

Orange County Public Schools

John Young Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

John Young Elementary

12550 MARSFIELD AVE, Orlando, FL 32837

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

Demographics

Principal: Lino Rodriguez

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

John Young Elementary

12550 MARSFIELD AVE, Orlando, FL 32837

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

Elementary School
PK-5

2018-19 Title I School

Yes

2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

73%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

81%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

2018-19
A

2017-18
B

2016-17
A

2015-16
A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and

using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

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

Provide the school's vision statement

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rodriguez, Lino	Principal	
Speights, Tyisha	Assistant Principal	
McCall, Katie	Guidance Counselor	
Brown, Bevan	Instructional Coach	
Garris, Robert	Dean	
Ryerson, Felicia	Instructional Coach	
Hill, Tara	Instructional Coach	
Ellis, Jessica	Instructional Coach	
Geenen, Mary	Instructional Coach	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	70	91	103	152	106	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	646
Attendance below 90 percent	2	9	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	3	7	13	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	4	7	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	48	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	1	16	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

46

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/2/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	20	18	10	17	24	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	1	5	8	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	16	8	19	22	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	32	46	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	20	18	10	17	24	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	1	5	8	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	16	8	19	22	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	32	46	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	57%	57%	57%	58%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	58%	58%	59%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	52%	53%	50%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	71%	63%	63%	69%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	72%	61%	62%	56%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	48%	51%	48%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	54%	56%	53%	64%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	70 (0)	91 (0)	103 (0)	152 (0)	106 (0)	124 (0)	646 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 (20)	9 (18)	7 (10)	13 (17)	0 (24)	0 (7)	31 (96)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	3 (1)	7 (5)	13 (8)	6 (1)	11 (3)	40 (18)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (8)	8 (16)	4 (8)	7 (19)	14 (22)	4 (13)	37 (86)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	18 (32)	48 (46)	36 (24)	102 (102)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	57%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	57%	-7%	58%	-8%
	2018	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
	2018	63%	55%	8%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	62%	11%	62%	11%
	2018	66%	61%	5%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	63%	17%	64%	16%
	2018	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	56%	57%	-1%	60%	-4%
	2018	67%	59%	8%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	53%	-2%
	2018	63%	53%	10%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	24	36	37	38	56	67	7				
ELL	52	55	60	65	73	72	43				
ASN	67	58		83	84						
BLK	54	42		63	75		57				
HSP	48	54	61	66	69	68	49				
WHT	71	58		82	78		62				
FRL	51	53	63	67	72	73	50				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	15	35	36	28	51	50	20				
ELL	41	43	43	52	42	38	36				
ASN	77	77		86	77		74				
BLK	70	68		68	61		91				
HSP	49	53	43	63	51	39	64				
WHT	64	61		75	57		43				
FRL	54	55	48	66	54	46	57				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	504
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	70
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	70
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

The data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA Learning Gains. Although the majority of our professional learning opportunities focused on ELA, emphasis was placed on foundational skills and providing targeted intervention to struggling students. While this contributed to gains for our students in the lowest quartile, it may have unintentionally created an imbalance of targeted classroom instruction and support for the remaining students. Over the past three years, the rate of student proficiency has fluctuated.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was fifth grade Science. A factor that contributed to this performance was teacher mobility in the grade level. Due to loss of Title 1 funding and increase in student enrollment, the Science Coach position was obsoleted for a classroom position. The removal of the Science coaching position impacted the amount of professional development that focused on science content. The rate of student proficiency has fluctuated over the past three years.

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

The data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was ELA Learning Gains. As previously stated, the majority of our professional learning opportunities focused on ELA. Emphasis was placed on foundational skills and providing targeted intervention to struggling students. While this contributed to gains for our students in the lowest quartile, it may have unintentionally created an imbalance of targeted classroom instruction and support for the remaining students. Over the past three years, the rate of student proficiency has fluctuated.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the Lowest 25% in Math. This past year, our school has provided intervention groups for math, differentiated support during After School Tutoring and Saturday School for students in grades three through five, and instructional support/coaching. New resources were also provided to support standards based instruction as well as build foundational skills in number sense. Furthermore, funding allowed for additional support positions to assist with small group instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

In reflecting on the EWS data, a potential area of concern is the amount of students that received a Level 1 on FSA ELA and/or Math.

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

1. Maintain safety of Staff and Students
2. Mental Health and Social Emotional competencies
3. ELA proficiency
4. ELA learning gains
5. Science proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	English Language Arts
Rationale	2018-2019 data shows that our lowest performance area was in ELA learning gains.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May of 2020, we expect our ELA proficiency and learning gains to increase by 5 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lino Rodriguez (lino.rodriguez@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students systematically engage in processing content to generate conclusions through collaborative interactions with other students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, learners must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, the students, and the content.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide the opportunity for teachers to attend professional development on collaborative structures 2. Provide opportunities for common planning prior to pre-planning 3. Continue to provide professional development on instructional strategies 4. Continue to incorporate data-driven discussion in order to provide targeted instruction 5. Provide coaching support and specific, actionable feedback based on observations 6. Differentiate professional development accordingly based on ongoing teacher observation 7. Provide various types of resources to meet student instructional needs 8. School-based DPLC team will present learned content (SEL and Writing focus)
Person Responsible	Tyisha Speights (58416@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Science
Rationale	2018-2019 data shows that our area of greatest decline was in Science proficiency.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	By May of 2020, we expect our Science proficiency and learning gains to increase by 5 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lino Rodriguez (lino.rodriguez@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Students systematically engage in processing content to generate conclusions through collaborative interactions with other students.</p> <p>Students generate inferences and elaborate to provide evidence that demonstrates understanding of learned content.</p> <p>In order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, learners must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, the students, and the content. Students must be skilled at generating valid conclusions based on content in order to support future analytical thinking and enhance comprehension.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide the opportunity for teachers to attend professional development on collaborative structures 2. Provide opportunities for common planning prior to pre-planning 3. Continue to provide professional development on instructional strategies 4. Continue to incorporate data-driven discussion in order to provide targeted instruction 5. Provide coaching support and specific, actionable feedback based on observations 6. Differentiate professional development accordingly based on ongoing teacher observation 7. Provide various types of resources to meet student instructional needs 8. Collaborate with UCF to provide job-embedded professional development
Person Responsible	Tyisha Speights (58416@ocps.net)

#3	
Title	Culturally Responsive Plan
Rationale	According to our sub-group data, the Asian and Black sub-groups had the greatest decline in ELA learning gains.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	To close the achievement gap between sub-populations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tyisha Speights (58416@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students interact in small groups and utilize effective conative skills necessary for collaboration to practice and deepen knowledge.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students use of conative skills necessary for understanding and interacting with others allows students to strategically extend learning by enhancing procedural skills and deepening knowledge.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assign an administrative lead to oversee and monitor culturally responsive school plan. 2. Continue to plan/facilitate deliberate conversations in large and small group settings with teachers. 3. Meeting with teams (PLCs, staff meetings, pre/post teacher conferences, new teacher cohort) 4. Dedicate intentional PLC time devoted to sharing and exploring District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) content, with specific focus on the use of close reading strategies and text complexity in order to accelerate vocabulary acquisition and enhance comprehension of our students. 5. Incorporate diverse texts throughout content areas 6. School-wide focus on content area vocabulary 7. Continue to provide Chess for students in grades 3-5
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

n/a

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

n/a

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

n/a

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

n/a

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

n/a

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: English Language Arts	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culturally Responsive Plan	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00