

Escambia County School District

# Oakcrest Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

# Oakcrest Elementary School

1820 HOLLYWOOD AVE, Pensacola, FL 32505

www.escambiaschools.org

## Demographics

Principal: Dawn Turley L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (44%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

# Oakcrest Elementary School

1820 HOLLYWOOD AVE, Pensacola, FL 32505

www.escambiaschools.org

## School Demographics

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

## 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 Escambia 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.**

Our mission at Oakcrest Elementary is to serve: Every Student...Every Day...Whatever it Takes!

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

The Oakcrest Family will use preventative, teaching, and reinforcement-based strategies every day to create a positive learning environment for students, parents, faculty, and staff. We believe that parent/family involvement is very important to student achievement, and we will provide many opportunities for our parents to be involved in their children's education.

### 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
Bonifay, Linda	Principal	Linda Bonifay, Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school is implementing PBIS, RTI, and engagement strategies; schedules common planning time within the master schedule and after school to enable grade levels to have planning and meeting time together.
Sheppard, Tasheba	Assistant Principal	Tasheba Sheppard, Assistant Principal: Assist grade levels with making data-based decisions for instruction, assist in monitoring the use of engagement and all academic strategies, facilitates RTI/MTSS, and student attendance rates.
McCants, Marisa	Other	Marisa McCants, Curriculum Coordinator : Provides instructional leadership across subject areas including the development, and implementation of instructional programs and the MTSS process. Provides scheduling and support for computer-based assessments and supervises transportation. Assists in the evaluation of academic assessments, and their effect on student achievement, as well as the coordination of relevant staff development.
Rich, Philicia	Reading Coach	Dr. Philicia Rich, Resource Teacher/Reading Coach: Provides information about Tier 1 ELA core instruction, models effective instructional strategies in classrooms, provides differentiated coaching and other forms of professional development, participates in student data collection and analysis for Rtl, and collaborates with other staff to implement Tier II and Tier III interventions.
Martin, Lori	Other	Lori Martin, Positive Behavior Support Coach: Partners with community groups and local businesses to provide needed resources and services for students and families. Provides resources for students struggling with behavior, facilitates discussions with teachers and students to reteach appropriate behaviors.
Melton, Michale	Other	Michale Melton, Librarian : Leadership Team Member that meets on a regular basis to devise strategies and interventions to meet the needs of our school. These strategies are shared with our faculty and staff to meet the needs of individual students.
Summers, Jackie	Teacher, K-12	Jackie Summers, Teacher : Will work within her grade level to ensure that our students' meet proficiency in all content areas. She will also provide mentoring support to other teachers.
Jones, Phillip	Teacher, K-12	Phillip Jones, Teacher: Will work within his grade level to ensure that our students' meet proficiency in all content areas. He will also provide mentoring support to other teachers.



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ramsey, Deja	Teacher, K-12	Deja Ramsey, Teacher: Will work within her grade level to ensure that our students' meet proficiency in all content areas. She will also provide mentoring support to other teachers.
Nicks, Angela	Teacher, K-12	Angela Nicks, Teacher: Will work within her grade level to ensure that our students' meet proficiency in all content areas. She will also provide mentoring support to other teachers.
Herber, John	Teacher, K-12	John Herber, Teacher: Will work within his grade level to ensure that our students' meet proficiency in all content areas. He will also provide mentoring support to other teachers.
Rabb, Sara	Teacher, K-12	Sara Rabb, Teacher: Will work within her grade level to ensure that our students' meet proficiency in all content areas. She will also provide mentoring support to other teachers.
Cross, Lora	Teacher, ESE	Lora Cross, Teacher: Will work within her grade level to ensure that our students' meet proficiency in all content areas. She will also provide mentoring support to other teachers.
Grace, George	Teacher, K-12	George Grace, Teacher: Will work within his grade level to ensure that our students' meet proficiency in all content areas. He will also provide mentoring support to other teachers.
Farmer, Rachel	Math Coach	Rachel Farmer/ Math Instructional Coach: Provides information about Tier 1 ELA core instruction, models effective instructional strategies in classrooms, provides differentiated coaching and other forms of professional development, participates in student data collection and analysis for RtI, and collaborates with other staff to implement Tier II and Tier III interventions.
Lett, Donna	Other	Responsible for creating systems and managing the RTI/MTSS process, scheduling and facilitating RTI meetings, and for providing coaching support to teachers as they carry out and document interventions. Additionally, responsible for Informing parents of the progress of interventions with their children.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2014, Dawn Turley L

**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.*

3

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

31

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

463

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

1

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

3

**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	77	74	85	75	76	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	463
Attendance below 90 percent	9	39	42	45	40	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	216
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	5	10	17	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	3	9	20	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	38	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	36	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	14	15	25	29	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

**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	6	12	17	15	19	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	7	7	1	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 9/10/2021

**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	42	84	74	70	93	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	445
Attendance below 90 percent	9	34	28	20	28	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	6	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	7	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

**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	10	10	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

**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	42	84	74	70	93	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	445
Attendance below 90 percent	9	34	28	20	28	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	6	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	7	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

**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	10	10	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

**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				31%	53%	57%	23%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	55%	58%	37%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	52%	53%	30%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				39%	57%	63%	42%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				56%	60%	62%	54%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	52%	51%	35%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				28%	54%	53%	34%	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	26%	56%	-30%	58%	-32%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
05	2021					
	2019	18%	51%	-33%	56%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	33%	55%	-22%	62%	-29%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	58%	-15%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	55%	-17%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	26%	55%	-29%	53%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR was utilized for Fall, Winter, and Spring ELA and Math progress monitoring. The science district quarterly assessment was used for science progress monitoring. The numbers reflect the membership, students tied to the school during both survey 2 and 3.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13/17.1%	27/32.9%	33/39.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/19.7%	23/32.4%	28/39.4%
	Students With Disabilities	1/9.1%	2/15.4%	3/25%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	6/42.9%	6/40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20/27.4%	26/31.7%	32/37.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/25.4%	21/30%	26/35.6%
	Students With Disabilities	1/10%	1/8.3%	1/7.7%
	English Language Learners	5/35.7%	6/40%	7/43.8%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13/21%	20/28.2%	21/28.4%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/20.4%	16/28.6%	16/27.6%
	Students With Disabilities	1/20%	1/20%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/9.1%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10/15.4%	17/23.3%	14/19.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/13.5%	13/22.8%	11/19.3%
	Students With Disabilities	1/25%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	1/11.1%	2/18.2%	1/9.1%

<b>Grade 3</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	5/7.4%	10/15.9%	7/11.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/9.8%	10/19.2%	6/12%
	Students With Disabilities	1/9.1%	1/10%	1/10%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/8.3%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7/10.8%	10/16.1%	13/21.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/14.3%	8/15.7%	11/22.4%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	1/5%	2/16.7%	3/21.4%
<b>Grade 4</b>				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	3/4%	8/10.8%	10/15.4%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2/3.3%	6/9.4%	8/14%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	1/11.1%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7/9.2%	11/14.9%	12/18.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/9.8%	10/15.6%	11/19.3%
	Students With Disabilities	9/11.1%	2/18.2%	3/33.3%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/20%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13/17.6%	9/13.6%	18/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/19%	7/13%	12/24%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	1/7.1%	0/0%	3/37.5%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11/14.9%	16/24.2%	13/22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/12.3%	9/16.7%	9/19.1%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/10%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	2/12.5%	4/50%	2/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	18/26.5%	17/22.1%	25/44.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/26.4%	13/21.7%	17/37.8%
	Students With Disabilities	1/12.5%	1/10%	1/14.3%
	English Language Learners	2/13.3%	3/17.6%	2/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

**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	4	20		23							
ELL	11			35							
BLK	13	34	54	25	32	42	38				
HSP	18			37							
WHT	23			57							
FRL	17	34	53	31	39	33	41				
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	31	58	64	39	56	50	15				
ELL	22	47		41	71						
BLK	27	51	50	31	45	44	19				
HSP	33	40		47	65						



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
MUL	50			42							
WHT	46	65		66	78						
FRL	30	52	55	39	56	52	31				
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	11	17	5	24	22	25	16				
ELL	29	70		55	73						
BLK	18	31	29	34	47	33	32				
HSP	36	60		59	56		40				
MUL	18			40							
WHT	33	50		57	77						
FRL	21	35	31	40	53	36	33				

**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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	327
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
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	35
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	37
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	40
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	37
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?

After analyzing the progress monitoring data, we noticed increases in achievement in ELA and Math from the fall to the spring for grades 1 through 5. However, the increases fall below 41% proficiency across the board and for all ESSA subgroups. Science was the only area where fifth grade students significantly improved achievement and exceeded 41%, by moving from 26.5% to 44.6%.

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

In 2019, Oakcrest students demonstrated 31% achievement in ELA, with 51% learning gains. In 2021, Oakcrest students demonstrated 16% achievement in ELA, with only 35% learning gains. Based upon that data, ELA represents our greatest need for improvement.

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

One of the major differences from 2019 to 2021, was the shift from in person instruction to remote instruction for many of our students. In 2019, our students increased ELA proficiency from 23% to 31%, with a targeted focus on Tier 1 instruction, where there was a specific emphasis on writing instruction with mini-lessons, small groups, and conferencing. Compounding the loss of instructional time due to remote instruction, was also the loss of key veteran teachers and their replacement with novice teachers. In this sense, the greatest hinderance to our intended academic progress was decreased teacher content and pedagogical knowledge. Last year, fifty percent (50%) of our K-5 teachers were classified as novice teachers, having four or less years of teaching experience. Even though we started the school year having identified teacher content and pedagogical knowledge as a barrier, it was further exacerbated by the overall number of students that began the year in remote status and who were asked or required to return to school as a result of their lack of academic progress in January. Even when students returned to school with traditional face to face instruction, our teachers were not able to close the significant achievement gaps. Our new actions include using PLCs and professional development to specifically address the content and pedagogical needs of our novice and veteran teachers.

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

Science represented the highest area of achievement. Our fifth grade students significantly improved achievement from 26.5% to 44.6%.

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

The main contributing factor is the level of experience demonstrated by our science teacher. Despite the instructional delivery challenges, our science teacher was able to make the necessary adjustments and obtain the needed buy-in from students. He adhered to the district science pacing guide, implemented hands-on learning with science experiments, and used results from the progress monitoring assessments to drive instruction and to encourage high student achievement.

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

We will need to increase ELA, Science, and Math proficiency through standards aligned instruction and support for our new core reading program (Tier 1). We will need to use progress monitoring data to guide instructional decision making and to identify areas for remediation and enrichment. This will require us to specifically identify our lower quartile students and subgroups who are not responding to instruction and provide targeted remediation for these students and track their response to instruction in our data PLCs.

**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.**

The professional development opportunities include:

1. Data PLCs to equip teachers with the ability to use the data for instructional decision making and accountability
2. Two different PLCs designed to target issues with Tier 1 Instruction and Tier 2/3 Instruction.
3. Specific support from ELA specialists to support teachers with the new B.E.S.T. standards, new core curriculum, and implementation of the district pacing guide.
4. Increasing the percentage of reading endorsed/certified teachers on campus.
5. Differentiated coaching support provided by our reading and math coach.

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

Historically, we notice that our first grade students build on their progress from Kindergarten, and then we notice a decline in our STAR 360 data in second grade and beyond. Kindergarten and first grade are cohesive grade levels and they implement a teams approach to instruction. This year, we have reassigned teachers and hired stronger teachers to teach second grade. In addition to staffing changes, underperforming second grade students will receive whole group and small group differentiated instruction that emphasizes foundational reading, speaking, and writing skills. Reading fluency and automaticity will also be emphasized. Teachers will deliver grade level instruction (Tier 1) during whole group instruction, and will utilize the district Decision Making Tree to identify and to implement appropriate Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for students. We believe the momentum we build up in second grade this year will ensure there is not a dip or decline in the progress of our students and they will demonstrate greater proficiency levels and less gaps in achievement in third grade and beyond.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

Achievement in ELA for Kindergarten through second grade has not reached 50% proficiency in all subgroups as evidenced on STAR 360 (AP3). The Kindergarten ELA proficiency rate was 32.9%. Our data shows underperformance of our subgroups in ELA, with the exception of our SWD subgroup. The breakdown of our data is as follows: Economically Disadvantaged (33.8%), Students with Disabilities (54.4), English Language Learners (0%). The first grade proficiency rate was 39.3%. Our data shows underperformance of all of our subgroups in ELA. The breakdown of the data reveals: Economically Disadvantaged (39.4%), Students with Disabilities (25%), English Language Learners (40%). The second grade proficiency rate was 28.4%. Our data shows underperformance of our subgroups in ELA. The breakdown of our data is: Economically Disadvantaged (27.6%), Students with Disabilities (0%), English Language Learners (9.1%).

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Achievement in ELA for third through fifth grade has not reached 50% proficiency in all subgroups on FSA or on our progress monitoring data. With regards to FSA, our third grade ELA proficiency rate was 17%, our fourth grade proficiency rate was 9%, and our 5th grade proficiency rate was 20%. In the absence of sub group data from the 2021 FSA, our progress monitoring data from STAR 360 (AP 3) reveals significant gaps for our Students with Disabilities and our ELL sub groups. For example, in third grade our ELA proficiency was 11.3%. Our data shows underperformance of all of our subgroups: Economically Disadvantaged (12%), Students with Disabilities (10%), English Language Learners (0%). In fourth grade our ELA proficiency rate was 15.4%. Our data shows underperformance of all of our subgroups: Economically Disadvantaged (14%), Students with Disabilities (11%), English Language Learners (0%). In fifth grade, our ELA proficiency rate was 29%. Our data shows underperformance of all of our subgroups: Economically Disadvantaged (24%), Students with Disabilities (0%), English Language Learners (37.5%). Based upon our analysis of the data, the areas that demonstrated a lack of academic growth, with particular emphasis on our Students with Disabilities and our English Language Learners, is a result of our students' lack of foundational, critical thinking and application skills. When best educational practices are implemented to address those deficiencies, each grade level will ensure a targeted focus on standards aligned instructional practices with our students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Kindergarten through 2nd grade will reach 50% ELA proficiency on the spring 2022 STAR AP3. ELA proficiency will improve from 16% to 50% on the 2022 FSA, which includes our Black and Economically disadvantaged subgroups. English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities will perform at or above the learning gain percentage of overall students.

**Monitoring:**

This area of focus will be monitored using quantitative data found in STAR 360, I-Ready, School Net, and writing data, and qualitative data found in classroom walkthroughs/visits, Test Taking Behavior Checklists, PLC artifacts, artifacts from grade-level planning meetings, student data chat documentation, and coaching documentation.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Linda Bonifay (lbonifay@ecsdf.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Systematic and explicit teaching that is aligned to the standards and provides specific feedback will help our students master the challenging content as outlined in our state standards. Teaching in this manner will also address the key Tier 1 instructional issues that are preventing our students, particularly our underperforming ESSA categories observed with our SWDs and our ELL students- from meeting the higher academic achievement

levels that we know they are capable of achieving with the proper level of instruction and support.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

According to Hattie (2012) & Fisher, Frey, & Hattie (2016), systematic and explicit teaching that is aligned to the standards and provides specific feedback will help our students master challenging content as outlined in our state standards. Teaching in this manner will also address the key Tier 1 instructional issues that are preventing our students, particularly our underperforming ESSA categories observed with our SWDs and our ELL students- from meeting the higher academic achievement levels that we know they are capable of achieving with the proper level of instruction and support.

**Action Steps to Implement**

The Curriculum Coordinator and content coaches will either provide or facilitate professional development focused on systematic and explicit standards-aligned instruction that ensures teachers understand how to use the district and state resources and how to implement the new core ELA curriculum and Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading intervention programs and/or materials. The content coaches will develop a Professional Development Calendar that outlines the expectations related to standards-aligned instruction for the year.

**Person Responsible** Philicia Rich (prich1@ecsdfl.us)

Teachers will participate in bi-monthly team or individual data chats to discuss instructional effectiveness and student responses to instruction. Teachers will be encouraged to engage in reflective practices with focused and targeted questions and will make adjustments to their instruction based upon the data.

**Person Responsible** Tasheba Sheppard (tsheppard@ecsdfl.us)

Teachers will implement quarterly data chats (minimum) with students (and share the assessment data with parents/guardians). In those data chats, teachers will provide specific feedback to students regarding their progress and help students set or reset individual learning goals/targets.

**Person Responsible** Philicia Rich (prich1@ecsdfl.us)

The Administrative Team conducts classroom walkthroughs to monitor specific expectations as outlined on the Professional Development Calendar. Coaching for individual teachers will be based on data collection during those classroom walkthroughs by administration or non-evaluative classroom visits by coaches.

**Person Responsible** Marisa McCants (mmccants@ecsdfl.us)

Content and Rtl coaches will provide differentiated coaching to assist teachers with ensuring meaningful and targeted Tier 1 instruction is provided for all students.

**Person Responsible** Tasheba Sheppard (tsheppard@ecsdfl.us)

Students who consistently do not meet the expectations for learning and do not respond to instruction will receive additional supports and may be referred for more targeted interventions (Tier 2), or intensive/individualized interventions (Tier 3).

**Person Responsible** Donna Lett (dlett2@ecsdfl.us)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Achievement in ELA has not reached 41% proficiency in all subgroups on FSA or on our progress monitoring data. In the absence of sub group data from the 2021 FSA, our progress monitoring data from STAR 360 reveals significant gaps for our Students with Disabilities and our ELL sub groups. With out overall STAR proficiency at 25% in ELA, 23% in Math, and 45% in Science, our data shows underperformance of our subgroups: Economically Disadvantaged (23%/ELA, 24%/Math, 37%/Science), Students with Disabilities (9%/ELA, 8.2%/Math, 14%/Science), English Language Learners (17%/ELA, 24%/Math, 25%/Science). Based on the data, the gaps in achievement for our Students with Disabilities and our English Language Learners is due to the need to increase the content and pedagogical skills of teachers and support staff. Teachers can successfully build their content knowledge and practical teaching knowledge base as they participate in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs).

**Measurable Outcome:**

Kindergarten through 2nd grade will reach 50% ELA proficiency on the spring 2022 STAR AP3. ELA proficiency will improve from 16% to 50% on the 2022 FSA, which includes our Black and Economically disadvantaged subgroups. English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities will perform at or above the learning gain percentage of overall students.

**Monitoring:**

This area of focus will be monitored using quantitative data found in STAR 360, I-Ready, School Net, and writing data, and qualitative data found in classroom walkthroughs/visits, Test Taking Behavior Checklists, PLC artifacts, artifacts from grade-level planning meetings, student data chat documentation, and coaching documentation.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Using a teams model, the Curriculum Coordinator, content coaches, and/or teacher leaders will serve as lead facilitators for each grade level data team. After the establishment of group norms, the teams will meet a minimum of twice per month and will use an explicit and data-driven structure to disaggregate data, analyze student performance, set incremental goals, engage in dialogue around explicit and deliberate standards-aligned instruction, and create a plan to monitor student learning and teacher instruction through classroom walkthroughs and feedback.

Lead Data Team Facilitators:

Grade K-K. Murphy  
Grade 1-P. Jones  
Grade 2-M. McCants  
Grade 3-P. Rich/R. Farmer  
Grade 4-R. Lett  
Grade 5-S. Rabb

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

According to Hattie (2012) & Fisher, Frey, & Hattie (2016), the effect sizes for teacher clarity of learning expectations and for specific feedback is 0.75 respectively. Systemic and explicit teaching that is aligned to the standards and provides specific feedback will help our students master the challenging content as outlined in our state standards. Teaching in this manner will also address the key Tier 1 instructional issues that are preventing our students, particularly our Students With Disabilities and our English Language Learners, from meeting the higher academic achievement levels that we know they are capable of achieving with the proper level of instruction and support. Using a data teams model will provide the support teachers need as we build teacher efficacy and capacity, which will

result in their increased ability to provide responsive and effective instruction to our diverse and gifted student population.

### Action Steps to Implement

The Curriculum Coordinator, the content coaches, the RtI Coach, and/or teacher leader will support all data team(s) and each will serve as lead facilitators for each grade level data team. They will develop group norms and will meet with data teams a minimum of twice per month.

**Person Responsible** Linda Bonifay (lbonifay@ecsdfi.us)

The Curriculum Coordinator, content coaches, RTI Coach, and/or teacher leaders will ensure each data team member understands the expectations for explicit and standards-aligned instruction. They will ensure each member has access to grade-levels standards (which includes district and state resources), implements the appropriate grade level assessments in School-Net, and uses common scoring guides/ rubrics.

**Person Responsible** Marisa McCants (mmccants@ecsdfi.us)

Upon the successful completion of state assessments and district progress monitoring measures, each grade level data team will collect and chart the data, making it visible for review.

**Person Responsible** Marisa McCants (mmccants@ecsdfi.us)

The data teams will question the instructional strategies and how they are impacting each student. They will examine result indicators by distinguishing between effective and ineffective practices, and they will be able to justify their instructional decisions. Based upon the team's findings, the teams will make mid-course corrections before moving on. The respective data teams will continuously monitor the impact of these strategies and the impact on student learning.

**Person Responsible** Donna Lett (dlett2@ecsdfi.us)

Content coaches will provide differentiated coaching to assist teachers based upon the agreed upon instructional practices identified in the data team PLCs.

**Person Responsible** Tasheba Sheppard (tsheppard@ecsdfi.us)

Building on the progress made in the previous year's Data PLCs, the Reading Coach will introduce and facilitate a Tier 1 PLC designed to support and strengthen Tier 1 ELA instruction to students and a Tier 2/3 PLC designed to support teachers as they deliver targeted and intensive reading interventions to students.

**Person Responsible** Philicia Rich (prich1@ecsdfi.us)

### 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.

**When in comparison to other schools in the State of Florida, our primary concern is the alleviate all SESIR incidents throughout our school environment. Our secondary concern is to reduce the number of our mir incidence by students relying on intrinsic motivation to drive their decision making process.**

**Addressing the culture and environment, it will be monitored by the major/minor infraction reports as well as the number of students attending quarterly PBIS Reward Celebrations throughout the school year. It will also be monitored through monthly PBIS Meetings to review and alleviate concerns regarding behavior or discipline data. We will continuously monitor these processes through the constant reteaching of school wide behavior policies and procedures.**

#### **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.**

Oakcrest will have a written Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP). The plan will be written in collaboration with parents, community stakeholders, and school personnel responsible for implementing the plan. The PFEP will assess the previous year's PFEP results and current needs. The plan will outline goals, strategies, and activities to better communicate with families, and will focus on building the capacity of parents to address the needs of all students. The PFEP will be reviewed by the district Title I office, and the approved plan will be disseminated to parents and stakeholders. A Family-School Compact will also be developed jointly with parents and other stakeholders. The school's Title I budget will directly support the PFEP.

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

The stakeholders at Oakcrest Elementary school include our administrators and faculty and staff members who service our students, and adhere to the PBIS (Positive Behavior Systems) that we have in place to promote a positive culture within our school. Our parents and community partners also assist with the development of a positive environment for our school by providing donations, and supporting the initiatives we have in place on our campus.

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>