

Orange County Public Schools

John Young 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 | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 19 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 19 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

John Young Elementary

12550 MARSFIELD AVE, Orlando, FL 32837

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

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.

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, 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 |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Santana, Alma | Principal | The team will work collaboratively to diagnose curriculum, instructional practices, school systems and structures for teacher and student learning, parent and community involvement, and operational procedures. Collectively gathering relevant information from all stakeholders and using cycles of continuous improvement to guide the work. The principal will lead the development of the Instructional Leadership Team focusing on the goals as well as the individual roles and responsibilities. Will work on weekly meetings focused on building organizational capacity and collective efficacy focused on the SIP. Progress monitor the implementation of the action steps. |
| Carmona, Deborah | ELL Compliance Specialist | |
| Hill, Tara | Instructional Coach | |
| Ellis, Jessica | Staffing Specialist | |
| Lalsingh, Tracey | School Counselor | |
| Speights, Tyisha | Assistant Principal | |

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.

The school has developed a school-based Instructional Leadership Support team (ILST) to collaborate and generate strategies of improvement based on diagnosing needs by collecting and analyzing different forms of data from all relevant stakeholders. The team will collaborate closely with grade level team/ special area teachers, various parent groups, and community members. The ILST will ensure equity of voice by setting up structured procedures for intentionally involving all meantion parties.

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))

We will use our ILST, Parent Teacher Association (PTA), School Advisory Council (SAC), Multilingual Parent Leadership Council (MPLC), and grade level team meetings strategically using cycles of continuous improvement to guide the work. We will revise different forms of student data as well as strategy implementation data. The work will be evident in structured meeting agendas and minutes.

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 | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 86% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 99% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| 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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: B |

| | |
|---|--|
| *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B |
| 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 | 15 | 34 | 31 | 20 | 11 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (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 | 3 | 25 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1 | 21 | 37 | 21 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |

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 | 1 | 10 | 14 | 11 | 28 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |

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 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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 | 16 | 40 | 31 | 32 | 31 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 38 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 16 | 40 | 31 | 32 | 31 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 38 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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* | 58 | 57 | 53 | 61 | 56 | 56 | 61 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 62 | | | 58 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 55 | | | 44 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 58 | 60 | 59 | 61 | 46 | 50 | 57 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 64 | | | 41 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 40 | | | 52 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 68 | 63 | 54 | 70 | 61 | 59 | 60 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 66 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 51 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 55 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 63 | 59 | 59 | 75 | | | 63 | | |

* 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) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 61 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 306 |
| 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 | 61 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 488 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| 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 | 25 | Yes | 2 | 1 |
| ELL | 50 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 92 | | | |
| BLK | 63 | | | |
| HSP | 56 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | | | |

| 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% |
| FRL | 56 | | | |

| 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 | 40 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | 56 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 83 | | | |
| BLK | 52 | | | |
| HSP | 59 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | | | |
| FRL | 57 | | | |

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 | 58 | | | 58 | | | 68 | | | | | 63 |
| SWD | 15 | | | 25 | | | 17 | | | | 5 | 50 |
| ELL | 47 | | | 53 | | | 44 | | | | 5 | 63 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 86 | | | 89 | | | 100 | | | | 4 | |
| BLK | 61 | | | 59 | | | 70 | | | | 3 | |
| HSP | 52 | | | 50 | | | 63 | | | | 5 | 61 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | | | 63 | | | 62 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 54 | | | 54 | | | 63 | | | | 5 | 63 |

| 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 | 61 | 62 | 55 | 61 | 64 | 40 | 70 | | | | | 75 |
| SWD | 17 | 38 | 35 | 23 | 50 | 48 | 41 | | | | | 70 |
| ELL | 52 | 59 | 53 | 53 | 58 | 34 | 61 | | | | | 75 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 90 | 67 | | 90 | 81 | | 89 | | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | 43 | | 52 | 62 | | 53 | | | | | |
| HSP | 53 | 60 | 56 | 54 | 60 | 45 | 66 | | | | | 80 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 74 | 71 | | 69 | 68 | | 74 | | | | | |
| FRL | 57 | 61 | 48 | 54 | 62 | 44 | 62 | | | | | 69 |

| 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 | 61 | 58 | 44 | 57 | 41 | 52 | 60 | | | | | 63 |
| SWD | 19 | 33 | | 17 | 27 | | 17 | | | | | 31 |
| ELL | 56 | 66 | 62 | 47 | 43 | 80 | 47 | | | | | 63 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 83 | | | 78 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 63 | | 40 | 47 | | 56 | | | | | |
| HSP | 52 | 52 | 40 | 49 | 33 | 54 | 49 | | | | | 62 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 60 | | 72 | 45 | | 74 | | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 50 | 39 | 48 | 40 | 61 | 49 | | | | | 67 |

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 | 61% | 54% | 7% | 54% | 7% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 56% | 60% | -4% | 58% | -2% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 53% | 52% | 1% | 50% | 3% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 62% | 59% | 3% | 59% | 3% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 60% | 62% | -2% | 61% | -1% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 50% | 55% | -5% | 55% | -5% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 62% | 59% | 3% | 51% | 11% |

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.

K-1 ELA demonstrated the lowest performance because they were at 25% proficiency. The contributing factors are use of a lower level depth of knowledge questions during instructional delivery, not meeting the full extent of the standard, and the need for stronger differentiation practices.

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

Based on the data from the 2022-2023 school year, 5th grade science showed a decline in proficiency from 70% to 62%.

Some contributing factors may have been lack of common planning, inconsistencies in science instruction, and lack of the school focus on science.

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.

In reviewing the data for students in grades 3-5, John Young Elementary, has remained comparable to the district and state averages. In both ELA and Math, we have performed at or above the district average. When looking at all students, the areas in which we perform closest would be 4th grade ELA and 5th grade Math and Science.

In reviewing K-2 grade 2023 FAST data, our greatest area of support would be needed in ELA.

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

Our school displayed the most improvement in the area of Math. In order to enhance our performance in this area, we put structures in place to help mimic the ELA block which included whole and small group instruction, center rotations, and math interventions. We also had the support of Tier 1 intervention teachers that offered push-in support in the classroom.

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

1. Reading deficiency overall (105 students) and low/stagnate standardized test scores overall.
2. Student Attendance (131 students high-risk)

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

1. Reading deficiency overall (105 students) and low/stagnate standardized test scores overall.
2. Student Attendance (131 students high-risk)
3. Building organizational capacity: Instructional Practices, Coaching, and Reflection of Data-Informed Decisions/Practices

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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 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.

Our area of focus is to increase organizational capacity around data-informed practices in order to improve intentional progress monitoring, differentiation practices, and instruction meeting grade-level standards for all students, with an intense focus on students with disabilities.

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 2023-2024 school year, 90% of our students will display growth in the areas of reading and math on PM3 increasing the number of students obtaining proficiency by 10%. At least 41% of students with disabilities will attain proficiency on the math and ELA PM3 assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Intentional active learning weekly PLCs will be conducted and twice monthly PDs focused on data-informed practices reflecting on instructional practices and analyzing student outcomes will be planned and conducted.

Quarterly data-chats with each teacher individually.

Monthly Learning Walks will be conducted by administrators and/or the instructional leadership team with the goal of diagnosing instructional practices and curriculum implementation.

Teachers needing intensive support and/or coaching on instructional strategies will be placed on coaching cycles conducted by the Instructional Leadership Team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alma Santana (alma.santana@ocps.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.)

Intentional interventions guided by analysis of various forms of data as well as aligned to the needs of our ESE students are being implemented using Being a Reader, SIPPS, Scholastic Book Room, Heggerty, Number Worlds, Envision Manipulatives, Exact Path, FCRR, and SuccessMaker. Interventions are scheduled for both ELA and Math daily and data is monitored weekly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These programs are researched based that begin with a specific diagnostic to support individualized student level of support.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Instructional Leadership Team will meet to develop a cohesive and coherent Teacher Learning Plan with a focus on strengthening standards aligned instruction meeting the needs of all students specifically our ESE students.

Person Responsible: Alma Santana (alma.santana@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023

We will plan and deliver Intentional, active learning weekly PLCs analyzing curriculum implementation and instructional best practices as well as the supports in place for our ESE students.

Person Responsible: Alma Santana (alma.santana@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

We will plan and deliver Intentional, active learning bi-weekly PDs specifically focused on supports for all students specifically our ESE populations.

Person Responsible: Tara Hill (93262@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

We will conduct monthly Learning Walks with a focus on standards aligned instruction and intentional curriculum implementation with a focus on supports available for ESE students.

Person Responsible: Alma Santana (alma.santana@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

We will implement K-2 grade level instructional best practices grade-level team coaching cycles with a focus on supporting ESE students.

Person Responsible: Rachel Steele (rachel.steele@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

We will implement 3-5 grade level instructional best practices grade-level team coaching cycles with a focus on supporting ESE students.

Person Responsible: Audra Fresoli (audra.fresoli@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

We will work with the ESE Teacher Teams to provide instructional learning cycles.

Person Responsible: Jessica Ellis (108934@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023 - May 2024

We will implement grade level teams instructional best practices coaching cycles focused on supporting ELL students that are also ESE.

Person Responsible: Deborah Carmona (deborah.carmona@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023 - May 2024

#2. 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.

Another area of focus are our early warning indicators, specifically student attendance. During the 22-23 school year, 186 students were identified as having 10 or more absences from school. Based on the data provided, there is a need for positive incentives to increase student attendance which will allow students to receive the appropriate amount of support in all content areas.

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 2023-2024 school year, less than 140 students will be absent 10 days or more which is a 25% decrease from the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Quarterly data-chats with each teacher individually (discuss attendance/tardy concerns) along with an administrator, guidance counselor, discipline support, and the attendance clerk.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tyisha Speights (58416@ocps.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 evidence-based interventions being implemented to build resiliency for all student, but specifically for our ESE students include Caring School Community and Leader in Me Curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our area of focus is to teach students metacognitive strategies to set and attain academic and social goals. By using the Leader in Me and Caring School Communities models, our goal is to develop life-long learners and leaders.

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.

Instructional Leadership Team will meet to develop a cohesive and coherent Teacher Learning Plan that also includes resilience focus.

Person Responsible: Tyisha Speights (58416@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023

We will plan and deliver intentional, active learning weekly PLCs and integrate resilience practices.

Person Responsible: Tyisha Speights (58416@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

We will support the development and delivery Intentional, active learning bi-weekly PDs integrating resilience practices.

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

By When: August 2023-May 2024

We will implement 3-5 grade level instructional best practices Coaching Cycles integrating Resilience.

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

By When: August 2023-May 2024

We will conduct weekly collaboration meetings with the Attendance Clerk to progress monitor student attendance.

Person Responsible: Tyisha Speights (58416@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

We will implement K-2 grade level instructional best practices Coaching Cycles focused on resilience.

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

By When: August 2023-May 2024

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).

In collaboration with the relevant stakeholders (School Advisory Council, school administration, and grade level instructional teams), we reviewed school-wide data and trends to determine where additional resources were needed to support and supplement student instructional needs, specifically students with disabilities.

Based on this review, the school based instructional leadership team met with the ESE instructional team, to select resources that would enhance classroom instruction. Using School Improvement and general budget funding, the school purchased materials from the Institute for Multi-Sensory Education. Teachers were also sent to Orton Gillingham training to support students with substantial reading deficiencies.

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

The students will develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters and teachers will teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

These foundational skills that support reading for understanding for students in grades kindergarten-third have a strong level of evidence according to the Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences.

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

The students will develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters and teachers will teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

These foundational skills that support reading for understanding for students in grades kindergarten-third have a strong level of evidence according to the Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 90% of our 2nd grade students will display growth in the area of reading on PM3, increasing the number of students obtaining proficiency by 10%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Data provided for the 2022-2023 school year shows that 56% of our 2nd grade students performed at or below the 40th percentile in reading. Given that the students represented in this data are currently 3rd grade students our goal is for 90% of our 3rd grade students to display growth in the area of reading on PM3, increasing the number of students obtaining proficiency by 10%.

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.

In order to monitor desired outcomes, administrators will conduct weekly reading walkthroughs. Administrators and Instructional Support Team will facilitate monthly data meetings by area including the MTSS Problem-Solving Teams. The Cadre leadership will review FAST progress monitoring assessments, K-1 DIBELS progress monitoring data, SIPPS progress monitoring data and district-created standard based unit assessments to monitor response to intervention.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Santana, Alma, alma.santana@ocps.net

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?

To support in the are of ELA, we will be utilizing Being a Reader, SIPPS, Scholastic Book Room, Heggerty, , Exact Path, and Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR) resources. These programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan and 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?

These programs are researched based that begin with a specific diagnostic to support individualized student level of support.

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 |
|---|---|
| <p>We will conduct monthly Literacy Leadership team meetings, where data are analyzed and action steps are implemented and monitored.</p> | <p>Santana, Alma, alma.santana@ocps.net</p> |
| <p>The Instructional Coach and both Resource Teachers will attend district coach meetings. The Instructional Leadership Team will use data to identify personnel and areas of need. Implementation of coaching cycles, modeling, and PLC facilitation to support ELA needs.</p> | <p>Hill, Tara, 93262@ocps.net</p> |
| <p>We will develop our professional learning plans based on the needs reflected in our progress monitoring data. Our school-based leadership and teachers will participate in District PD options available include the Instructional Literacy Institute, literacy coach meetings, K-5 District ELA Impact Series, Being a Reader PD, SIPPS PD and Making Sense of Multisensory Instruction PD.</p> | <p>Speights, Tyisha, 58416@ocps.net</p> |