to work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Build a collaborative culture that is committed to collective inquiry, action research, and continuous improvement. Lead all students to high levels of achievement by working in teams, not in isolation. Develop a shared understanding of assessments, implement common formative assessments, analyze evidence of student learning, and use that evidence to learn from one another and respond to the individual needs of students. Build a systematic process to provide additional time and support for students who are experiencing difficulty and to ensure every student has a clear path to deeper learning

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 PLC at Work professional development training for a core group of subject area teacher leaders so they may become PLC Leads.

Person Responsible	Pat McCoy (mccoyp@okee.k12.fl.us)

Funding to provide a PLC leader stipend will be set aside in Title I

Person Responsible	Pat McCoy (mccoyp@okee.k12.fl.us)

PLC leads will conduct weekly PLC session in subject alike groups

Person Responsible	Pat McCoy (mccoyp@okee.k12.fl.us)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Yearling Middle had 1,200 number of discipline referral in SY 20-21. Climate survey results indicate
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Reduce the number of discipline referral by 20%. Climate survey results
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Collecting discipline referral data and climate survey results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kellyann Campbell (kellyann.campbell@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	PBIS, CHAMPS Classroom management, and student engagement best practices

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.	The classroom management programs were chosen because the YMS staff have been trained in both routines. Student engagement practices will help ensure students are actively and meaningfully participating. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based three-tiered framework for improving and integrating all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. It is a way to support everyone – especially students with disabilities – to create the kinds of schools where all students are successful. C.H.A.M.P.S (Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, Participation, Success) is a classroom management program that aims to improve student behavior plus strengthen learner engagement through a strategic system of clearly defined expectations. It supports the idea that learners need to see and practice certain behaviors so that they are active participants in successfully managing their own behaviors

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.

Organize PBIS committee and duties, and routinely hold PBIS meeting.

Person Responsible	Walt Caves (walter.caves@okee.k12.fl.us)

Fully implement the universal screening process and MTSS for behavior including FBA and BIT implementation.

Person Responsible	Kellyann Campbell (kellyann.campbell@okee.k12.fl.us)

Provide classroom management training through FDLRS.

Person Responsible	Pat McCoy (mccoyp@okee.k12.fl.us)

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

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating 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 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)

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

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.

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

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. §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 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?

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

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.

Yearling Middle School is a PBIS school. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based three-tiered framework for improving and integrating all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. It is a way to support everyone – especially students with disabilities – to create the kinds of schools where all students are successful. A new PBIS coordinator, Krista Stanley, has been put in place and she has recruited a new group of staff to form the PBIS committee. Prior to school opening, the PBIS committee met to draft school-wide expectations for behavior for major areas of the school. A positive behavior reward system was devised where students earn points each day for their positive behavior choices. Once each quarter, the PBIS committee will plan a reward celebration for students who have earned 100 points. The PBIS committee will also meet bi-quarterly to review student academic and behavior data and make recommendations for changes to promote student success and improved school culture and environment.

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

Staff committee members include:
Sylvia Bandi, Teacher (6)
Krista Stanley, Coach
Walt Caves, Dean
Brian King, Guidance
Megan Williamson, Teacher (Voc)
Howard Martin, Teacher (7)
Wendy Moreno. Teacher (6)r
Tammy Wright, Coach
Leslie Garcia, Teacher (ESE)
Kellyann Campbell, Asst. Principal
Kathy Williams, director of mental and behavioral supports
Florida PBIS Project at USF
YMS Parent Teacher Organization
YMS School Advisory Council