

Orange County Public Schools

John Young Elementary



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 3 |
| School Information | 4 |
| Needs Assessment | 6 |
| Planning for Improvement | 9 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 10 |

John Young Elementary

12550 MARSFIELD AVE, Orlando, FL 32837

<https://johnyounges.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2017-18 Title I School | 2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 73% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 81% |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
| Grade | B | A | A | A* |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title |
|------------------|---------------------|
| Rodriguez, Lino | Principal |
| Speights, Tyisha | Assistant Principal |
| McCall, Katie | School Counselor |
| Brown, Bevan | Instructional Coach |
| | Dean |
| Ryerson, Felicia | Instructional Coach |
| Hill, Tara | Instructional Coach |

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The leadership team functions as a learning community and is led by the principal. The team meets to analyze data, monitor the progress of students, and develop priorities for delivery of instruction to students. Grade-level progress monitoring data is used to identify students who are meeting/ exceeding standards, or who are at moderate or high risk for not meeting standards. The leadership team collaborates regularly to share effective practices, assess instructional implications, evaluate implementation of programs, determine resource needs, review data collected from teacher observations, and plan professional development needs. General education teachers provide specific student information, collect student data, implement Tier I and Tier II support, and work with the team to analyze data and adjust instruction as needed.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 20 | 18 | 10 | 17 | 24 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 8 | 16 | 8 | 19 | 22 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 46 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 4 | 7 | 4 | 17 | 26 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected

Monday 7/9/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 7 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 8 | 14 | 19 | 23 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 2 | 2 | 7 | 16 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 7 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 8 | 14 | 19 | 23 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 2 | 2 | 7 | 16 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

When focusing on the seven school grade components, the lowest performance was in the area of math lowest 25th percentile. The decrease in percentage was displayed in four of the seven subgroups; specifically, English Language Learners, the Hispanic subgroup, Students with Disabilities, and Free and Reduced Lunch. The reduction of math proficiency scores was a trend throughout the state and district; however, even with the decrease in scores, our school performed above the district and state averages.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The greatest decline from the prior year was displayed in the area of math learning gains. This trend was consistent with the decrease of math proficiency in all seven subgroups.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

In comparison to the state average, the biggest gap was displayed in the area of math learning gains. The school had a decline of 28 percentage points overall. This was 3 percentage points lower than the state average in this area. Math learning gains was the largest gap compared to the other data components.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

When focusing on the data components, science achievement showed the most improvement with an increase of 5 percentage points. The subgroup data shows an improvement of scores in 6 of the 7 subgroups. This is consistent with the increase in science achievement displayed within the state, in which our school performed above the state average by 9 points.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Science teachers met weekly to discuss standards, lessons and assessments. District Performance Matters Assessments (PMAs) were analyzed with a focus on re-teaching the standards with lowest

proficiency. After the third PMA, data was compared with student reading abilities; students with high reading abilities but performing lower on PMAs were grouped for a focused intervention of the science standards. In addition, prior to FCAT science, the team worked together to provide review of all standards using collaborative science/problem solving activities for students.

School Data

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

| School Grade Component | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 58% | 56% | 56% | 72% | 53% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 59% | 55% | 55% | 63% | 52% | 52% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | 48% | 48% | 63% | 42% | 46% |
| Math Achievement | 69% | 63% | 62% | 70% | 56% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 56% | 57% | 59% | 62% | 54% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 46% | 47% | 39% | 41% | 46% |
| Science Achievement | 64% | 55% | 55% | 67% | 49% | 51% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 20 (11) | 18 (7) | 10 (13) | 17 (12) | 24 (7) | 7 (8) | 96 (58) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (1) | 1 (1) | 5 (5) | 8 (0) | 1 (2) | 3 (4) | 18 (13) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 8 (8) | 16 (14) | 8 (19) | 19 (23) | 22 (7) | 13 (9) | 86 (80) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 32 (22) | 46 (25) | 24 (25) | 102 (72) |

Grade Level Data

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 52% | 55% | -3% | 57% | -5% |
| | 2017 | 65% | 57% | 8% | 58% | 7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 54% | 54% | 0% | 56% | -2% |
| | 2017 | 61% | 57% | 4% | 56% | 5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 63% | 55% | 8% | 55% | 8% |
| | 2017 | 63% | 51% | 12% | 53% | 10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 66% | 61% | 5% | 62% | 4% |
| | 2017 | 74% | 63% | 11% | 62% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 65% | 62% | 3% | 62% | 3% |
| | 2017 | 77% | 64% | 13% | 64% | 13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 67% | 59% | 8% | 61% | 6% |
| | 2017 | 77% | 56% | 21% | 57% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -10% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2018 | 63% | 53% | 10% | 55% | 8% |
| | 2017 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 15 | 35 | 36 | 28 | 51 | 50 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 41 | 43 | 43 | 52 | 42 | 38 | 36 | | | | |
| ASN | 77 | 77 | | 86 | 77 | | 74 | | | | |
| BLK | 70 | 68 | | 68 | 61 | | 91 | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 53 | 43 | 63 | 51 | 39 | 64 | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 61 | | 75 | 57 | | 43 | | | | |
| FRL | 54 | 55 | 48 | 66 | 54 | 46 | 57 | | | | |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 27 | 39 | 23 | 45 | 78 | 67 | | | | | |
| ELL | 49 | 59 | 60 | 66 | 79 | 74 | 22 | | | | |
| ASN | 76 | 73 | | 91 | 83 | | 70 | | | | |
| BLK | 68 | 71 | | 83 | 79 | | 44 | | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 67 | 55 | 77 | 87 | 72 | 54 | | | | |
| WHT | 76 | 67 | | 82 | 84 | | 83 | | | | |
| FRL | 63 | 66 | 53 | 77 | 82 | 70 | 50 | | | | |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title Mathematics

Rationale Mathematics learning gains and proficiency were the lowest areas of performance for all subgroups. While they were the lowest performance areas, they showed significant declines from the previous year compared to all other assessed areas.

Intended Outcome To increase learning gains by in mathematics by 20 percentage points and proficiency in mathematics by 12 percentage points during the Spring 2019 assessment cycle.

Point Person Tyisha Speights (58416@ocps.net)

Action Step

Teachers will incorporate differentiated math instruction consisting of real-world problems, mathematical fluency and spiral review.

Description

1. Teachers will use collaborative planning to plan differentiated lessons to incorporate math centers.
2. Teachers will incorporate Number Talks during whole group math instruction.
3. Teachers will analyze data and group students for Tier 2 support.
4. Incorporate close reading strategies during math instruction.
5. Teachers will work collaboratively with ELL and ESE teams to provide additional support for students.
6. Teachers will incorporate the use of close reading strategies to support student understanding and enhance their ability to successfully solve complex word problems.

Saturday school and after-school tutoring will be utilized to provide additional support for students.

Person Responsible Tyisha Speights (58416@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description

- Review of lesson plans
- Classroom walk-through and observations
- PLC time to review student data and common assessments
- Provide timely actionable feedback from classroom walk-through and observations
- Identify teachers that need coaching cycle support
- Select effective/highly effective teachers for Saturday school and after-school tutoring.
- Monitor assessment data (iReady, common assessments)

Person Responsible Tyisha Speights (58416@ocps.net)

Activity #2

Title Culturally Responsive School Plan

Rationale According to our sub-group data, the Hispanic and ELL sub-groups had the greatest decline in scores.

Intended Outcome To close the achievement gap between sub-populations.

Point Person Tyisha Speights (58416@ocps.net)

Action Step

Description

- Assign an administrative lead to oversee and monitor culturally responsive school plan.
- Continue to work with Freedom High School (Latinos in Action)
- Continue to plan/facilitate deliberate conversations in large and small group settings with teachers.
- Meeting with teams (PLCs, staff meetings, pre/post teacher conferences, new teacher cohort)
- Dedicate intentional PLC time devoted to sharing and exploring District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) content, with specific focus on the use of close reading strategies and text complexity in order to accelerate vocabulary acquisition and enhance comprehension of our ELL learners.

Person Responsible Tara Hill (93262@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description

- Data review to include focus on specific sub-groups
- Review lesson plans for differentiated instruction
- Classroom walk-through and observations

Person Responsible Lino Rodriguez (lino.rodriguez@ocps.net)

Part V: Budget

| | |
|---------------|--------------------|
| Total: | \$25,000.00 |
|---------------|--------------------|