

Orange County Public Schools

Oak Hill Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	0

Oak Hill Elementary

11 S HIAWASSEE RD, Orlando, FL 32835

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

Demographics

Principal: Cicely Marks

Start Date for this Principal: 8/11/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 (46%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Oak Hill Elementary

11 S HIAWASSEE RD, Orlando, FL 32835

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Marks, Cicely	Principal	Serves as instructional leader and responsible for the overall performance of the school, teacher evaluations and continual monitoring of the School Improvement Plan with the involvement of the School Advisory Committee.
Weaver-Baker, Terica	School Counselor	Provides support and guidance in meeting the overall needs of students. Conducts MTSS related meetings as needed, for the purposes of intervention, parent communication and student guidance.
Mohamed, Roshan	Reading Coach	The primary responsibility of the Reading Coach is to facilitate the implementation of reading programs, activities and strategies designed to achieve school improvement objectives.
Nye, Michelle	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal monitors the development of lesson plans through common planning & ensure standard is being implemented accurately according to B.E.S.T benchmark clarifications/expectations, item specs, etc., assist in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan and conducts classroom walkthroughs and observations providing evaluative and non-evaluative feedback.
Tellier, Tara	Reading Coach	The primary responsibility of the Reading Coach is to facilitate the implementation of reading programs, activities and strategies designed to achieve school improvement objectives.
Peters, Barbi	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The CRT serves as the school-wide testing coordinator, school liaison for English Language Learners and school based trainings facilitator.
Kneebone, Caitlyn	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist serves as the school liaison for ESE, coordinates initial staffings/annual reviews and confers with leadership team members and classroom teachers on content problems, solutions, and implementation of ESE accommodations and overall curriculum.
Castor, Nicole	Math Coach	The Math Coach facilitates the implementation of math programs, activities, and strategies designed to achieve school improvement objectives. In addition, the Math Coach is responsible for conducting coaching cycles, modeling lessons and providing non-evaluative walkthrough feedback.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/11/2021, Cicely Marks

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.*

1

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

389

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	66	66	67	64	76	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	414
Attendance below 90 percent	6	16	16	19	31	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	1	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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

Tuesday 7/6/2021

2020-21 - 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	35	73	64	92	72	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	404
Attendance below 90 percent	12	9	10	20	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	25	17	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	25	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	19	17	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	

2020-21 - 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	35	73	64	92	72	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	404
Attendance below 90 percent	12	9	10	20	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	25	17	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	25	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	19	17	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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 Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				47%	57%	57%	44%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				44%	58%	58%	45%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31%	52%	53%	38%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	63%	63%	52%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	61%	62%	41%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	48%	51%	24%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				42%	56%	53%	28%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	57%	-15%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	54%	-16%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	63%	-11%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	57%	-3%	60%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	37%	54%	-17%	53%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The data below was compiled using i-Ready Reading and Math beginning of the year, middle of the year and end of the year diagnostic assessments. Fifth grade Science data was derived from district PMA (Progress Monitoring Data) taken three times per year.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27	33	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	26	35
	Students With Disabilities	25	25	25
	English Language Learners	6	17	28
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26	19	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	13	26
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	25
	English Language Learners	6	16	28
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14	15	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	19	29
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	6	0	11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2	10	17
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	10	17
	Students With Disabilities	0	25	0
	English Language Learners	0	5	5

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10	19	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	15	23
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	5	14	11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3	8	23
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	4	17
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	5	19
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	15	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	18	25
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	9
	English Language Learners	12	12	16
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6	11	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	13	34
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	9
	English Language Learners	8	12	32

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12	9	20
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	5	12
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	11	5	21
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24	8	22
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	5	17
	Students With Disabilities	27	0	0
	English Language Learners	14	5	16
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52	46	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	38	39
	Students With Disabilities	50	50	25
	English Language Learners	35	8	7

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	12			12							
ELL	23	50	58	36	44		17				
ASN	90			100							
BLK	49	52		50	33		61				
HSP	33	46		34	26		45				
WHT	29			21							
FRL	41	51	50	37	26	27	44				
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	14	35	25	9	35	29					
ELL	43	47	25	59	66	45	31				
BLK	47	42	28	57	60	38	44				

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
HSP	43	50	35	53	63	42	31				
WHT	53	50		82	75						
FRL	45	46	35	55	58	35	47				
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	8	25	29	24	20	9	8				
ELL	25	33	35	35	34	22					
BLK	46	43	38	51	38	22	26				
HSP	38	41	31	45	43	27	33				
WHT	35	36		67	36						
FRL	43	46	39	51	39	24	30				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	34
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	355
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	95
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	25
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

When examining 18-19 FSA proficiency data, there was a decrease overall in ELA and Math proficiency, ELA and Math Learning Gains and ELA and Math Learning gains among the lowest 30%. This trend was consistent across all grade levels and subject areas. Most recent data indicates that the achievement gap has widened among all subgroups in ELA as well as Math. The biggest gap which is among English Language Learners and Students With Disabilities.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on 2018/2019 FSA and 2021 end of year i-Ready results, the data component that showed the lowest performance was the lowest 25% learning gains in ELA. Data in this category from the past three years show this to be a trend.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors were the limited time spent teaching foundational reading skills, planning differentiated small group instruction as well as Tier III structure and implementation.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math learning gains and Math proficiency. 41% of students, in 2018, made learning gains in math compared to 62% showing increases in 2019. End of the year i-Ready Math diagnostic results reflect 52% proficiency which is an increase of 33% from the beginning of the year.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

New actions that were taken in this area include: adjusting the math block to include whole group and small group instruction, math intervention two times a week and math tutoring before and after school.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

During the 2021-2022 school year, Oak Hill will implement Acceleration as a means to preview standards prior to being presented during the planned scope and sequence. The Acceleration model will also be used as the structure for after school tutoring.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

All classroom teachers in addition to resource team members will be trained in the use of Acceleration as a means of strategically preparing students for success by delving into new concepts.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement will include: the implementation of Math intervention and the use of engagement strategies to increase cognitive engagement. In addition, students scoring in the top quartile will participate in enrichment two times per week.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Three year trend data shows a decrease in overall proficiency, learning gains, and learning gains among the bottom 25th percentile. School-wide decreases in proficiency indicate a need to examine the delivery of core instruction and the level of students' cognitive engagement. Decreases in overall learning gains and learning gains among the lowest quartile reflect the need for explicit instruction and the increased use of student engagement strategies. Instructional practice specifically related to student engagement helps to ensure that instruction is delivered in a manner which will increase students' willingness and ability to approach learning tasks and achieve mastery of the standards.

Measurable Outcome:

By increasing the rigor and effectiveness of standards-based instruction, proficiency in ELA will increase from 47% to 57%, learning gains will increase from 44% to 58%, and learning gains in the bottom 25th percentile will increase from 31% to 52%. Math proficiency will increase from 59% to 65%, learning gains will increase from 62% to 65%, and learning gains in the bottom 25th percentile will increase from 39% to 48%. Science proficiency will increase from 42% to 50%.

Monitoring:

We will use i-Ready Diagnostic Assessments and Standards Based Unit Assessments to monitor student progress as well as classroom observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will effectively implement the use of cognitive engagement strategies during whole group and small group instruction. Oak Hill Elementary teachers will utilize the Art and Science of teaching in addition to the instructional framework to deliver instruction that is both standards-based and cognitively engaging.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Research has shown that engaging students in the learning process increases their attention and focus, motivates them to practice higher-level critical thinking skills, and promotes meaningful learning experiences.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be provided with a series of professional development courses centered around element 18 (student engagement) to include: the use of academic games, managing response rates, pacing, using physical movement and creating student centered tasks that produces high levels of engagement.

Person Responsible

Roshan Mohamed (roshan.mohamed@ocps.net)

Quarterly IGNITE (Inspiring Growth Through Nurturing, Innovation, Transformation and Engagement) days will be implemented in which classrooms will be transformed and students will engage in themed, standards based learning in efforts to increase students' cognitive engagement.

Person Responsible

Michelle Nye (michelle.nye@ocps.net)

The use of Kagan and/or engagement strategies will be added to the lesson plan template and become a standard "look-for" during classroom walkthroughs and a discussion item during common planning meetings.

Person Responsible

Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

Student engagement mini-clinics will be held by content area coaches in which teachers will be provided with modeling of the use of engagement strategies that are content area specific.

Person Responsible Roshan Mohamed (roshan.mohamed@ocps.net)

Teachers will be provided with targeted feedback aimed at improving professional practice as it specifically relates to student engagement.

Person Responsible Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Focusing on culture and environment specifically relating to Student Emotional Learning will allow us to integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen our school culture which will enable every student to grow academically, socially, and emotionally. Building and establishing a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students is essential. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: academic growth, student attendance and learning gains among our students with disabilities, English Language Learners and lowest quartile students.

Measurable Outcome:

With the implementation of Social and Emotional Learning school-wide, the percentage of Students With Disabilities that are scoring below the 41% federal index will increase from 26% to 45%. In addition, the number of students with an attendance rate below 90% will decrease from 64 to 32. With a school-wide focus on SEL, students' sense of belonging will increase from 72% to 77% and school safety will increase from 59% to 75%.

Monitoring:

Teachers will effectively implement the Second Step curriculum in addition to SEL practices across curriculum areas and school-wide. Early warning systems indicators, classroom walkthrough trend data and Panorama survey results will be utilized to monitor the effectiveness of school-wide Social and Emotional Learning practices.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Terica Weaver-Baker (terica.weaver-baker@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Distributive leadership and social and emotional learning will be used to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. OHES will plan and implement three cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. OHES will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessment, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs and adult feedback survey responses.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In order to achieve large scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the building. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational change and improvement. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model, OHES can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement Second Step SEL Curriculum School-Wide - OHES school based SEL Leadership Team will facilitate implementation through a train the trainer model.

Person Responsible Terica Weaver-Baker (terica.weaver-baker@ocps.net)

Monthly Adult ESOL classes will be hosted to support parents of English Language Learners. Adult and Family ESOL classes will be aimed at communication, resources and parental engagement.

Person Responsible Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

An OHES Family Learning Lab will be established as a resource center for students and families. Resources, workshops and events will be provided (hosted) in multiple languages in order to build community among all cultures.

Person Responsible Michelle Nye (95847@ocps.net)

A common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students will be established to include a character trait of the month in which a character trait will be highlighted and reinforced school-wide.

Person Responsible Terica Weaver-Baker (terica.weaver-baker@ocps.net)

Students within the lowest quartile will be paired with an Academic Coach. Academic Coaches will serve as mentors for the purpose of building relationships, increasing confidence and monitoring progress.

Person Responsible Roshan Mohamed (roshan.mohamed@ocps.net)

Positive Behavior Supports will be implemented school-wide to reinforce and highlight positive behaviors and choices.

Person Responsible Michelle Nye (95847@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that 57% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA).

Measurable Outcome:

The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 10 percentage points from 43% to 53%

Monitoring:

MTSS and Common Planning meetings will be utilized to monitor and analyze student data from the following data sources: i-Ready Diagnostics, i-Ready Growth Monitoring, SIPPS Mastery Assessment, Classroom Walkthroughs and Standards Based Unit Assessment data. Instructional adjustments will frequently occur based on student outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Exposing students to on grade level text helps to teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. In addition, it ensures that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency and comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

This selected instructional practice has a strong level of evidence, as noted in the IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

Strengthen the common planning process by utilizing the district created K-2 and 3-5 Common Planning Resources to guide the agenda and discussions. Common planning will include foundational skill in grades K-2.

Person Responsible

Cicely Marks (cicely.marks@ocps.net)

Classroom walkthroughs are conducted regularly and ELA feedback is provided; when needed adjustments are made in common planning/PLCs.

Person Responsible

Michelle Nye (michelle.nye@ocps.net)

Standards Based Unit Assessment (SBUA) Data and Foundational Assessment Data is used to plan small group instruction and differentiation opportunities.

Person Responsible

Roshan Mohamed (roshan.mohamed@ocps.net)

MTSS Problem Solving Teams meet regularly to ensure students are appropriately identified and matched to appropriate interventions and intensity. Data analysis is routinely part of the process, and adjustments are made to interventions based on the MTSS Problem Solving Team's findings.

Person Responsible

Caitlyn Kneebone (caitlyn.kneebone@ocps.net)

90 minute reading block fidelity checks will be conducted to ensure statutory requirements are met to include: 6 components of reading and daily inclusion of on level whole group instruction and differentiated small group instruction.

Person Responsible Tara Tellier (tara.tellier@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org/), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to SafeSchoolsforAlex.org 2019-2020 data, Oak Hill Elementary' s school incident ranking is very high for violent incidents when compared to all elementary schools statewide. Oak Hill ranked 1,347 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide. Total reported suspensions ranked high with a total of 24 suspensions during the 2019 school year. Property incidents, drug and public order incidents ranked very low.

Based on 2019-2020 school year data, the primary area of concern is violent incidents. Both school culture and environment are critical components of a school and student's success. This includes the expectations of behavior. Culture and environment will be assessed and monitored through discipline data and successful implementation of SEL practices. Specific areas of focus will include: safety, student engagement, and environment. Panorama survey results as well as Early Warning System indicators will be monitored to measure the effectiveness of SEL practices.

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support

a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

A core team of teachers, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.