The School District of Palm Beach County

H. L. Johnson 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	15
III. Planning for Improvement	20
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

H. L. Johnson Elementary School

1000 CRESTWOOD BLVD N, Royal Palm Beach, FL 33411

https://hlje.palmbeachschools.org

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/18/2023.

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.

H.L. Johnson Elementary is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

H.L. Johnson Elementary envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

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
Amado Kurcharski, Crystal	Principal	Dr. Amado is our Principal. She serves as our Educational Leader. She assumes the responsibility for promoting safety, providing equity and access for all, coordinating and monitoring the implementation of schoolwide instructional strategies, analyzing student achievement data, providing support to staff for academic success for all students and families, and monitoring progress toward meeting school goals. Providing a shared vision for databased decision-making ensures that the school-based team is implementing Rti, ensuring implementation of the intervention support and documentation, and ensuring adequate development to support Rti implementation. Attends PLCs to provide input and to serve as the education leader, ensuring the state standards are taught with fidelity. Dr. Amado continually advocates for the best services and support for students and staff and promotes a positive climate for all stakeholders. She leads the School Leadership Team and reviews the SIP components to assess implementation and results to promote a continuous cycle of improvement and inquiry.
Agudelo, Danielle	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Agudelo is our Assistant Principal. Supports the principal and is an educational leader of the school in all aspects of administration, including promoting safety, and providing equity and access to the curriculum. She serves as our instructional leader and is responsible for monitoring the implementation of school-wide instructional strategies, analyzing student achievement data, providing support to staff, students, and families, and monitoring progress toward meeting school goals. Supports a shared vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing Rti, ensures implementation of the intervention support and documentation, and ensure adequate development to support Rti implementation. She is the organizational planner for all progress monitoring and assessments for the leadership team, instructional staff, and students. Promotes equity and access for all at HLJ. She is a significant part of the School Leadership Team, which routinely reviews the SIP components to assess implementation and results and promote a continuous improvementand inquiry cycle.
Moore, Kaytie	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Moore is the Kindergarten team leader and PLC lead. She ensures the school's vision is carried out, leads weekly common planning meetings, ensures her team follows the scope and sequence, and helps carry out the school's vision and goals. As part of the Team Leader PLC, she assists in systematic reviews of the SIP components to assess implementation and results to promote a continuous cycle of improvement and inquiry. PLC Lead. Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection and monitoring, facilitates weekly team planning for scaffolded and differentiated instruction based on data, supports Tier 1 instruction/ intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities for her team. She also shares in enrichment for our high achievers and gifted support in Kindergarten. As part of the PLC Leader Team, she assists in systematic

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		reviews of the SIP components to assess implementation and results to promote a continuous cycle of improvement and inquiry.
Conner, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Conner is our SAI teacher. She is an instructional leader responsible for reading intervention focusing on the many components critical to reading success and academic success. Provides intervention expertise, assists school staff with identifying specific student deficiencies and matches students to research-based interventions. Facilitates and supports data collection in reading instruction activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of intervention plans. Her specialty includes the following areas: Oral Language, Phonemic Awareness/Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension She supports all stakeholders with strategies, PD, and information on reading achievement for all students. She also shares in enrichment for our high achievers and gifted support in 4th grade. Mrs. Conner also is our SBT Chair, PD Chair, third grade PLC Lead, and tutoring coordinator. She is also part of the School Leadership Team, which routinely reviews the SIP components to assess implementation and results and promote a continuous improvement and inquiry cycle. The SIP is subject to periodic modifications and annual revision with an opportunity for stakeholder engagement and feedback.
Neps, Stacey	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Neps is the School Advisory Council (SAC) Chair. As the SAC chair, she is responsible for notifying members of upcoming meetings and votes. She facilitates the monthly SAC meetings and informs the SAC of relevant issues related to school improvement activities. She is also part of the SIP Team and Team Lead for second grade. As the team leader, she ensures the school's vision is carried out, leads common planning meetings, ensures her team follows the scope and sequence, and helps carry out the school's vision and goals. As part of the Team Leader PLC, she assists in systematic reviews of the SIP components to assess implementation and results to promote a continuous cycle of improvement and inquiry.
Nerenberg, Taryn	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Nerenberg is the team leader for first grade. She ensures the school's vision is carried out, leads weekly common planning meetings, ensures her team follows the scope and sequence, and helps carry out the school's vision and goals. As part of the Team Leader PLC, she assists in systematic reviews of the SIP components to assess implementation and results to promote a continuous cycle of improvement and inquiry
Silver, Tracey	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Silver is the team leader for third grade. She ensures the school's vision is carried out, leads weekly common planning meetings, ensures her team follows the scope and sequence, and helps carry out the school's vision and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		goals. As part of the Team Leader PLC, she assists in systematic reviews of the SIP components to assess implementation and results to promote a continuous cycle of improvement and inquiry.
Tidd, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Tidd is the 5th-grade team leader and PLC. She ensures the school's vision is carried out, leads weekly common planning meetings, ensures her team follows the scope and sequence, and helps carry out the school's vision and goals. Mrs. Tidd is our math and science support she is responsible for providing Standards-based Math/Science academic support in grades 3-5. As part of the Team Leader PLC, she assists in systematic reviews of the SIP components to assess implementation and results to promote a continuous cycle of improvement and inquiry. PCL Lead provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection and monitoring, facilitates weekly team planning for scaffolded and differentiated instruction based on data, supports Tier 1 instruction/ intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities for her team. She also shares in enrichment for our high achievers and gifted support in 4th grade. As part of the PLC Leader Team, she assists in systematic reviews of the SIP components to assess implementation and results to promote a continuous cycle of improvement and inquiry.
Meeks, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Meeks is the second-grade PLC Lead. Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection and monitoring, facilitates weekly team planning for scaffolded and differentiated instruction based on data, supports Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities for her team. As part of the PLC Leader Team, she assists in systematic reviews of the SIP components to assess implementation and results to promote a continuous cycle of improvement and inquiry.
Fleming , Robyn	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Fleming is the 4h-grade team leader. She ensures the school's vision is carried out, leads weekly common planning meetings, ensures her team follows the scope and sequence, and helps carry out the school's vision and goals. As part of the Team Leader PLC, she assists in systematic reviews of the SIP components to assess implementation and results to promote a continuous cycle of improvement and inquiry.
O'Bryant, Cher	School Counselor	Ms. O'Bryant provides education, prevention, early identification and intervention, elementary school counselors help their students achieve academic success, develop an understanding of career opportunities and develop social/ emotional skills in response to issues they face.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Krieger, K	ELL Compliance Specialist	Mr. Krieger ensures that English Language Learners' academic, cultural and linguistic needs are met. He promotes academic achievement, addresses their social-emotional needs as they acquire English language proficiency, and works closely with the staff members at HLJ to provide adequate and appropriate services and advocate for our ELL students. He is also responsible for maintaining ELLs' Program records and updating information using ELLevation. He is responsible for ensuring that our ELL students receive comprehensive instruction by monitoring their data, supporting them in their classrooms, and keeping up to date with their ELL Plans. Mr. Krieger advances and monitors our ability to grow in equity and access. He is also part of the School Leadership Team, which routinely reviews the SIP components to assess implementation and results and promote a continuous improvement and inquiry cycle. The SIP is subject to periodic modifications and annual revision with an opportunity for stakeholder engagement and feedback.
Lenahan, Chelsea	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Lenahan is the ESE Contact. She ensures students with disabilities receive appropriate educational services leading to increased student achievement. She meets with all stakeholders and is responsible for overseeing the appropriate support is provided to each student, teacher, support staff, therapist, etc. She ensures that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance in the standard or Access curriculum, statewide assessments, and accountability systems. She assists HLJ in fully and satisfactorily implementing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requirements. She provides leadership in developing and implementing the ESE Service and is the ESE team leader. Mrs. Lenahan meets at least weekly with her team to track and analyze student-related data and works with teachers on the team to plan for differentiation of instruction based on student needs and support. She is a part of the School Leadership Team, which routinely reviews the SIP components to assess implementation and results and promote a continuous improvement and inquiry cycle. The SIP is subject to periodic modifications and annual revision with an opportunity for stakeholder engagement and feedback.
Sheffield, Jill	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Sheffield is the fourth-grade PLC Lead. Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection and monitoring, facilitates weekly team planning for scaffolded and differentiated instruction based on data, supports Tier 1 instruction/ intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities for her team. She also shares in enrichment for our high achievers and gifted support in 4th grade. As part of the PLC Leader Team, she assists in systematic reviews of the SIP components to assess

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		implementation and results to promote a continuous cycle of improvement and inquiry.
Goode- McDaniel, Alexandra	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Alfonso is the 1st grade PLC Lead. Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection and monitoring, facilitates weekly team planning for scaffolded and differentiated instruction based on data, supports Tier 1 instruction/ intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities for her team. She also shares in enrichment for our high achievers and gifted support in 1st grade. As part of the PLC Leader Team, she assists in systematic reviews of the SIP components to assess implementation and results to promote a continuous cycle of improvement and inquiry.
Trombley, Sandra	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Trombley is the ESE team leader. She ensures the school's vision is carried out, leads weekly common planning meetings, ensures her team follows the scope and sequence, and helps carry out the school's vision and goals. As part of the Team Leader PLC, she assists in systematic reviews of the SIP components to assess implementation and results to promote a continuous cycle of improvement and inquiry.

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.

At H.L. Johnson Elementary, the wellbeing of our students is a top priority. We have a School Behavior Health Professional (SBHP) who partners with our school counselors to provide mental and behavioral health services to our students. This role was created in 2019 as part of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act, which aimed to increase the number of mental health professionals in schools.

Our school offers a range of services to families, including parent trainings, educational workshops, and supplementary support services. These services are facilitated by our school counselor, Behavior Health Professional, SAI, ESOL, ESE, team teacher leaders, and the Administrative Team. Additionally, our ESOL Coordinator works with the District's multicultural department to ensure the effective implementation of programs and services designed to improve the outcomes of English Language Learners.

Ensuring safety and security on campus is a top priority for us. We have a school district officer present every day, one point of entry for everyone, and the Fortify Florida Application installed on every computer. We also use the Raptor System to sign in parents/visitors before they can attend a classroom or school event on campus.

The School Counselors and SBHP work alongside families and the District McKinney-Vento liaison to

ensure that the unique needs of families and students are met. These supports are also supplementary to school-wide support services for students and families. Our ESOL Coordinator and CLF collaborate with the District's Multicultural Department to ensure that programs and services designed to enhance the outcomes of our English Language Learners are implemented effectively.

The Parent Teacher Organization and School Advisory Council also play an important role in our school. They provide input, develop, and approve our goals and plans for improvement at H.L. Johnson Elementary. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to reach out to us.

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))

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is a living document that memorializes the continuous improvement work we do at our school. The SIP is updated throughout the year to ensure proper documentation of what we do. Continuous improvement at the forefront of what we do. We work collaboratively to review and analyze data. We make decisions based on the data to ensure all students receive the necessary support and accommodations during instruction. Our team works towards the following student achievement goals:

- Strategic visioning and planning
- Problem identification and root cause analysis
- Developing action steps towards improvement
- Creating and maintaining a culture of collaboration towards shared decision-making
- Supporting professional learning and improvement

Monitoring will take place throughout the year. We will monitor mastery of grade level benchmarks through the use of Unit Assessments, i-Ready Diagnostic, and FAST Progress Monitoring (PMs 1, 2, and 3 in English Language Arts and Mathematics). The Unit Assessments will occur every 4 weeks. The i-Ready Diagnostic and the FAST/STAR assessments will occur three times a year.

Student assessments include the new Progress Monitoring which occur 3 times per year. In VPK- Grade 2 there is Early Literacy/Star Reading, and Star Math. In Grades 3-5 there is FAST Reading and Math. Performance Matters Assessments.

The annual test administered for ELL students is WIDA ACCESS. The WIDA is used to assess ELL students' proficiency in the areas of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Teachers are trained by the ESOL Coordinator to assess data, modify, and implement differentiated instruction based on the results of data.

The annual test for ESE students is the FSAA. The FSAA is used to assess ESE students' proficiency in all content areas to include: English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies. Teachers are trained by the ESE Coordinator to assess data, modify, and implement differentiated instruction, based on the results of data.

Content area teachers meet with the PLC leaders and administration to discuss and analyze data, modify instruction, and create standards-based learning goal scales. Student work and best practices are shared and analyzed during Administrative Team meetings, Professional Learning Communities, the Instructional Leadership Team meetings, Faculty meetings, and School Advisory Council meetings. Teachers follow the scope and sequence as outlined on the Palm Beach County curriculum resource on blender. This ensures that teachers have a concrete timeline as well as the resources to provide quality instruction on the

mandated curriculum.

Employing frequent monitoring will allow us to adjust the instructional focus for remediation, remediating deficiencies before they become substantial. In addition, we will be able individualize instruction to best meet the needs of our students, thus increasing student achievement. We strategically plan for a variety of monitoring techniques:

- Review of Lesson Plans,
- Data Analysis,
- Classroom walks,
- Student attendance,
- Data Chats,
- Formal Observations,
- Professional Learning Communities attendance/participation,
- Formative/Summative Assessments and Technology.

Demographic Data

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

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) Primary Service Type (per MSID File) R-12 General Education (per MSID File) R-12 General Education No 2022-23 Title I School Status 2022-23 Minority Rate Charter School RAISE School RAISE School PWA Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BHK) Hispanic Students (MUL) White Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) School Grades History *2022-23 school Improvement Rating History DJJ Accountability Rating History Elementary School PK-5 Elementary School PK-5 Elementary School PK-5 K-12 General Education PK-5 No Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (HSN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) 2017-12: A 2017-18: A	2023-24 Status	
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) Primary Service Type (per MSID File) 2022-23 Title I School Status No 2022-23 Minority Rate Charter School RAISE School RAISE School *updated as of 3/11/2024 Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. School Improvement Rating History Elementary School PK-5 K-12 General Education No K-12 General Education No Students No Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) 2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A		Active
(per MSID File) Primary Service Type (per MSID File) 2022-23 Title I School Status No 2022-23 Minority Rate 61% 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate 66% Charter School RAISE School ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 Fligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. School Improvement Rating History K-12 General Education K-12 General Education No K-12 General Education No Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) 2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2017-18: A	u ,	Flementary School
Primary Service Type (per MSID File) 2022-23 Title I School Status 2022-23 Minority Rate 2022-23 Minority Rate Charter School RAISE School ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. RK-12 General Education No K-12 General Education No K-12 General Education No Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) 2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2017-18: A		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
(per MSID File) 2022-23 Title I School Status No 2022-23 Minority Rate Charter School RAISE School RAISE School *updated as of 3/11/2024 Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) School Grades History *2022-23 School grades will serve as an informational baseline. R-12 General Education No R-18 General Education No 61% 61% 62% 62% 64% 66% No No Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) 2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A	,	F IX-5
2022-23 Title I School Status 2022-23 Minority Rate 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate Charter School RAISE School *updated as of 3/11/2024 Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. School Improvement Rating History	, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Minority Rate 61% 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate 66% Charter School No RAISE School No ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 N/A Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) No Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) *2021-22 A School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. School Improvement Rating History	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	No
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate Charter School RAISE School RAISE School *updated as of 3/11/2024 Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with a sterisk) School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. School Improvement Rating History No Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) 2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A		_
Charter School RAISE School ROISESA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with a sterisk) School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. School Improvement Rating History	·	
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 RIgible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) No Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) 2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A		No
*updated as of 3/11/2024 Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. School Improvement Rating History No Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) 2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A	RAISE School	No
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) No Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) 2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A	ESSA Identification	
Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) *2022-23 school grades Will serve as an informational baseline. School Improvement Rating History Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) 2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A	*updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) *2022-23 school grades Will serve as an informational baseline. School Improvement Rating History Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) 2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A		
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) 2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A	Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	1.75
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. School Improvement Rating History 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A	(subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an	English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A
DJJ Accountability 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:

Indiantos		Grade Level											
Indicator			2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total			
Absent 10% or more days	0	27	28	30	24	22	0	0	0	131			
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	1	2	3	0	0	0	11			
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	18	29	28	31	12	0	0	0	118			
Course failure in Math	0	14	11	24	41	11	0	0	0	101			
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	27	23	0	0	0	50			
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	28	0	0	0	43			
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	7	6	10	0	0	0	0	27			

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										
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total		
Students with two or more indicators	0	15	18	27	38	29	0	0	0	127		

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

Indicator	Grade Level										
Indicator		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	2	3	4	7	0	0	0	17	
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:

lu dinatan		Grade Level											
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total			
Absent 10% or more days	15	16	12	17	24	17	0	0	0	101			
One or more suspensions	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5			
Course failure in ELA	21	65	42	40	34	47	0	0	0	249			
Course failure in Math	11	19	24	44	34	35	0	0	0	167			
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	13	16	0	0	0	41			
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	21	16	22	0	0	0	59			
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	19	27	11	3	0	0	0	68			

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

Indicator		Grade Level								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Students with two or more indicators	14	25	24	36	30	39	0	0	0	168

The number of students identified retained:

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

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
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	29	28	30	28	20	16	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	2	3	1	1	5	3	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	19	35	31	35	11	18	0	0	0	149
Course failure in Math	15	16	24	48	10	25	0	0	0	138
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	25	25	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	29	24	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	16	24	24	44	31	36	0	0	0	175

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

Indicator		Grade Level								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Students with two or more indicators	16	24	27	44	31	36	0	0	0	178

The number of students identified retained:

In diagram	Grade Level									
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	3	6	8	5	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	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.

A constability Commonweat		2023		2022		2021				
Accountability Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	
ELA Achievement*	59	53	53	73	59	56	70			
ELA Learning Gains				75			52			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			40			
Math Achievement*	64	57	59	73	53	50	70			
Math Learning Gains				61			37			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			17			
Science Achievement*	62	54	54	66	59	59	52			
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64				
Middle School Acceleration					54	52				
Graduation Rate					47	50				
College and Career Acceleration						80				
ELP Progress	45	56	59	55			44			

^{*} 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)	N/A							
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58							
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No							
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2							
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	288							
Total Components for the Federal Index	5							

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	509
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

		2022-23 ES	SA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMA	RY
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	27	Yes	1	1
ELL	27	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	46			
HSP	57			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	48			

		2021-22 ES	SA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMAF	RY
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	41			
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	58			
HSP	64			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	56			

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)

			2022-2	3 ACCOU	NTABILIT	Y COMPO	NENTS BY	SUBGRO	UPS			
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	59			64			62					45
SWD	28			34			14				5	25
ELL	17			33							4	45
AMI												
ASN	86			93							2	
BLK	51			53			41				4	
HSP	57			63			71				5	45
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	64			69			68				4	
FRL	47			49			49				5	52

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	73	75	65	73	61	41	66					55
SWD	31	55	50	40	42	33	33					
ELL	48	69		33	46							55
AMI												
ASN	87	71		93	79							
BLK	66	66	62	65	59	42	46					
HSP	79	82	77	72	57	33	66					42
MUL	64	45		71	36							
PAC												
WHT	72	82	72	77	67	47	73					
FRL	64	71	61	60	52	38	55					47

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	70	52	40	70	37	17	52					44
SWD	39	35	43	47	31	15	39					
ELL	44			38								44
AMI												
ASN	91			95								
BLK	52	26		55	21		38					
HSP	70	49	31	64	24	15	31					42
MUL	76			63								
PAC												
WHT	77	62		82	49		67					
FRL	58	45	42	58	26	20	38					46

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	59%	56%	3%	54%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	58%	8%	58%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	48%	8%	50%	6%

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	54%	46%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	74%	57%	17%	59%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	52%	3%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	59%	56%	3%	55%	4%

			SCIENCE			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	58%	51%	7%	51%	7%

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.

ELA Math

Grade 3: 56.4% 73.7% Grade 4: 65.6% 55.4% Grade 5: 59.1% 59.2% Grade 6: N/A 100% SWD All: 23.4% 31.3% ELL All:14.7% 23.5% FRL All: 49% 51.9%

When looking over the data, it appears that third-grade students are facing challenges in English Language Arts (ELA) compared to other grades. Although H.L. Johnson stakeholders feel as though they should be better in every grade due to the comparison of FSA decrease across grade-levels. Additionally, data indicates that English Language Learner (ELL) students have the lowest proficiency levels, followed by Students with Disabilities (SWD).

The district's implementation of new standards and curriculum has not effectively provided proper instruction for proficient students, which has contributed to this issue. Specifically, third-graders struggle with comprehending various reading genres and poetry, as well as adjusting to computer-based testing, introduced for the first time. Unfortunately, due to some vacancies, our students' learning was further impacted. Furthermore, there were many new teachers in these grades, so we need to establish stronger coaching and mentoring programs to support and develop these new educators. We plan to work closely with the district's ESE and Multicultural department to ensure our teachers receive the necessary support to promote student growth and achievement. Lastly, we will ensure that Professional Learning Communities focus and align on the review of data and best practices. By prioritizing standards-based instruction in PLCs, we can ensure that each student receives rigorous instruction and small group support to meet their needs. During their collaborative planning, ELA teachers will engage in a standards-based instruction cycle, which includes planning, teaching, assessing, and revising instruction. Teachers will analyze standards and test item specifications during the planning process.

Additional support is needed in all content areas, as indicated by our data trends. Math, ELA, reading, and science will focus on remediation of standards, foundational skills, and scaffolding instruction using research-based strategies. We will specifically focus on our ESSA-identified subgroups - ELL and SWD students - who will receive strategic, targeted support through various modes of instruction, including technology, small groups, tutorials, data chats, and student monitoring.

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

It's important to note that the math scores for 4th-grade students have decreased by 24 points compared to the previous year's FSA results. The students faced difficulties in number sense, operations, fractions, decimals, and geometric reasoning. Despite the district providing a math curriculum and manipulatives, no professional development was provided to teachers before implementing the curriculum. The district strictly followed its curriculum, without considering any input from experienced teachers to improve it. HLJ abided by the district's guidelines accordingly. Additionally, new standards were introduced in grades 3-5 last year, which caused significant learning gaps.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

At H.L. Johnson Elementary School, we are proud to announce remarkable results in Grades 3-5, where we outscored the state in ELA, Math, and Science. However, we are continuously striving to improve our instructional methods to ensure a year's worth of growth and provide a more individualized approach to instruction. We are pleased to share that we maintained our 100% passing rate in AMP (6th Grade), which is a great accomplishment. We also saw improvements in AMP5 and third-grade mathematics. However, we experienced a decrease in all other areas due to the new standards and adherence to the purchased curriculum's scope and sequence as well as activities and tasks that did not provide the rigor and differentiation our students at HLJ need. To address this, we plan to enrich our students with tasks that correlate with the benchmark being taught.

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

HLJ made a focused effort to address gaps by offering do-now activities in areas where we noticed weaknesses. As a result, we saw improvements in 3rd grade Math and AMP5 at H.L. Johnson. Our goal is to implement this strategy in all areas of instruction to ensure that every student receives the necessary support.

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

H.L. Johnson has over twenty students in each grade from 1-5 with less than 90% attendance, which is a total of 130 students. Consistent attendance in elementary school has a strong correlation with grade-level performance. Regular attendance also helps to create a sense of community within the classroom and has a positive impact on academic success. By attending school regularly, students gain valuable background knowledge from discussions and develop important social skills through interactions with their peers. Additionally, higher attendance rates increase a child's chances of academic success, as well as their chances of obtaining a high school diploma and a college degree, which can lead to higher pay in their future careers.

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

At H.L. Johnson Elementary, there are five main priorities in place to ensure student success. These include distributed responsibilities among campus leaders, weekly monitoring metrics, implementation of sustainable systems with documented processes, classroom walkthroughs and feedback, and continuous improvement through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). The school works towards ensuring each student achieves a year's worth of growth in ELA and Mathematics through individualized instruction, and uses adaptive technology to cater to each student's unique learning needs.

PLC leaders and team leaders work together to facilitate subject-area planning with all ELA, Math and Science teachers during their common planning period on Mondays, and an additional day of the week of their choosing to focus on improving target/task alignment. The school aims to improve attendance and early intervention for those who need it, and PLCs plan tasks and activities that align with the depth of the benchmark being taught.

The school has sustainable systems, including weekly calendars, PLC agendas, sample student work products, instructions related to classroom walkthroughs, target/task alignment data based on PLCs and classroom walks, scoreboards, and sharing student data. The data collected is used to inform next steps in the PLC process.

Classroom walkthroughs and feedback are also an essential part of the process. The leadership team uses a targeted classroom walkthrough tool to measure target/task alignment. Each team demonstrates target/task alignment and has school goals, class goals, and individual student goals to work toward and scoreboards to help with monitoring towards those goals. The OILT meets weekly for continuous improvement, gathering around scoreboards and action boards. The focus is on specific actions and outcomes from the classroom that will lead to meeting the definition of done by the end of the week.

It is worth noting that H.L. Johnson Elementary also offers a Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Program, which is designed to enhance student readiness before entering Kindergarten. In addition, for students aged 3 to 5 who are eligible for exceptional student education as per their Individual Education Plan (IEP), the school provides enrichment hours and a PreK self-contained program. These programs are fully supported by the Department of Early Childhood Education and the Department of Exceptional Student Education and comply with all Florida statutes, rules, and contractual mandates.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

The goal is to increase ELA and Math proficiency by concentrating on attendance initiatives to help cultivate a school-wide culture of attendance:

HLJ began outreach to families before the school year

We leverage existing activities to communicate the importance of good attendance and offer support. We nurture school-wide system of attendance incentives such as Attendance Awareness Month by recognizing families, not just students. Offer incentives (e.g., gas cards, grocery cards, food baskets) that help to address common barriers to getting to school. Build in recognition for teachers and staff who successfully motivate students to show up and engage families. Have initiatives for staff who also have great attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Decrease attendance by students across grade levels to ensure attendance is above 90% for the entire school year.

Monitoring:

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

Each month, we monitor student attendance. We give rewards and address any attendance as it surfaces on an individual basis. The Attendance Team will evaluate the accuracy of attendance data, including absences, tardies, and early departures from class/school, as well as the accuracy of the school's data collection systems. Using available data, the team will analyze year-long data as appropriate for us to identify patterns. Absences, tardies, and early departures from class will be analyzed by type including excused and unexcused, month, day of the week, grade level, and course or subject in order to determine which students are more likely to miss class and when. The team will analyze year-long data to identify students who had chronic absenteeism the previous year, as well as students at risk of chronic absenteeism. Chronic absenteeism is defined as missing 10% or more of a school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Crystal Amado Kurcharski (crystal.amadokucharski@palmbeachschools.org)

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.)

Establishing a contact person for parents to work with is a research-based strategy for early intervention in HLJ. The homeroom teacher is responsible for supporting the student's attendance and academic progress. As a homeroom teacher, you take attendance every day and are the first to know about a student's attendance. You also communicate with the child's family regarding attendance. To create and revise the school's attendance intervention system, an Attendance Team consisting of diverse stakeholders is responsible. The team will collaborate on various elements, review data regularly to assess the effectiveness of interventions, and focus resources on developing additional interventions as needed. It's crucial to ensure the Attendance Team has access to information about best practices and evidence-based interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Attendance directly affects student achievement and students receiving individualized instruction.

In addition, as stipulated within Florida Statute & Policy 2.09 and in alignment to the District's Strategic plan our school ensures all students receive equal access to the pillars of Effective Instruction: Students immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42.

Continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 Instruction applicable to appropriate grade levels including but not limited to:

- (g) History of Holocaust
- (h) History of Africans and African Americans
- (i) History of Asian Americans & Pacific Islanders
- (o) Health Education, Life Skills & Social Media
- (q) Hispanic Contributions
- (r) Women's Contributions
- (t) Civic & Character Education
- (u) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The teacher will reach out after each absence and inform Dr. Amado before the monthly report. Parents will receive monthly communication regarding attendance.

Person Responsible: Crystal Amado Kurcharski (crystal.amadokucharski@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Monthly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

From FY23 PM3 to FY24 PM3, the ELA proficiency of third-grade students at H.L. Johnson Elementary will increase by 5%, as this was the lowest proficiency group and content area.

Measurable Outcome:

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

3rd Grade students will increase by 5% in PM3 from the FY24 PM3 specifically from 56% proficiency to 61% proficiency. In the information provided this year, 3rd grade students will go up from FY24 PM1 ELA from 55.7% to 61.7% on PM3.

Monitoring:

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

In third grade, various tools and approaches are used to ensure continuous improvement in our classrooms. Weekly metrics, classroom walks and feedback, PLCs, and subject-area planning facilitated by the team and PLC leaders are some of the tools we use. During these meetings, we focus on improving target/task alignment and making data-driven decisions to serve our students better.

iReady is utilized to cater to the unique learning needs of each student. Our leadership team monitors the taxonomy level of the lesson learning target and the student work being produced to ensure alignment.

To work towards our end-of-year goals, we set both class and individual student goals, and we use scoreboards to track our progress. We base our target/task alignment data on PLCs and classroom walks, and we use scoreboards to share student data, which we then use to inform our next steps in the PLC process for continuous improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Crystal Amado Kurcharski (crystal.amadokucharski@palmbeachschools.org)

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.)

To ensure effective teaching and learning, focusing on evidence-based strategies. Starting each lesson with a brief review of the previous topic. Introduce new concepts in small, manageable chunks and offer support as

students practice. Ask open-ended questions to encourage you to make connections with what you have learned previously. Use models or demonstrations to clarify complex concepts, and provide constructive feedback while guiding you through your practice exercises. Verify that you have understood the material by using assessment techniques that can help reduce errors. Adopt teaching strategies that follow mastery learning techniques, which emphasize small steps and high success rates of around 80%. Use scaffolding techniques to provide temporary support for challenging material. Prepare yourself for independent practice and monitor your progress to ensure that you have grasped the new concepts. Regularly scheduled weekly and monthly reviews of past material to keep you engaged and to reinforce your knowledge.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Effective evidence-based practices are vital for supporting student achievement and closing achievement gaps.

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.

Classroom Walks and Feedback

Person Responsible: Crystal Amado Kurcharski (crystal.amadokucharski@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: At most minimum monthly and at most weekly targeted walks.

Facilitate PLCs and notes - During these meetings, we focus on improving target/task alignment and making data-driven decisions to serve our students better.

Person Responsible: Stacy Conner (stacy.conner@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Weekly

ELA planning - During these meetings, we focus on improving target/task alignment and making datadriven decisions to serve our students better.

Person Responsible: Tracey Silver (tracey.silver@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Weekly

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).

As part of the SDPBC school requirements, all schools must complete a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) that aligns with the district's 5-Year Strategic Plan in the Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS) portal. These sessions will ensure that the SIP and Strategic Plan are in sync, provide a summary of the School Board's requirements, and update schools on improvement efforts. Principals must attend the training and can choose members of their SIP leadership teams to attend with them.

Collaboration between the District and the school leadership team, Regional Superintendent's Office, Performance Accountability/School Improvement, School Transformation, and Federal/State Programs ensures that the SIP, the Schoolwide Title I Plan, and other grant-funded plans or allocations align with the District's Five-Year Strategic Plan and complement the funded strategies and support for each school's continuous improvement. All plans are reviewed and approved by the School Advisory Council (SAC), the Regional Office team, and the Office of School Improvement.

Ongoing professional development opportunities, with the support of resource teachers (ESOL and ESE), teachers and support staff, ensure deep, focused, collaborative planning that supports and strengthens data analysis and small group planning and implementation. Professional Learning Community (PLC)/Professional Development will ensure teachers collaborate to focus on best practices and methodologies.

The Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework ensures that students receive the specific instruction,

resources, time, and intensity needed for success. The Regional and Instructional Superintendents monitor the implementation of strategies, and the District Reading Collaboration team provides professional development.

Curriculum resources are available to enhance ELA, Science, Civics, and Math skills and support student mastery of the Florida B.E.S.T. standards, as well as to support literacy across the content areas and social-emotional growth through the resources found in the Skills for Learning & Life (SLL) Resource Center to promote character education.

Partnerships with multiple community and business organizations provide additional high-quality resources and services to students and families, focusing comprehensively on health and wellness, as well as academic achievement.