Oak Grove Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Oak Grove Elementary School

6315 N ARMENIA AVE, Tampa, FL 33604

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jerry Franchino

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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 Hillsborough 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 Grove Elementary School

6315 N ARMENIA AVE, Tampa, FL 33604

[no web address on file]

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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	93%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	82%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

In order to achieve our vision, we will work to nurture a caring environment, motivating staff and students to work as a community always in the pursuit of excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

For all students to excel to their highest potential in their pursuit of excellence.

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
Wilkins, Pamela	Principal	Leadership team meetings can include the following: Principal Assistant Principal / ELP Coordinator Guidance Counselor SAC Chairs School Psychologist/ Behavior team Representative School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis) ESE teachers PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area District support (including Area Superintendents, Support Specialist, District Coaches) The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs. Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader. Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County. HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other schooling factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district's vision of instructional improvement. Several Teacher Interview Days and Recruitment Fairs occur throughout the summer months, under the oversight of Human Resources. All applicants must be pre-approved by the District to attend these events. Certified teachers with an

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities

Effective or Highly Effective performance evaluation, teaching in field, at our highest needs schools are eligible for salary differential. This program was established with the purpose of helping to create stability and equity in harder to staff schools, recruiting and retaining highly qualified instructional staff, increasing student achievement, and promoting a culture of ongoing professional development.

Compensation is grounded in a performance-based salary structure that explicitly ties salary increases to sustained high-level performance, while career ladder positions, such as Instructional Mentors, are available to effective educators. The base teacher salary schedule is designed to provide substantial increases in compensation to teachers who have demonstrated positive student impact.

Once hired, teacher induction and teacher retention are supported through fully-released instructional mentors assigned to every new educator for up to two years to increase effectiveness and decrease recidivism. Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers' transfer options and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD opportunities to HR functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in response to areas of need identified by educator evaluations. Training course completions can also be tracked by HR Partners to inform human capital decisions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Jerry Franchino

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.*

4

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

66

Demographic Data

2020-21 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

2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	135	112	97	119	111	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	691
Attendance below 90 percent	26	32	18	27	19	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	12	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	116	105	126	130	116	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	727
Attendance below 90 percent	0	28	20	17	17	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	15	32	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	0	4	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	116	105	126	130	116	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	727
Attendance below 90 percent	0	28	20	17	17	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	15	32	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	2	0	4	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	47%	52%	57%	45%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	58%	46%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	50%	53%	48%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	54%	63%	55%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	57%	62%	59%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	46%	51%	53%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	50%	53%	36%	48%	51%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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	41%	52%	-11%	58%	-17%
	2018	45%	53%	-8%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	55%	-9%	58%	-12%
	2018	40%	55%	-15%	56%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	40%	54%	-14%	56%	-16%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	54%	2%	62%	-6%
	2018	56%	55%	1%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	57%	6%	64%	-1%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	34%	51%	-17%	53%	-19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	48%	52%	-4%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	33	50	44	49	56	46	17				
ELL	40	55	57	59	62	58	28				
BLK	36	43	33	42	46	42	20				
HSP	46	54	57	64	62	55	35				
MUL	27			64							
WHT	69	78		63	60		75				
FRL	46	54	50	60	58	52	35				
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
SWD	20	46	55	43	60	63	20				
ELL	40	55	64	56	72	70	39				
BLK	33	67	70	60	71		47				
HSP	48	58	70	62	69	66	53				
MUL	50			60							
WHT	64	46		71	70		80				
FRL	47	57	66	63	70	65	55				
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
SWD	20	30	35	30	47	40	19				
ELL	41	44	51	52	63	51	21				
BLK	33	41		45	48		27				
HSP	45	47	52	54	60	51	28				
MUL	38			77							
WHT	63	48		69	67		79				
FRL	43	46	48	54	60	51	36				

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	424
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	37
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	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	71
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	51
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 component with the lowest performance was science at 38%. A contributing factor to that would explain the low performance was that those students entered 5th grade with only 40% of the students proficient in reading

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

The area with the greatest decline from prior year was science. Students were also low in reading, and the reading achievement for that grade level also had a decline.

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 area with the biggest gap when compared o the state average was also science.

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

All areas showed a slight decline but ELA Achievement and Math Achievement had the least decline.

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

Black/African American Students did not make the 41% goal for the this school year.

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

1. Increase science achievement.
2. Increase achievement and gains for our Black/African American students.
3. Increase Lowest Quartile ELA gains.
4. Increase Lowest Quartile Math gains
5. Increase learning gains of our Students with Disabilities.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reading data had an impact on Science Achievement this school year. Lowest quartile ELA and Math Gains also dropped more than other areas. Also our African American Students struggled to make gains and be proficient. Differentiating instruction will make sure all students needs are met,therefore increasing student learning gains and achievement. Science and ELA teachers working together to incorporate science into the reading instruction will increase Science Achievement. Teachers will be aware of the African American students in their classrooms and closely monitor their growth and progress and differentiate instruction to meet their needs.
Measurable Outcome:	The targeted areas of Science Achievement, ELA Lowest Quartile , and Math Lowest Quartile will increase by 10% this school year. African American American proficiency will increase by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Pamela Wilkins (pamela.wilkins@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Content area resource teachers will plan with teachers to help incorporate evidence-based teaching strategies and differentiation using various resources with technology and other supplemental resources throughout their lessons based on student data. Professional development will be provided to teachers based on current best practices and evidence-based strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies will promote professional growth and help implement best practices in instruction to support all our learners in face to face learning and/or elearning formats.

Action Steps to Implement

1.Content area and RtI resource teachers will work with teachers with individual coaching, professional development, and planning sessions to assist in developing differentiated instruction that is data driven using supplemental and technology based instruction where appropriate for meeting the needs of our learners.
2. Data chats and plc meetings will be held regularly to analyze student data and plan to use that data to drive their instruction.
3. Teachers and PSLT will work to monitor data and student response to intervention, and move students through the MTSS process.
4. Teachers will use evidence based, differentiated teaching materials, technology and paper based resources, and strategies to reach all learners.
5. Teachers will utilize district approved technology resources to help differentiated instruction (Myon, Iready, Teacher Toolbox, Fastt math, code.org, as well as technology based resources embedded in currently adopted curriculum.)

Person Responsible	Pamela Wilkins (pamela.wilkins@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will continue to grow and implement our School wide PBIS program to keep students motivated and making positive choices that will have a positive impact on their learning in all academic areas.

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.

Oak Grove Elementary communicates with parents in both English and Spanish. We encourage parents, community members, volunteers to help at our school. Students from neighboring High Schools tutor and mentor our students throughout the year. The organization Seniors in Service works daily with our primary classrooms and partner with Zoo Tampa. We encourage our parents to be an active part of our school and their child's education. We hold several family events throughout the school year to help our parents and community be involved.

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: Differentiation	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00