

Sarasota County Schools

Oak Park School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	21
Budget to Support Goals	23

Oak Park School

7285 HAND RD, Sarasota, FL 34241

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/oakpark

Demographics

Principal: Jamie Lowicz

Start Date for this Principal: 8/5/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Sarasota 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	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	21
Budget to Support Goals	23

Oak Park School

7285 HAND RD, Sarasota, FL 34241

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/oakpark

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2011-12
Grade	F

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota 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.

The mission of Oak Park School is to promote student achievement and self advocacy in a safe and supportive environment through academics, therapeutic intervention, and community involvement based on the individual needs of each student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We recognize each student's right to receive high quality instruction to maximize individual potential. This will be accomplished by aligning instruction with academic standards and life skills, using progress monitoring for innovative lesson design and IEP Goal setting, maximizing the impact on learning through the use of high expectations teaching strategies, and engaging in relevant professional development and leadership opportunities.

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
Lowicz, Jamie	Principal	
Marsh, Mark	Teacher, ESE	
Holmes, Stacey	Other	
DeCoursey, Gloria	Teacher, ESE	
McNair, Denise	School Counselor	
Perry, Monica	Attendance/Social Work	
Coughlan, Joanne	Administrative Support	
Swezey, Shane	Teacher, ESE	
Bassett, Maureen	Assistant Principal	
Meo, Nicole	Assistant Principal	
Hilliard, Susan	Teacher, ESE	
Pastore, Helen	Teacher, ESE	
Disler, Jackie	Teacher, ESE	
Robinson, Christine	Teacher, ESE	
Bucholz, Jessica	Teacher, ESE	
Giannini, Elena	Other	
Adams, Bobbi	Teacher, ESE	
Regan, Heather	Teacher, ESE	
Ruscoe, Serenity	Teacher, ESE	
Flee, Brandie	Instructional Coach	
Rawley, Jayson	Teacher, ESE	

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	6	19	15	32	12	24	19	20	27	13	16	18	70	291
Attendance below 90 percent	1	8	7	16	5	10	10	10	8	2	5	3	25	110
One or more suspensions	0	7	7	18	7	10	9	4	9	1	0	2	1	75
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	5	1	8	2	4	3	0	2	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	6	11	6	5	5	0	0	0	0	37

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	2	2	2	12	6	10	9	6	8	0	1	0	0	58

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	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

64

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/4/2019

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	4	10	3	6	9	1	4	5	12	9	1	6	24	94
One or more suspensions	2	8	5	6	3	3	6	6	12	3	2	1	4	61
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	4	3	5	8	7	0	0	0	0	36

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	1	3	0	4	3	3	4	7	9	1	1	0	1	37

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	4	10	3	6	9	1	4	5	12	9	1	6	24	94
One or more suspensions	2	8	5	6	3	3	6	6	12	3	2	1	4	61
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	4	3	5	8	7	0	0	0	0	36

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	1	3	0	4	3	3	4	7	9	1	1	0	1	37

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	0%	67%	61%	0%	69%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	60%	59%	0%	62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	54%	0%	58%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	70%	62%	0%	68%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	65%	59%	0%	64%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	55%	52%	0%	57%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	63%	56%	0%	58%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	88%	78%	0%	85%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	6 (0)	19 (0)	15 (0)	32 (0)	12 (0)	24 (0)	19 (0)	20 (0)	27 (0)	13 (0)	16 (0)	18 (0)	70 (0)	291 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 (4)	8 (10)	7 (3)	16 (6)	5 (9)	10 (1)	10 (4)	10 (5)	8 (12)	2 (9)	5 (1)	3 (6)	25 (24)	110 (94)
One or more suspensions	0 (2)	7 (8)	7 (5)	18 (6)	7 (3)	10 (3)	9 (6)	4 (6)	9 (12)	1 (3)	0 (2)	2 (1)	1 (4)	75 (61)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)	5 (2)	1 (0)	8 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	3 (2)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (2)	0 (0)	27 (7)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (9)	6 (4)	11 (3)	6 (5)	5 (8)	5 (7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	37 (36)

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	25%	70%	-45%	58%	-33%
	2018	20%	68%	-48%	57%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	67%	-67%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	67%	-67%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
05	2019	0%	68%	-68%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	66%	-66%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	63%	-63%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	64%	-64%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	9%	66%	-57%	56%	-47%
	2018	0%	70%	-70%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	20%	73%	-53%	62%	-42%
	2018	10%	72%	-62%	62%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2019	0%	72%	-72%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	71%	-71%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	0%	70%	-70%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	72%	-72%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	67%	-67%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	66%	-66%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	73%	-73%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	73%	-73%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	9%	65%	-56%	46%	-37%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	65%	-65%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	67%	-67%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	10%	62%	-52%	48%	-38%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	42%	85%	-43%	71%	-29%
2018	0%	80%	-80%	71%	-71%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		42%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	26	41	53	25	45	55	27	50		91	
BLK	48	47		41	25						
HSP	36	50		30	40						
WHT	13	35	50	19	49	59	21	40		92	
FRL	29	42	54	31	45	50	34	58		92	
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

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)	TS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	38
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 underperforming subgroup that demonstrated the lowest performance is the White group. While last year's performance fell far below the acceptable Federal Index threshold, the White subgroup improved by 14% from the 2017-2018 school year to the 2018-2019 school year.

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

There were no data components that showed a decline from the prior year.

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 had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Students with Disabilities and Students without Disabilities. One factor that contributes to this gap is the lack of

social/emotional well being (mental health) which is compounded by the students' varying exceptionalities.

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

The under-performing subgroup that showed the most improvement is the Students With Disabilities group. This group improved by 14%, from 27% to 41%.

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

1. Attendance Below 90%
2. One or More Suspensions

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

1. High Expectations Teaching
2. Behavioral Systems Integration
3. Learning Gains for Underperforming Subgroups
4. Staff Recruitment and Retention
5. Climate and Culture

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	High Expectations Teaching
Rationale	With an emphasis on high expectations and the belief that all students can learn, staff will focus on Saphier's "High Expectations Teaching" with an emphasis on the 12 Highly Effective Teaching Strategies.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2020 school year, faculty will become proficient in the understanding and implementation of the 12 Highly Effective Teaching Strategies that our school district values.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jamie Lowicz (jamie.lowicz@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Staff will utilize the newly created tile "High Expertise Teaching" through the MySCS portal on the district website. The priority strategies with HET at Oak Park are: Culturally Responsive Teaching, Literacy & MTSS, Growth Mindset, and Classroom Climate.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This strategy is being employed because of research based impact that it will have on student learning, both in the academic and social-emotional domains. The district has participated in two years of HET training with the expectation that schools will personalize it for their unique student populations.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide copies of the book "High Expectations Teaching" to faculty and offer opportunities for professional development relating to high expectations teaching throughout the year. 2. Encourage teachers to have collegial conversations during Common Planning Time (CPT) to evaluate the effectiveness of attribution retraining. 3. Encourage teachers to identify any of the 12 Highly Effective Teaching Strategies used as evidenced in lesson plans, CPT minutes, or during classroom walk-throughs or observations. 4. Follow up will include monitoring lesson plans and classroom instruction and coaching teachers in the use of these strategies.
Person Responsible	Jamie Lowicz (jamie.lowicz@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2	
Title	Behavioral Systems Integration
Rationale	Many students at Oak Park experience the challenge of emotional dysregulation. Sometimes a result of deficient social & emotional skills, sometimes through trauma. These challenges must be addressed through proactive strategies to increase instructional time and have a positive impact on instruction. These strategies have been incorporated into a comprehensive plan authored by Lewis Weber, BCBA, with input from the Oak Park Leadership Team.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 2019-20 school year, Oak Park will increase the use of restorative strategies by twenty-five percent in lieu of punitive consequences that may result in loss of instructional time. Positive outcomes will include a decrease in the number of days assigned to ISS and OSS by 25%. An additional benefit of this approach will result in improved attendance for Action and Transition students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Maureen Bassett (maureen.bassett@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Conduct monthly discipline data review and analysis for recommendations for PBIS</p> <p>Conduct weekly support staff meetings to discuss students of concerns and supports to be put in place (MTSS)</p> <p>Explore mentoring services for at risk students (Big Brother/Big Sisters)</p> <p>Conduct counseling sessions, restorative circles, etc.</p> <p>Implement school wide PBIS</p> <p>Employ ROAR core values (Respectful, On-Task, Accepting, Responsible)</p> <p>Implement Civility Squad and CHAMPS</p> <p>Repurpose time-out room and outfit area with sensory equipment designed to calm students prior to escalation</p> <p>Issue Quarterly Positive Recognition Referrals (exemplary behavior and academic improvement)</p> <p>ROAR Award (Quarterly Teacher Awards)</p> <p>Refer elementary students to mental health counselor for on-site counseling</p> <p>Refer secondary students to outside agencies for mental health supports</p> <p>CPI Training for verbal and physical de-escalation</p> <p>Professional Development (Kognito, Youth Mental Health First Aid)</p> <p>Student centered Youth Mental Health Training</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	An increase in the use of restorative strategies will increase student's instructional time, therefore positively impacting student learning. Additionally, students will have better ability to self-regulate in emotional situations as a replacement behavior to verbal and/or physical aggression.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitor Discipline Data and discuss at Grade-Level Chair meetings, PBIS meetings, MTSS meetings and Staff Meetings. Discuss and review behavior trends, responses and interventions 2. Utilize District Dashboard data/SIS data (Attendance, Discipline- Suspension, Restorative Strategies) 3. Monitor TPS Data 4. Referrals to on-site Licensed Mental Health Counselor, and outside mental health

agencies

5. Provide Crisis Prevention Intervention (CPI) training to Oak Park Staff
6. Refocus team members and other support staff will provide students time to refocus in order to get the students back to the classroom
7. Professional Development for staff (Kognito, Youth Mental Health First Aid)
8. 1:1 behavioral support provided in classrooms from behavior tech with direction from BCBA
9. Analysis of Refocus Room data.

Person Responsible	Maureen Bassett (maureen.bassett@sarasotacountyschools.net)
-------------------------------	---

#3	
Title	Learning Gains for Underperforming Subgroups
Rationale	The Leadership Team reviewed FSA, FSAA, and categorical data to determine the priority areas of weakness for our under-performing subgroups which include: White, Black and Hispanic subgroups.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2020 school year, 50% of the population of students in the under-performing subgroups will be successful in making learning gains on the FSA and FSAA Reading and Math assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Nicole Meo (nicole.meo@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilize i-Ready, Teachtown, and other data points to monitor students in the under-performing subgroups and provide small group instruction based on skill deficits identified. Students requiring remediation in reading will receive 30-45 minutes of additional ELA instruction daily from the Academic Interventionist or the Classroom Teacher through a strategic MTSS process. Students requiring remediation in math will receive remediation through the Classroom of Tomorrow utilizing STEAM resources and the grant funded Reflex Math program. Data chats between teacher and students, and daily prescriptive intensive individualized instruction will positively impact learning gains. Data chats between students and teachers will contribute to students awareness of their strengths and needs and will allow them to set individual learning goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Due to missed instructional time related to behavioral, cognitive, and social/emotional challenges associated with their disabilities, students have specific deficit areas. By disaggregating the data collected on students by skill, teachers will be able to provide intensive, prescriptive instruction to fill the gaps in student learning. Providing students additional instructional time in the areas of reading and math will afford additional opportunities to instruct students in deficit areas.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional Coach will meet with Teacher PLC groups monthly to review (progress monitor) iReady and Teachtown data and assist in disaggregating the data by skill areas. 2. Students who have been retained will be referred to the MTSS Team to develop an individualized instructional plan. 3. Classroom Teachers or Instructional Coach will provide 30-45 minutes of additional Reading instruction for students needing remediation. 4. COT teacher will work in conjunction with classroom teachers to implement the Reflex Math program. 5. Teachers will conduct regularly scheduled data chats with students to discuss ongoing progress and coach students in setting learning goals.
Person Responsible	Nicole Meo (nicole.meo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#4	
Title	Staff Recruitment and Retention
Rationale	In an effort to increase staffing with high quality employees, Oak Park Administration, in conjunction with Human Resources, will develop recruitment strategies to attract ESE teachers and paraprofessionals to the school.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 2020 school year, 94% of the allocated teaching positions will be filled with ESE and certified content area personnel. In addition, 80% of the allocated classified positions will be filled with highly qualified personnel.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jamie Lowicz (jamie.lowicz@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Oak Park Administration will work with the district provided Talent Acquisition Specialists to recruit highly qualified staff for instructional and classified positions. Oak Park staff will regularly attend recruitment fairs, both in and out of state, in an effort to recruit quality employees.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This is a newly developed strategy intended to support site based efforts in recruiting and retaining highly qualified staff. Effectiveness will be evaluated at the end of the current school year by reviewing position control reports.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Host an on-site annual job fair and offer same day interviews to recruit and hire qualified applicants. 2. Create monthly opportunities for staff to reduce stress in the work environment. 3. Provide ongoing, relevant professional development training, including CPI, to all staff. 4. Assign SSP-7 designations to all paraprofessionals at Oak Park. 5. Institute a Culture and Climate Committee who meets monthly to discuss and implement strategies to maintain a positive school environment.
Person Responsible	Jamie Lowicz (jamie.lowicz@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#5	
Title	Climate and Culture
Rationale	Students learn best when they are in an environment in which they feel safe, supported, challenged, and accepted.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The intention of improving culture and climate at Oak Park School will result in students exhibiting fewer problem behaviors, improve instructional and classified job satisfaction, and decrease staff turnover.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Maureen Bassett (maureen.bassett@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Build a positive school climate in both classrooms and the school as a whole. 2. Shape positive student behaviors through social and emotional learning. 3. Develop productive instructional strategies that support motivation, competence, and self-directed learning. 4. Create individualized supports that address student needs, including the effects of trauma and adversity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The primary goal of K–12 education should be to empower individual students to reach their full potential. Environments that are relationship-rich and attuned to students' learning and developmental needs can buffer students' stress, foster engagement, and support learning. Educators, especially those who serve special needs populations, need the resources and training to address the many challenges to school attachment and engagement and must be able to create responsive, supportive, and inclusive learning environments.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce rates of exclusionary discipline. 2. Provide multi-tiered systems of student support. 3. Invest in educator preparation, including teacher well-being, professional development, & educator diversity.
Person Responsible	Jamie Lowicz (jamie.lowicz@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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, Â§ 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.

Leadership engages parents in actions that promote student achievement and mitigate or eliminate barriers to success. These actions on behalf of the students form a foundation of mutual respect between students, faculty, and parents. Oak Park keeps families informed of their students' progress and successes. Teachers reach out daily through communication logs to parents. The principal utilizes BlackboardConnect to disseminate timely information and reminders to families. The school wide newsletter is distributed four times per year highlighting student celebrations and happenings on campus. Each parent is invited to the student's yearly IEP meeting to review yearly progress. Additionally, we offer parent workshops to assist families with transitional planning, guardianship, deferment, and self advocacy. Parents are invited to attend an interactive workshops for Agencies for Persons with Disabilities and school wide events such as Meet the Teacher, Open House, Donuts with Dads, Fall Festival, SAC Meetings, PTA Meetings, FSAA Parent Information Night, Spring Fling, and Panther Prowl.

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.

Oak Park ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met by collaborating with outside agencies, including but not limited to Severe Emotional Disturbed Network (SEDNET), Coastal Behavioral Health, The Florida Center, Centerstone and Teen Court, so that students may receive counseling. Through other collaborative partnerships, we have agencies who provide services including pet therapy, music therapy, Tidewell grief counseling, and Instride Hippo-therapy. These therapies are provided based on student needs. Additionally, we have student mentoring on campus provided by our neighboring elementary school and Booker, Riverview, and Sarasota High Schools. We are fortunate to have a full time school social worker, guidance counselor, LMHC, and school psychologist. These support professionals provide counseling as a related service in a small group setting and one on one. All teachers provide direct instruction in Social/Emotional skills throughout the curriculum.

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

We support our 8th grade Standard Diploma students by holding transition meetings with the high school liaison, parent, student, and current teacher. At this meeting, students and parents are apprised of student expectations, school supports, and activities. At the elementary level, students who are being considered for transition attend inclusion classes at Lakeview Elementary. This allows for the student and teacher to adjust and strengthen needed skills for a successful transitioning process.

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.

School Leadership identifies and aligns available resources in order to meet the needs of all students and maximizes desired outcomes by providing specific input into the School Improvement Plan. The MTSS (Multi-Tiered System of Support) team is responsible for supporting and coordinating interventions for individual students, once the interventions made by the grade level team are deemed unsuccessful. The MTSS team will define the problem using data, observations and relevant information, analyze and identify the problem revealing barriers and challenges, develop and implement a plan, and

evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies and plan. Often times, the IEP must be amended and re-evaluations are opened to further analyze the problem. The MTSS team is comprised of the Principal, Asst. Principal, Behavior Specialist, School Psychologist, Guidance Counselor, Home-School Liaison, ESE Liaison and therapists. The team will align resources in order to meet the needs of our students. The Guidance Counselor is responsible for documenting meeting notes, interventions, support, services and data. Input for the School Improvement Plan (SIP) structures will be gathered from the academic teams, School Advisory Council (SAC) and Program Specialists in individual areas of instructional need. Each organizational structure will make recommendations to school administration regarding programming and the expenditure of school, district and state funds, when applicable. We participate in the federal nutrition program, as 77% of students receive benefits. Another federal program accessed is IDEA, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 40% of IDEA funds are allocated for support. Structured Work Programming is intended for students who have deferred their diplomas so that they may receive training and supervised job coaching. Funds are allocated from the state to our district for this program and service. ACCESS is a state funded program that provides teacher training and funds substitute coverage to support instruction for our severely cognitive disabled population.

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

Transitioning officially begins at the age of 14 and students' IEPs include plans for their futures. All students are given transition assessments yearly to help them determine interest, strengths and needs. Students as early as kindergarten are learning basic work skills and about jobs in our community. Our high school students are enrolled in career preparation or career experience classes. On campus we have a job training lab (We Work Lab) and many campus wide projects to teach job skills (book bag program, recycling, yarn shop, flier delivery, cafeteria, mosaic classes, horticulture, and dog biscuits). The transition coaches will continue to partner with Honey Baked Ham and Elysium Fields to facilitate real world job activities on campus. Additionally, we have several programs that specifically target off campus job training with students. Our work sites include Home Depot, the Hampton Inn and Burlington Coat Factory. We have seven full time transition coaches onsite and three teachers that work with our students to secure job placements. We have over 20 of our students off campus at job training or placement sites. We collaborate with Suncoast Technical College (STC) to access certification programs and Community Haven that duplicates job skills used in private industries.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: High Expectations Teaching	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Behavioral Systems Integration	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Learning Gains for Underperforming Subgroups	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Staff Recruitment and Retention	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Climate and Culture	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00