

Orange County Public Schools

John Young Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

John Young Elementary

12550 MARSFIELD AVE, Orlando, FL 32837

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

Demographics

Principal: Alma Santana

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

John Young Elementary

12550 MARSFIELD AVE, Orlando, FL 32837

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">99%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">86%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B	B	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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.

With the support of families and the community, we create exciting and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

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
Rodriguez, Lino	Principal	
Speights, Tyisha	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Bevan	Instructional Coach	
Hill, Tara	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Ellis, Jessica	Staffing Specialist	
Carmona, Deborah	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Lalsingh, Tracey	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/1/2017, Alma Santana

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.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

643

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

3

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

4

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	30	101	75	99	108	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	519
Attendance below 90 percent	16	40	31	32	31	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	26	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	38	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
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	2	29	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	1	2	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/12/2022

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	25	69	96	103	95	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	13	20	18	22	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	16	8	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	1	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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	25	69	96	103	95	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	13	20	18	22	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	16	8	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	1	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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	61%	56%	56%				57%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%						54%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						60%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	61%	46%	50%				71%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	64%						72%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						69%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	70%	61%	59%				54%	56%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	73%	62%	11%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	80%	63%	17%	64%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2022					
	2019	56%	57%	-1%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	53%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	17	38	35	23	50	48	41				
ELL	52	59	53	53	58	34	61				
ASN	90	67		90	81		89				
BLK	48	43		52	62		53				
HSP	53	60	56	54	60	45	66				
WHT	74	71		69	68		74				
FRL	57	61	48	54	62	44	62				

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	19	33		17	27		17				
ELL	56	66	62	47	43	80	47				
ASN	83			78							
BLK	50	63		40	47		56				
HSP	52	52	40	49	33	54	49				
WHT	73	60		72	45		74				
FRL	52	50	39	48	40	61	49				

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	24	36	37	38	56	67	7				
ELL	52	55	60	65	73	72	43				
ASN	67	58		83	84						
BLK	54	42		63	75		57				
HSP	48	54	61	66	69	68	49				
WHT	71	58		82	78		62				
FRL	51	53	63	67	72	73	50				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

There was a slight improvement in students in grades 3-5 demonstrating proficiency in Math from 2021 to 2022 (4%). 5th grade Science proficiency displayed a 10% increase. ELA proficiency remained at 61% proficiency overall.

Our Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup demonstrated minimal progress towards proficiency in core content areas.

The improvement of proficiency scores were higher in Math versus ELA in Grades 3-5. Kindergarten-2nd grade End of Year proficiency data showed a decrease of 2% in ELA from 2021 to 2022. The proficiency remained the same in Math at 58%.

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

End of Year data indicates that our Students with Disabilities subgroup continues to demonstrate the greatest need for improvement in the core content areas. The lowest 25% of students in grades 3-5 showed a need for improvement in the area of mathematics.

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

A contributing factor to this need was the lack of a streamlined school-wide model for Math intervention and an inconsistency of small group instruction amongst grade levels. Due to the adoption of multiple initiatives, there was no training provided for the Math K-3 resources that were purchased which resulted in inconsistent implementation.

More collaboration opportunities were needed between classroom teachers and ESE Resource teachers.

New actions: School-wide professional development focus on differentiated small group Math instruction; addition of 2 Tier 1 Intervention Teachers; professional development on inclusion strategies; implement Number Worlds curriculum (ESE teachers participated in professional development during the summer)

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

Overall, students in grades 3-5 showed improvement in ELA Learning Gains (4%), ELA Lowest 25% (11%), Math Proficiency (4%), Mathematics Learning Gains (23%) and Science (10%).

Our White, Hispanic, Asian and Free/Reduced Lunch student subgroups displayed growth in ELA learning gains with over 60% showing gains. All of our subgroups, with the exception of Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners, showed growth in Math learning gains with over 60% showing proficiency; however our SWD were at 50% and our ELL students were at 58%.

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

Contributing factors include teacher placement, after-school tutoring, and differentiated small group instruction.

After analyzing the Mid Year Data, we began to implement professional development on small group instruction in Math.

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

We will need to continue professional development of instructional strategies in Math and streamline the instructional focus during tutoring sessions to meet identified needs. The addition of the Tier 1 Interventionists will assist with the acceleration.

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.

Professional development will continue to focus on Social Emotional Learning through Leader in Me, small group differentiation in ELA and Math and the B.E.S.T. standards.

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

Ongoing job-embedded professional development, continuing school/district collaboration for resources and learning models to accelerate learning for our students with disabilities and continuing our relationship with consultants and experts in the field to enhance learning for all students.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

<p>Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</p>	<p>John Young Elementary teachers will continue to receive professional development and coaching in order to gain a better understanding of the newly adopted standards in literacy and Math. This will help to address gaps in student subgroups, specifically our Students with Disabilities in core content areas. In addition, this focus will improve instruction which will result in increased proficiency in Math and ELA for students in grades K-5.</p>
<p>Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.</p>	<p>Teacher standards-based instructional practices will be monitored through regular classroom observations. Using progress monitoring data (i-Ready, PM1, PM2, and PM3), students will demonstrate an increase in proficiency of 15 percentage points in ELA and Math from Fall to Winter and again from Winter to Spring (30 percentage points total).</p>
<p>Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.</p>	<p>We will monitor student progress through data chats with teachers, Professional Learning Communities (PLC's), classroom walkthroughs and pre and post observation conferences.</p>
<p>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</p>	<p>Lino Rodriguez (lino.rodriguez@ocps.net)</p>
<p>Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.</p>	<p>Teachers will continue to implement small group ELA and Math frameworks that are inclusive of evidence-based instructional and assessment practices, with an emphasis on alignment to the B.E.S.T. Standards.</p>
<p>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.</p>	<p>Job embedded professional learning is demonstrated through daily classroom practice of proven effective teaching strategies. These strategies include student observation, differentiation, planning for student engagement, balancing teacher-talk versus student-talk, allowing for productive struggle and reflection.</p>

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.

<p>Provide the opportunity for teachers to participate in collaborative planning with their colleagues</p>	<p>Person Responsible Lino Rodriguez (lino.rodriguez@ocps.net)</p>
<p>Provide professional development on instructional strategies related to the B.E.S.T. Standards in collaboration with OCPS Curriculum Services Department</p>	<p>Person Responsible Bevan Brown (56865@ocps.net)</p>
<p>Incorporate data-driven discussion in order to provide targeted instruction</p>	<p>Person Responsible Tyisha Speights (58416@ocps.net)</p>
<p>Provide coaching support and specific, actionable feedback based on observations and student data</p>	<p>Person Responsible Lino Rodriguez (lino.rodriguez@ocps.net)</p>
<p>Provide various types of standards-aligned, high quality resources to meet student instructional needs</p>	<p>Person Responsible Tara Hill (93262@ocps.net)</p>

Differentiate professional development based on ongoing teacher observation

Person Responsible Bevan Brown (56865@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Our Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup demonstrated the greatest need for improvement. In ELA, students in this subgroup displayed 17% proficiency. In Math, students in this subgroup displayed 23% proficiency. Our 5th grade students in this subgroup displayed 41% proficiency in Science.

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

Teacher standards-based instructional practices will be monitored through regular classroom observations. Using progress monitoring data (i-Ready, PM1, PM2, and PM3), students will demonstrate an increase in proficiency of 15 percentage points in ELA and Math from Fall to Winter and again from Winter to Spring (30 percentage points total).

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

We will monitor student progress through data chats with teachers, Professional Learning Communities (PLC's), classroom walkthroughs and pre and post observation conferences. We will maximize inclusionary practices and collaboration between Exceptional Student Education (ESE) teachers and General Education teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lino Rodriguez (lino.rodriguez@ocps.net)

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

Regular collaborative planning to align SWD services with grade level standards-based instruction

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

To accelerate academic progress for SWD by providing more targeted, rigorous standards-based instruction

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 the opportunity for Exceptional Education and General Education teachers to participate in ongoing collaborative planning

Person Responsible

Lino Rodriguez (lino.rodriguez@ocps.net)

General Education and Exceptional Education teachers will collaborate to provide joint parent/teacher conferences during each marking period.

Person Responsible

Lino Rodriguez (lino.rodriguez@ocps.net)

During upcoming annual reviews for SWD, IEP goals will be revised to include grade-level specific standards with benchmarks to target achievement gaps.

Person Responsible

Jessica Ellis (108934@ocps.net)

Provide professional development on instructional strategies related to supporting SWD

Person Responsible

Jessica Ellis (108934@ocps.net)

Facilitate data-driven discussion between General Education and Exceptional Education teachers in order to enhance differentiated instruction and support

Person Responsible Bevan Brown (56865@ocps.net)

Provide coaching support and specific, actionable feedback based on observations and data

Person Responsible Tyisha Speights (58416@ocps.net)

Provide various types of resources to meet student instructional needs in all content areas

Person Responsible Tara Hill (93262@ocps.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Self-Regulated Learning (SRL)

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

On the 2021-2022 Student Panorama Climate Survey, 70% of students in grades 3-5 responded favorably in the category of Self-Management. This was an increase of only 1% from the previous school year. This data aligns with student self-reported results on Leader in Me Measurable Results Assessment (MRA) in which 72% of students responded favorably to the subset Goal Achievement. Research has shown that Self-Regulated Learning strategies have a positive impact on academic achievement.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, student favorable response rates will increase by 5 percentage points in the area of Self-Management on the Student Panorama Survey and in the area of Goal Achievement on the MRA.

Monitoring:

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

SRL practices will be monitored through observations during school-wide implementation of the Leader in Me and Caring School Communities models and the newly established Student Leadership Council. This includes morning and closing meetings, classroom buddies and monitoring of discipline data, student achievement data and survey results.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lino Rodriguez (lino.rodriguez@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Our area of focus is to teach students metacognitive strategies to set and attain academic and social goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

By using the Leader in Me and Caring School Communities models, our goal is to develop life-long learners and leaders.

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.

Identify instructional leaders as members of the school-based Lighthouse Team in preparation for school-wide implementation of the Leader in Me model

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

Provide professional development on the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People in order to provide the foundational understanding for the Leader in Me Model and SRL strategies

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

Provide ongoing support through resources, materials and PLCs on SRL strategies and the Leader in Me and Caring School Communities models

Person Responsible Bevan Brown (56865@ocps.net)

Continue to facilitate deliberate conversations in large and small settings with teachers about the impact of SRL strategies on student academic and social achievement

Person Responsible Tracey Lalsingh (tracey.lalsingh@ocps.net)

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

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

Through our use of the Leader in Me and Caring School Communities models, our students work hard in their studies, find and express their voice in morning meetings and through their writing, help their classmates and their younger “cross-aged buddies”, act in a safe manner on campus and demonstrate resilience, kindness and most importantly, leadership skills.

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

Administration - Lead and monitor the environment of our school culture.

Instructional Support - Support and coach teachers with the SRL strategies and resources

Staff - Model positive SRL strategies; implement Leader in Me and Caring School Communities models

Students - Participate in school-wide SRL initiatives (morning meetings, closing meeting, cross-aged

buddies, Student Leadership Council)

Families/Community - Support and participate in SRL strategies through the Home Connection and family/community involvement opportunities including monthly Coffee Chats, Exceptional Student Education events, and Multilingual Parent Leadership Council meetings