Oak Park School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Oak Park School

7285 HAND RD, Sarasota, FL 34241

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/oakpark

Demographics

Principal: Jamie Lowicz

Start Date for this Principal: 8/3/2017

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
2019-20 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
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

Oak Park School

7285 HAND RD, Sarasota, FL 34241

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/oakpark

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 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 is 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 expertise teaching strategies, and engaging in relevant professional development and leadership opportunities.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lowicz, Jamie	Principal	
Marsh, Mark	Teacher, ESE	
McNair, Denise	School Counselor	
Perry, Monica	Attendance/Social Work	
Coughlan, Joanne	Administrative Support	
Swezey, Shane	Teacher, ESE	
Meo, Nicole	Assistant Principal	
Hilliard, Susan	Teacher, ESE	
Pastore, Helen	Teacher, ESE	
Adams, Bobbi	Teacher, ESE	
Regan, Heather	Teacher, ESE	
Ruscoe, Serenity	Teacher, ESE	
Flee, Brandie	Instructional Coach	
Rawley, Jayson	Teacher, ESE	
Leinweber, Joshua	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 8/3/2017, Jamie Lowicz

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
2019-20 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
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.

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	4	9	20	16	29	12	20	21	18	17	13	14	82	275
Attendance below 90 percent	3	0	12	10	12	5	7	11	4	3	0	2	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	1	7	10	14	5	9	10	3	6	0	2	3	70
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	8	3	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	10	3	0	0	0	0	23

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	5	10	14	6	8	14	4	4	0	1	14	81

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/5/2020

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	
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

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	
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

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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						
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%
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
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%	0
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%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	38
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	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 White under-performing subgroup has demonstrated the lowest performance. While there were no scores for the 2019-2020 school year, the White subgroup did show a significant 14% improvement from the 2017-18 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 Students with Disabilities and Students without Disabilities has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. One factor that contributes to this gap is the state of mental health (social-emotional well being) of students with varying exceptionalities.

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

The Students with Disabilities subgroup has shown the most improvement, with a 14% increase from the prior year. With an emphasis on high expertise teaching, we anticipate this trend to continue upward.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

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

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 Under-performing Subgroups
4. Staff Retention
5. Remote Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With a continued emphasis on high expectations and the belief that all students can learn, staff will continue to grow and hone skills in the the area of Diversity and Relationship Building as it relates to Students with Disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	At the conclusion of the 2021 school year, faculty will have learned, practiced, modeled and exemplified the tenets of addressing the needs of Students with Disabilities and Relationship Building so that all students can demonstrate and/or articulate that they feel authentically known and valued by their administrators, teachers and para-educators.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jamie Lowicz (jamie.lowicz@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Staff will continue to utilize the "High Expertise Teaching" tile available through the MySCS portal and focus on Saphier's work in this area through lesson study, collaborative planning, and PBIS. Artifacts, books, social stories, and curriculum will connect us to our students' needs, and commonalities and diverse backgrounds.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	High expertise teachers and staff make students feel known and valued. Thus we know about our students' life and the diversity of their needs and show interest in their activities and success. The unrelenting tenacity and high expectations of staff with low performing students also becomes evidence to the student that the staff thinks they are worthwhile.

Action Steps to Implement

Offer opportunities for professional development relating to the diversity of Students with Disabilities and Relationship Building throughout the school year.

Person Responsible	Jamie Lowicz (jamie.lowicz@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Encourage teachers to have collegial conversations during PLCs to evaluate the effectiveness of relationship building and the implementation of strategies that address the diverse needs of Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible	Jamie Lowicz (jamie.lowicz@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Coach teachers in creating and implementing high impact strategies that can be evidenced in lesson plans, PLC minutes, classroom walk throughs and observations.

Person Responsible	Jamie Lowicz (jamie.lowicz@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Proactive and instructive responses to problem behavior are more likely to lead to improved student outcomes than exclusionary practices such as referrals or suspensions. School wide expectations (ROAR) are a brief, memorable set of positively stated expectations that create a school culture that is clear, positive, consistent, and focused on teaching social and emotional competencies.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020-2021 school year, we will increase the use of restorative strategies by 50%, and reduce the number of In-School Suspensions to 0% through the use of our restorative classroom.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joshua Leinweber (joshua.leinweber@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teams and staff review existing discipline practices to ensure inclusionary practices are used whenever possible and that exclusionary practices are used with discretion for safety purposes only, and always with an instructional component.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We employ and support an instructional approach to discipline that emphasizes teaching pro-social skills rather than using exclusionary discipline and zero tolerance practices. We will continue to examine disciplinary practices for disparate impact and from a power versus purpose perspective (i.e. practices that reflect the preferences of staff versus those with a clear purpose based on educational outcomes).

Action Steps to Implement

Actively seek input from families and the community on discipline strategies and align procedures with community expectations.

Person Responsible	Joshua Leinweber (joshua.leinweber@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Create procedures for staff to respond to behaviors by reteaching the skill with a focus on restoring relationships.

Person Responsible	Shane Swezey (shane.swezey@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Provide staff with explicit training and practice in de-escalation techniques (CPI) create professional development opportunities based on system and student outcome data.

Person Responsible	Mark Marsh (mark.marsh@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Learning gains for ESSA subgroup specifically relating to students with disabilities. 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 groups.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021 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 iReady, 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 and the grant funded Reflex Math program or through the classroom teacher providing additional individually designed activities to support growth in deficit areas. 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 Steps to Implement

FSA Instructional Coach will meet with Teacher PLC groups monthly to review (progress monitor) iReady data and assist in disaggregating the data by skill area.

Person Responsible	Brandie Flee (brandie.flee@sarasotacountyschools.net)

FSAA Instructional Coach will meet with Teacher PLC groups monthly to review (progress monitor) Teachtown data and assist in disaggregating the data by skill area.

Person Responsible	Nicole Meo (nicole.meo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Students who have been retained will be referred to the MTSS Team to develop an individualized instructional plan.

Person Responsible	Nicole Meo (nicole.meo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Classroom Teachers or Instructional Coach will provide 30-45 minutes of additional Reading instruction for students needing remediation.

Person Responsible	Brandie Flee (brandie.flee@sarasotacountyschools.net)

COT Teacher will work in conjunction with the classroom teachers to implement the Reflex Math program.

Person Responsible   Helen Pastore (helen.pastore@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

One or More Suspensions - utilize the Restorative Classroom in lieu of ISS and OSS Attendance Below 90% - identify at-risk or disengaged learners, and create additional opportunities for participation outside the traditional school day.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

1. Incorporate real life experiences or values of students into expectation lessons.
2. Examine rules for reflection of values that may need explicit teaching, and if found, define the necessity of that skill and a plan for explicitly teaching it to all students.
3. Provide opportunities for students to articulate their expectations at home and to discuss similarities and differences.
4. Seek feedback on lesson plans from school staff, students, families, and community members.
5. Include family and community members as teachers of behavior expectations.
6. Provide materials for families so that they can define and teach behavior expectations at home in ways that fit their needs.
7. Engage in frequent two-way positive communication with families regarding classroom procedures and student progress in multiple languages and modes of delivery.
8. Actively plan and deliver a range of school-wide activities.
9. Acknowledge students, staff, and families for their participation in the PBIS program.
10. Collect and use feedback to gauge perceptions of and suggestions for morale, wellness, and leadership, accessibility.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00